



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2002

No. 82

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 19, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Right Reverend John B. Lipscomb, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Southwest Florida, Parrish, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Sovereign and Lord of all, we commend to You those who serve in the several branches of the government of our Nation. Especially we pray this day for the representatives of the people of the United States gathered in this Chamber to seek and to do Your will for those who elected them to this high office. We offer You grateful Thanksgiving for all who serve in this House with honor and integrity. Guard them from the presumption of self-importance and self-interest. Give them clarity of vision and thought. Renew in them a passion for justice and freedom. Endue them with the courage needed to guard the dignity and extend the blessings of liberty to all the people of our great Nation and of the whole Earth. All this we ask in Your holy Name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER) is recognized for 1 minute to introduce the guest chaplain.

There was no objection.

### BISHOP JOHN BAILEY LIPSCOMB

(Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today Bishop John Bailey Lipscomb, who gave our very eloquent prayer this morning, is from my hometown of Bradenton, Florida. Bishop Lipscomb was instituted as the Fourth Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Southwest Florida in 1997. The Diocese of Southwest Florida covers the area from Brooksville, Florida, which is north of Tampa, south to Naples, and includes my area along the Gulf of Mexico, as well as portions of the gentlemen from Florida's (Mr. BILIRAKIS), (Mr. YOUNG), (Mr. DAVIS), (Mr. PUTNAM), (Mr. GOSS) and the gentlewoman from Florida's (Mrs. THURMAN) districts in our area of southwest Florida.

Born in Alexandria, Virginia, Bishop Lipscomb grew up in Jacksonville. He received his BA from the University of North Carolina, Asheville, his Master's in Divinity degree from the School of Theology of the University of South Sewanee, his Doctor of Ministry degree from the Graduate Theological Foundation and is a Fellow of the Foundation. Bishop Lipscomb has worked in several States throughout the South and as chaplain of the Louisiana National Guard. Bishop Lipscomb served on active duty during Operation Desert Shield.

Bishop Lipscomb and his wife, Marcie, have two children, Matthew and Natalie, and four grandchildren. The Lipscombs are very active in my community, and I have had the pleasure of working with them personally, especially and most recently on the Boys and Girls Club in Manatee County. It is my honor to be able to welcome him here today and consider him my friend.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3671

business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 42, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—353

Abercrombie	Crowley	Harman
Ackerman	Cubin	Hart
Akin	Culberson	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Armey	Davis (FL)	Hayworth
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hill
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Hilleary
Baldacci	Davis, Tom	Hinchee
Ballenger	DeGette	Hobson
Barcia	DeLauro	Hoefel
Barrett	DeLay	Hoekstra
Bartlett	DeMint	Holden
Barton	Deutsch	Honda
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Becerra	Dicks	Horn
Bentsen	Dingell	Hostettler
Bereuter	Doggett	Houghton
Berkley	Dooley	Hoyer
Berman	Doolittle	Hunter
Berry	Doyle	Inslee
Biggert	Dreier	Isakson
Bilirakis	Duncan	Israel
Blumenauer	Dunn	Issa
Blunt	Edwards	Istook
Boehlert	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Boehner	Emerson	Jackson-Lee
Bonilla	Engel	(TX)
Bonior	Eshoo	Jefferson
Bono	Evans	Jenkins
Boozman	Everett	John
Boswell	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Fattah	Johnson (IL)
Boyd	Ferguson	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (TX)	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Fletcher	Jones (NC)
Brown (OH)	Foley	Jones (OH)
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Kanjorski
Bryant	Ford	Keller
Burr	Frank	Kelly
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Kennedy (RI)
Buyer	Frost	Kerns
Callahan	Gallely	Kildee
Calvert	Ganske	Kilpatrick
Camp	Gekas	Kind (WI)
Cannon	Gephardt	King (NY)
Cantor	Gibbons	Kingston
Capito	Gilchrest	Kirk
Capps	Gillmor	Klecicka
Cardin	Gilman	Knollenberg
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Carson (OK)	Goode	LaFalce
Castle	Goodlatte	LaHood
Chabot	Gordon	Lampson
Chambliss	Goss	Langevin
Clayton	Graham	Lantos
Clement	Granger	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Graves	Latham
Coble	Green (TX)	LaTourette
Combust	Green (WI)	Lee
Condit	Greenwood	Levin
Cooksey	Grucci	Lewis (CA)
Cox	Gutierrez	Lewis (KY)
Coyne	Hall (OH)	Lipinski
Cramer	Hall (TX)	Lofgren
Crenshaw	Hansen	Lowey

Lucas (KY)	Pelosi
Lucas (OK)	Pence
Luther	Peterson (PA)
Lynch	Petri
Maloney (CT)	Phelps
Maloney (NY)	Pickering
Manzullo	Pitts
Mascara	Pombo
Matheson	Pomeroy
Matsui	Price (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn
McCollum	Radanovich
McCrery	Rahall
McGovern	Rangel
McInnis	Regula
McIntyre	Rehberg
McKeon	Reyes
McKinney	Reynolds
Meehan	Riley
Meeks (NY)	Rivers
Menendez	Rodriguez
Mica	Roemer
Millender-	Rogers (KY)
McDonald	Rogers (MI)
Miller, Dan	Rohrabacher
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller, George	Ross
Miller, Jeff	Rothman
Mink	Roybal-Allard
Mollohan	Royce
Moran (KS)	Rush
Moran (VA)	Ryan (WI)
Murtha	Ryun (KS)
Myrick	Sandlin
Nadler	Sawyer
Napolitano	Saxton
Nethercutt	Schakowsky
Ney	Schiff
Northup	Schrock
Nussle	Scott
Obey	Sensenbrenner
Ortiz	Sessions
Osborne	Shadegg
Ose	Shaw
Otter	Sherman
Owens	Sherwood
Oxley	Shimkus
Pallone	Shows
Pascrell	Shuster
Pastor	Simmons
Paul	Simpson
Payne	Skeen

NAYS—42

Aderholt	Holt	Ramstad
Baird	Kennedy (MN)	Sabo
Baldwin	Kucinich	Sanchez
Baskin	Larsen (WA)	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	LoBiondo	Strickland
Capuano	Markey	Stupak
Costello	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Crane	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Moore	Thompson (MS)
English	Neal	Udall (NM)
Etheridge	Oberstar	Visclosky
Finer	Olver	Waters
Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hefley	Platts	Wu

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—38

Bachus	Hilliard	Putnam
Barr	Hinojosa	Roukema
Bishop	Hulshof	Sanders
Blagojevich	Hyde	Serrano
Clay	Kaptur	Shays
Collins	Leach	Smith (NJ)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Cummings	Linder	Sweeney
Deal	McHugh	Towns
Delahunt	Meek (FL)	Trafficant
Ehrlich	Morella	Wynn
Fossella	Norwood	Young (AK)
Herger	Portman	

□ 1028

Mr. MORAN of Kansas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3686

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3686.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 387. Concurrent resolution recognizing the American Society of Civil Engineers for reaching its 150th Anniversary and for the many vital contributions of civil engineers to the quality of life of our Nation's people including the research and development projects that have led to the physical infrastructure of modern America.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2600. An act to ensure the continued financial capacity of insurers to provide coverage for risks from terrorism.

S. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution recognizing the American Society of Civil Engineers on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of its founding and for the many vital contributions of civil engineers to the quality of life of the people of the United States, including the research and development projects that have led to the physical infrastructure of modern America.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1214) An Act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to establish a program to ensure greater security for United States seaports, and for other purposes, agrees to a conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CLELAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon; and for matters in section 108 of the House amendment and sections 112 and 115 of the Senate bill, Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. GRASSLEY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 6968(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), from the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), At Large.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy:

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), from the Committee on Appropriations (reappointment).

The Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), from the Committee on Appropriations (reappointment).

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), At Large.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 9355(a), of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Air Force Academy:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), At Large.

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), from the Committee on Appropriations (reappointment).

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minutes per side.

#### RECOGNIZING SISTER JEANNE O'LAUGHLIN

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sister Jeanne O'Laughlin, President of Barry University in Miami Shores, Florida.

During her 21-year tenure as President, Sister Jeanne has resuscitated a once-dormant campus with limited resources into a thriving, world-class institute of higher learning.

□ 1030

Setting ambitious goals for the university, Sister Jeanne has been a poised and relentless leader in seeing them through to fruition. Once a struggling university with only 2,000 students, Barry now boasts a student population of 8,500. Barry's student body represents more than 70 countries and has earned the distinction of being the most diverse southern regional university.

Sister Jeanne's contributions, however, are not limited to the boundaries of Barry's campus. As a woman of faith and compassion, Sister Jeanne has dedicated herself to serving those in needs. We count children, the home-

less, and women among the many lives she has touched.

Please join me in recognizing Sister Jeanne for her selfless commitments to our community and for turning Barry University into a factory of men and women who graduate better prepared to serve their fellow man.

#### STOP PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES FROM ROBBING AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the great country western music singer Merle Haggard has a song he sings called "Rainbow Stew." One of the lines in that song says, "One of these days, when the air clears up and the sun comes shining through, we will all be drinking that free Bubble-up and eating that rainbow stew."

Tonight, the pharmaceutical manufacturers and the insurance companies are going to have a big rainbow stew banquet for the Republicans. They are going to serve free Bubble-up. The pharmaceutical manufacturers in this country are going to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to do this, and they are pledging millions more in another attempt to deceive the senior citizens in this country and make them think that they are going to get a prescription drug benefit.

Corporate greed in America has gone too far. It is time for this Congress to fulfill its obligation and stop the pharmaceutical companies from robbing the American people.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND PARTISANSHIP

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have been working hard to design a plan to help America's seniors get the prescription drugs that they need. No senior should ever have to choose between putting food on the table and getting the medicine they need. American seniors need our help.

Now we have a plan that is working its way through the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means and should be voted on soon. The Democrats have their plan, too. The Democrats plan may be too expensive and inefficient, but I think we in the majority are willing to work with them.

Unfortunately, it looks like our friends on the other side of the aisle are not willing to reciprocate. The Washington Post reported on Tuesday, and I quote, "Democratic strategists are advising candidates to tout the Democrats' plan and are encouraging them to take shots at the Republicans."

Mr. Speaker, that story was written on the same day our plan was unveiled; before even reading it, already attacking it. Looks to me like our friends on the other side of the aisle are just out for political points, not to solve problems. I hope they will prove me wrong.

#### AMERICANS NEED PRESCRIPTION DRUG RELIEF

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in The Washington Post, I read with alarm: "Drug Firms Among Big Donors at GOP Event Tonight." Thirty million dollars is going to be raised.

In lieu of trying to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors, why can we not do the right thing today and stay as long as it is going to take to make sure that we do the right thing for our seniors?

Every weekend that I go home and speak to my seniors, most of them say, Congresswoman SOLIS, what is it going to take for the Congress to listen to the needs of senior citizens? And I tell them that right now our House is not working in the democratic mode. We are not allowing for discussion and debate so that we can provide assistance and benefits that are much needed by our senior citizens.

This is a sham that is occurring here today, and it is unfortunate that we cannot come together and work in a bipartisan manner to see that our seniors and those that are on fixed incomes receive the kind of relief that is due them.

Many people save their money for their retirement. Right now they are faced with some major hardships. I would ask that Republicans meet with us until after 5 o'clock today, before they go to their fundraiser, and let us get the work done for our seniors on prescription drug relief.

#### NEW BILL BRINGS HOPE TO SENIORS FACING SKYROCKETING DRUG BILLS

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for years, seniors have been saying that they need help with their prescription drug bills. None of us anticipated prescription drugs would be the backbone of modern medicine, and we certainly did not anticipate that the cost would be so high.

I am proud of this new bill that has just emerged which brings a new hope to all seniors who face skyrocketing drug prices. The Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act will ensure that all Medicare beneficiaries will be covered.

Not only that, but those who want to stay with their current coverage may

do that as well. For as little as just over \$1 a day, seniors will have the ability to choose among plans to find what works best for their prescription drug needs. Additionally, seniors will enjoy immediate savings through a prescription drug discount card which will be accepted by local pharmacies.

These are just two major components of this groundbreaking new drug bill, and I am glad Congress has answered seniors' call for help.

#### DRUG FIRMS AMONG BIG DONORS AT GOP EVENT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, while the purported Republican benefit would total 16 percent of the first \$4,500 of prescription drug costs, it would not reduce the outrageous and obscene charges of the pharmaceutical companies. Why? Because they are the sponsors of the big fundraiser tonight.

Mr. Robert Ingram of GlaxoSmithKline, the chief operating officer, is the chief corporate fundraiser. His company has given one quarter of a million dollars to the Republicans, and they have delivered a bill that will do nothing to deal with the outrageous extortionist cost of prescription drugs in the United States of America.

People will still be able to go to Canada and buy drugs manufactured in this country by their major contributors for half the cost, or Mexico for 40 percent of the cost, or Europe for a third of the cost. But, no, not here at home. Our seniors will be offered a Trojan horse benefit, 16 percent of the first \$4,500 of their prescription drug cost. Boy, that is really going to help my seniors a lot.

Do my Republican colleagues have no sense of shame, or is it just a sense of humor, to adjourn the House early to go to an event sponsored and paid for by the pharmaceutical companies while offering this phony Trojan horse benefit?

#### SLAVE MEMORIAL LEGISLATION

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) in introducing legislation to develop a memorial to American slaves. It must not be forgotten that each slave was an individual and a child of God. Not only do they deserve our remembrance, we owe them our respect.

The legacy of our Nation includes many people, including those who were victims but who chose not to be victimized. As Americans, we naturally understand this universal story of resilience and strength, and with this

memorial we have the opportunity to honor those who suffered in bondage yet maintained their humanity.

With this memorial we will remember those who endured slavery and those who fought to end their slavery. In addition, this legislation will educate the current and future generations on the evils of slavery. This discussion cannot stop with the troubles of those who were enslaved, but must continue on to celebrate their deliverance into freedom.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT FOR ALL SENIORS

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, for months now, as I have gone home, I have listened to my seniors. They continue to talk about the high cost of drugs. About 6 months ago, I began to receive early-morning phone calls from my 77-year-old dad. That is when I know things have really gotten out of hand.

He continues to tell me that every place he goes, to the senior center, to the little food banks that he goes to to help out and volunteer, et cetera, that everybody is out of food and, worse, they are paying all their money for drugs, for prescription medication that they need. Every week he tells me a new story about somebody that he knows and how they have to choose between their rent or their doctors' visits or their prescription drugs, and how some people are taking their dose of drugs and halving them or taking one quarter of what they are supposed to take in order to make it last for the month.

Many seniors on fixed incomes have been forced to cut back on basic needs and others have chosen to travel to other countries because the prices are lower. It is shameful that we have not done something about this, and we must work together to do it right. We must do it for all of our seniors.

#### PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 2002

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of Western civilization, we have evaluated the justice of societies by how they treat the most vulnerable and the weakest among them. This is a biblical principle best expressed in the verse, "Whatsoever you do for the least of these, you do to me."

Several thousand times a year in the United States, mostly on healthy babies and healthy mothers in the fifth and sixth month of pregnancy, a procedure known as partial-birth abortion takes place, forcibly turning the child to a breach position, pulling the living

child out of the mother by the leg, stabbing the child in the base of the skull, removing its brains with a vacuum, and pulling the dead child out of the mother.

We will introduce today the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2002. It should break the heart of America. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it breaks the heart of God. Let us bring an end to this devious and evil practice in the United States of America.

#### REPUBLICAN PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN IS ILLUSION FOR SENIORS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership has developed a prescription drug plan for seniors, but it is an illusion. The pharmaceutical industry is pleased: they win, seniors lose under the Republican plan.

Seniors rely on Medicare for their health care, but they are going to have to get their prescription drug coverage from an insurance company, if any company is willing to provide it, and that is not likely in rural America or perhaps anywhere in this country.

No guaranteed benefits, no guaranteed premium, no guaranteed reduction in price. The Republican plan is a vaccine to inoculate Republicans for yet another election against the truth that they continue to protect the pharmaceutical industry at the expense of seniors.

Why did they do it? Today's Washington Post: "Drug Firms Among Big Donors at GOP Event." Today's New York Times: "Drug Makers Sponsor Event for GOP As Bill Is Debated." Corporate greed and political self-interest are married in this Republican bill, and it should be rejected.

#### RECREATIONAL MARINE EMPLOYMENT ACT

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Recreational Marine Employment Act, which I recently introduced with broad bipartisan support.

The purpose of this legislation is to create thousands of jobs in the recreational marine industry by ensuring that marinas, boat builders, and recreational boaters will not have to pay the unnecessary and exorbitant insurance premiums under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Individuals who work in the recreational marine industry are already covered under State worker's compensation laws, and Congress never intended that these jobs also be covered under the longshore act, which is supposed to apply to commercial ships,

not recreational boats. This bill will provide the commonsense clarification needed under the longshore act.

A recent survey indicated that employers in the recreational marine industry would save an average of \$99,000 a year if this legislation passes, and 95 percent of those employers said they would use the money to create additional jobs. I urge my colleagues to call my office today to sign on as a cosponsor of H.R. 4811.

#### TRIBUTE TO DETROIT RED WINGS—STANLEY CUP CHAMPIONS

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to own up to a promise I made to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), and, equally important, to honor the World Champion Detroit Red Wings.

Later today, I will also deliver the other part of my friendly wager with the gentleman from Michigan, a big spread of traditional North Carolina barbeque from Bullock's in Durham. And for those of you who may not know, let me clarify for the record: barbeque is a noun, not a verb.

Muhammad Ali once said "Champions are made from something they have deep inside them, a desire, a dream, a vision."

Detroit and the entire State of Michigan are a part of that dream today. In the place they call "Hockeytown," the Detroit Red Wings are a team for the ages. Last week, they did more than just win a 10th Stanley Cup. In the end, it was an incredible journey by true legends of the game that will be remembered for a long time to come.

Undaunted by pressure, stoic in the face of defeat, resilient in the fight for glory, the Detroit Red Wings proved once and for all that hockey is a game of confidence and a game of skill. They embody the gritty do-it-yourself spirit that Detroit is known for, and the town embraces them for it.

This series will always hold a special place in my heart. While it ended with the defeat of our Carolina Hurricanes, it will always be remembered as the time when, for a brief moment, hockey amazingly overshadowed basketball in the State of North Carolina.

So congratulations to the Detroit Red Wings, to the city of Detroit, and to the citizens of Michigan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this speech obviously was written by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR). And as a man of my word, I am gladly reading the tribute that he has written, as promised in my wager. But as a defender of Mayberry—that is how the Detroit media refer to us—I would like to add something unscripted here about North Carolina, "Hockeytown of the South," as we prefer to be called.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, the Hurricanes made us proud with their fine performance and their hometown spirit. Excellent in both athletic performance and sportsmanship, they are equally gracious in defeat, setting a good example for their congressman.

I also feel compelled to issue a storm warning. If the gentleman does not know what a "Category 5" is, he had better find out before next season!

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for his graciousness and his challenge, but I really look forward to that very tangy, delicious North Carolina barbecue that at this very minute is making its way over the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, we had 1.2 million people participate in the Red Wings victory parade on Monday. Winning the Stanley Cup has brought our city and State together. As the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) said, hockey is more than just a sport in Detroit, it is a passion. That is why we call it "Hockeytown." In Hockeytown, we serve breakfast by handing out forks to each kid and then dropping an Eggo in the middle of the table.

In Hockeytown, when the traffic signal turns red, we start cheering because we think Steve Yzerman just scored again.

Every once in a while I would say to my Republican friends, I will throw a body check or two around here, I want Members to know it is not personal, I will wind up in the Cloak Room for 2 minutes, but it is where I come from. I come from Hockeytown; that is what it is about.

Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina Hurricanes fought hard. They are worthy opponents. They are good sports, and they have good hearts. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is a good sport with a great heart. Babe Ruth once said, "You may have the greatest bunch of individual stars in the world, but if they do not play together, the club will not be worth a dime." Well, the Hurricanes have stars, and they played together; the Red Wings have stars, and they certainly played together, and that is what makes them both great. We in Hockeytown look forward to many more spirited games with our friends from North Carolina.

#### ECONOMIC RECOVERY REQUIRES AN ENERGY PLAN

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, America's economic recovery requires an energy plan, and Americans are watching gas prices in preparation for summer

vacations, reminding all of us that oil products are the core of our American economy. If we expect Americans to hop on airplanes and climb into cars, we must immediately implement the House energy plan.

Mr. Speaker, our fellow citizens are also watching for the latest terrorism alerts. If we want our friends to visit our Nation's great cities and landmarks, we must provide them with security. By supporting H.R. 4, we can reduce dependence on foreign oil and make this country safer from unstable rogue nations that consider us their enemy.

H.R. 4 provides for increased domestic oil production, which will increase new jobs and boost economic development. Our economy is growing stronger by the day, but without a new energy plan there is no guarantee that we will have the resources we need to see continued improvement.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4 provides long-term answers to our Nation's energy needs. We must reject the radical opposition's political games which may appease special interest groups, but do not reflect this Nation's need for jobs, economic security, nor its energy needs.

#### TITLE IX

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the 30th anniversary of title IX, which requires public schools to grant girls the same access to athletic programs as boys.

Before title IX, women were discouraged from participating in many sports, such as basketball, soccer, wrestling and hockey. Title IX legislation created new opportunities for women to explore and excel in sports traditionally limited to men.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years later, title IX has been the foundation of increased funding for female athletic scholarships, parity in salary among female teachers and their male counterparts, and intolerance of discrimination among females.

Title IX has allowed the number of females participating in interscholastic sports to increase from 300,000 in 1971 to approximately 2.4 million at present. It is important for young women to participate in athletics. Even a small amount of daily physical activity can contribute to health benefits that last a lifetime. By leading an active lifestyle, the risk of diseases can be dramatically reduced. Girls and women participating in sports have higher levels of confidence, stronger self-images, and less depression.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to participate in this vital initiative this week and forever more.

## PROMOTE ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 735,000 jobs; 735,000. That is the estimate of the number of jobs that will be created if the President gets to sign a comprehensive energy bill that reduces our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

This body has done its part. Last August the Republican-led House with the support of the President passed the most comprehensive energy package this country has seen in decades.

Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the Capitol see things a little differently. They voted to ignore working families and some of their own supporters, and instead keep the status quo when it comes to America's dependence on foreign countries for our energy needs. That is too bad because most of our foreign oil comes from the Middle East, which is the least stable part of the world. This is the same Middle East which is the home to thousands of al Qaeda operatives, and this is the same Middle East that houses Saddam Hussein and his tyrannical dictatorship.

Let us put that number, 735,000, in perspective. That number would equal one job for every person in the district I represent. I do not know about the other side of the aisle, but when I can vote to create one job for every citizen in my district, I will not hesitate to do so.

## HOME OWNERSHIP MONTH

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as many Members know, June is Home Ownership Month. This past weekend in the great city of Cleveland in the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, we hosted a housing summit. It is wonderful that more than 500 people came out to the housing summit. We had the opportunity to have people get free credit reports. More than 275 people got free credit reports, and we were able to counsel them.

Mr. Speaker, home ownership is a wonderful opportunity. It is an American dream, and this weekend in the 11th Congressional District in Ohio in conjunction with the Congressional Black Caucus Housing Summit, we were able to help Americans realize that dream, for which I am very thankful.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last night in the Committee on Ways

and Means we marked up the biggest change in Medicare in 37 years. It was a good change. What we did in the Committee on Ways and Means last night was provide a comprehensive prescription drug benefit for seniors. We recognize on both sides of the aisle that seniors have problems paying for their medicines.

Medicare is an outdated program. It was written in 1965, and in 2002 it is basically giving seniors 1965 health care. What we have accomplished in this committee and what we are about to accomplish in this Congress is to give seniors a prescription drug benefit that gives them the choice of plans, comprehensive benefits, catastrophic stop-loss coverage, a discount in the price of their drugs, and coverage from dollar one.

This is important, Mr. Speaker, because we also recognize the need that low income seniors who cannot afford deductibles and premiums have a fully subsidized prescription drug benefit. When the other side gnashes their teeth, just remember this: We are acting, we are moving, and we are providing a comprehensive prescription drug benefit for all seniors on Medicare.

## SAFE RETURN OF MIRANDA GADDIS AND ASHLEY POND

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today for the fourth time to again plead for the safe return of two missing girls from my district, Miranda Gaddis and Ashley Pond.

Those who saw the May 23 People magazine cover story on the plight of these girls surely understand the pain and anguish the families of the girls are facing, and also realize that Oregon City, as any small community would be, has been changed drastically by the tragedy.

Unfortunately, these types of abductions are not as rare as we would like. While the vast majority of missing children are due to those who have gotten lost, run away, or been abducted by a parent embroiled in a custody battle, roughly 4,400 are taken each year by nonfamily members who often release them a short time later.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children says parents should urge children to remember three steps: No, go, and tell.

They should know it is okay to resist adults and make noise. They should run away if they can; and if they break loose, they can help identify their abductors by remembering details and telling a trusted adult.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect America's children; and if anyone has any information about Miranda and Ashley, please contact the local FBI office.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has reported out a very modest bill to deal with the issue of prescription drugs. All of us have spoken to senior citizens, gone to their meetings. The issue is not how much can the Congress provide in Medicare coverage, and I must say that the plan that we are going to be debating provides very modest coverage. It does almost nothing until there is \$4,500 worth of bills to pay. The real issue for seniors is that the price of prescription drugs has gone completely out of hand.

Unless Congress deals with that issue, no matter how much coverage we give under Medicare, the problem is not solved. The issue is what are we going to do about the skyrocketing costs of these drugs.

Tonight's celebration that the Republicans are all going to is typical of the problem. They are in bed with the pharmaceutical companies. Until we break apart this coalition, the seniors are going to suffer and have to pay more and more. Instead of taking one pill a day, they take one pill every 2 days.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, not a day goes by without my hearing from a senior who is struggling to pay for prescription drugs. Recently a senior in the town of Westminster, Colorado, told me how she has to visit the food bank once a week so she can afford her prescription drugs. Another told me how she plays her own version of the lottery. She puts all of her bills in a fish bowl, draws one bill, and the one she draws is the one she puts off paying so she can afford to take the drugs that the doctor tells her she needs.

Unfortunately, these women are not alone. Medicare only covers two-thirds of its enrollees. No senior should be faced with a choice of paying for food, paying the electrical bill, or buying critical lifesaving medicines. We have an obligation to our Nation's seniors to provide them with the lifesaving drugs that they need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, when we take up, and we need to take up a prescription drug bill next week, we must provide a Medicare drug benefit that is affordable and dependable, without gaps or gimmicks in coverage. Members of Congress, government employees, employees of major corporations have this kind of coverage today. It is time our seniors did, too.

□ 1100

## GLOBAL WARMING

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, global warming is upon us. The glaciers are melting, the West is on fire due to prolonged drought, the tundras of Alaska are melting and the White House has now confirmed this. It has issued a report that says global warming is occurring and we are responsible for it. But what does the White House say they are going to do about it? Nothing. They say we have just got to get used to it.

I was talking to a good young man, my son, who is a sophomore at Bainbridge High School, who says that the 15- and 16-year-old kids understand science enough to know that we have got to do something about global warming. We urge the President to get with the Bainbridge kids, the high school sophomores, who know we have got to do something about this problem. America deserves it and we ought to have it.

FULL PRESCRIPTION DRUG  
BENEFIT UNDER MEDICARE

(Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a full drug benefit under Medicare. I have seen firsthand the lengths to which our seniors are forced to go in order to get the prescriptions that they need.

Recently I had the sad occasion to meet with a group of seniors from Massachusetts who were actually boarding a bus to travel to Canada in order to get prescription drugs that were not available to them at an affordable price in Massachusetts or elsewhere in the United States. One of these seniors is a woman named Rosemary Morgan, who is a 67-year-old woman who is fighting a recurring battle with breast cancer. Rosemary needs the drug Tamoxifen in order to keep her disease in check and to prolong her life. We are talking about a prescription drug that she needs desperately, not something that is merely an optional drug. However, because Medicare does not cover the cost of prescription drugs and Rosemary has no other form of drug coverage, she is forced to pay the highest prices in the world for this Tamoxifen. Were she to buy a year's supply at her CVS, it would be \$1,468. However, in Canada the same prescription is \$155 for a year's supply.

We need to do the right thing by our seniors and adopt a full prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

COMMEMORATION OF  
JUNETEENTH

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is Juneteenth, June 19, and for many who are not aware of that historical and very special day in America's history, it is the day that we commemorate the discovery that the slaves in the South had been freed. As a representative from the great State of Texas, it was the call from Galveston that indicated 2 years later after the Emancipation Proclamation that there had been a declaration of freedom for the slaves of the United States of America.

We hope that we will have a commission that will commemorate that great history, and as well let me say that I want to announce my joining as an original cosponsor with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and many of my colleagues who will today announce a legislative initiative to establish a monument or a recognition of those who were enslaved in the United States. Our history is our history, and we should recognize that and be prepared to acknowledge the wrongness of that history, but we should capture it and respect those who helped build this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will move forward in the light of our history to do good things by passing a real prescription drug bill for our seniors, and I hope that that will be done very soon on behalf of our seniors in America who need it.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES  
ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA  
VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3295 be instructed—

(1) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 504(a) of the House bill (relating to the effective date for the Federal minimum standards for State election systems); and

(2) to disagree to the provisions contained in section 104(b) of the Senate amendment to the House bill (relating to a safe harbor from the enforcement of the Federal minimum standards for State election systems for States receiving Federal funds under the bill).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act. As we all know,

conferees are currently involved in negotiations on the many tenacious differences that exist between the bills passed by each Chamber.

My motion to instruct will help provide guidance on what I consider two of the more critical differences that exist between the bills.

Section 1 of this motion instructs House conferees to insist on the date requiring States to conform to minimum national standards of November 2004 contained in the House bill. This is in contrast to the even more delayed 2006 effective date in the Senate bill. Currently under the House bill, States must conform to all minimum national standards within 2 years of the bill's enactment. In the special circumstances where a State can demonstrate to the Department of Justice that the State cannot meet the 2-year requirement, it can receive a waiver until November 2004. Under the Senate bill, States are not required to conform to the minimum national standards until January 2006.

Realize, Americans will return to the polls in November 2004 to elect a President. If the Senate's effective date becomes law, then we may very well face the same election day controversies that engulfed this Nation the last time we tried electing a President.

Section 2 of this motion instructs conferees to disagree with the safe harbor provision contained in section 104(b) of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3295. Under a provision added in the Senate by amendment, States which receive Federal funds under the bill are assumed to be in compliance with the bill's minimum national standards. Under the Senate amendment, States are provided with safe harbor until 2010, or 8 years from now, from being scrutinized or prosecuted for not complying with the minimum national standards in the bill. The one exception is that States can be prosecuted prior to 2010 for failing to conform with accessibility provisions in the bill as they pertain to individuals with disabilities.

If this provision becomes law, then we are giving States zero accountability until 2010 as they go about spending Federal dollars to conform their election systems. This is a horrible and dangerous path to embark on. If there is no enforcement until 2010, then States are essentially given the green light to nonconformity until 2010 despite any other provision in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I checked the website of the ranking Democrat of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). His website noted that 515 days have passed since the election day 2000 fiasco. Five hundred fifteen days, Mr. Speaker. In mentioning this number, I remind my colleagues and the American people that on a Federal level, our election system is no better off today than it was on election day 2000. Though some States have taken it upon themselves to reform their election laws, the clear majority have not.

For those which have, like my home State of Florida's baby steps, the need for financial assistance and Federal election reform is real and immediate.

The House did the right thing in appropriating \$450 million for election reform in the supplemental. I note that appropriating before authorizing when it came to election reform is something that I called for more than 1 year ago. However, as I said then and I will say again today, \$450 million is not enough money.

We should all be thankful for the hard work currently being done in the election reform conference committee by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and all of the conferees. Their leadership in the election reform arena, even during times when many in this body did not want to see any bill, is widely known and much appreciated and I say to BOB and STENY how much I genuinely appreciate the concrete efforts that they put forward to produce a measure here in the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the absence of new election laws is as much of an embarrassment today as it was 2 years ago. All too many facts point to the need for Congress to act today. The fact remains that election laws today are the same flawed laws around the country that were in place on election day 2000. The fact remains that while we know what problems exist and we know how to fix them, Congress' response to date has been inadequate at best. The fact remains that voters in many States have already voted in this year's primaries on the same broken system, and I might add that occurred in Florida, that failed them 2 years ago. Even in Florida, some of the newer systems being offered have shown that they have flaws.

Therefore, we need to be about the business of trying to get this whole matter straightened out. Another 12 States will be returning to the polls within the next week to vote with the same faulty technology.

Confidence in our election system is the linchpin of our democracy and we must do anything and everything to restore that confidence with the American people. Contrary to what many argue, election reform is much more than just a civil rights issue. Rather, the need for election reform is a challenge to our democracy. It is a challenge that we cannot back down from and it is a challenge that we will not back down from. My motion to instruct ensures that real and comprehensive election reform occurs before the 2004 presidential election.

In addition, it ensures that the Department of Justice can hold States accountable in cases where they fail to conform to new Federal election laws prior to 2010.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I appreciate the sentiment just expressed in the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida. I nevertheless must oppose it. The gentleman from Florida has shown a tremendous amount of interest in this issue. He has been very passionate and has pushed for action on this issue for quite some time. I remember when I testified at the Committee on Rules last year on the campaign finance reform bill and the gentleman expressed his displeasure that the House was even taking up that issue prior to consideration of election reform. I certainly agreed with him that election reform should have been the priority and I appreciate his support for our efforts.

I also appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that his motion instructs the conferees to insist on the provision in the House bill pertaining to the effective date of the minimum standards the bill imposes. I, like every American, want the improvements that will be brought about by the passage of this bill to be implemented as soon as possible. I want to restate that, as soon as possible. I am anxious for the day when all voters will have access to provisional ballots and better technology, when registration systems are modernized and made more accurate. No one should have a vote cancelling another vote. Technology is a part of getting to that solution. A part. But there are other parts that we have to be able to insist upon to make sure that voting is fair across the Nation. When disabled citizens will be able to cast a secret ballot and those serving in our military will be assured that their votes will be counted, this will be an appropriate election process for the United States.

The House bill set up a formula grant process that would ensure that Federal funds get to the States quickly, allowing them to begin implementing these improvements without delay. That is a very good and important provision of the bill that my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), worked on.

Obviously, like the gentleman from Florida, I want to see these improvements in place as quickly as possible. Nevertheless, I must oppose the gentleman's motion for a simple reason. The effective dates that were in the bill that passed this House last December were drafted in the fall of 2001.

□ 1115

They provided that the requirements go into effect 2 years from the date of enactment and gave a waiver to States that could not comply, allowing them until the November 2004 election to come into compliance.

Mr. Speaker, it is now June of 2002. While I hope the Congress will be able to come to agreement rather soon, I think the best we could hope for is a bill being enacted in July. The waiver language which we included was in-

tended to give States having difficulty coming into compliance a significant amount of time to do so. The reality of the time frame we are now working under has effectively rendered the waiver meaningless.

I certainly also agree with the gentleman from Florida that we need to get going and should impose an aggressive schedule for compliance. However, we must also be realistic in what we impose. We cannot fall into the trap of thinking that, just by commanding it, we can make it work and make it so.

The fact is, whatever conference agreement is reached, States will have a heavy burden in coming into compliance with the requirements imposed. We will be offering a significant amount of Federal money to assist them in their efforts, but the fact remains it will simply take some time for States and localities to incorporate the changes we will require to their election systems.

The Senate bill has a number of different effective dates for different provisions that, frankly, we do not have necessarily in our House bill. This is appropriate, as some requirements will be more difficult to meet than others. Establishment of a state-wide registration system will take more time, for example, than it will to provide voters with educational materials and sample ballots. The Congress will have to wrestle with how best to strike the balance between imposing effective dates that get States into compliance as soon as possible, without imposing unrealistic time frames that prove impossible to meet, create chaos, and wind up doing more harm than good.

In light of that, we should not be instructing the conferees to incorporate bill language that is outdated, and thereby unrealistic, given our current schedule.

Therefore, I do oppose the gentleman's motion; but I do want to reiterate that I agree with the sentiment and the spirit that it expresses and hope and will push and work with my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce to make sure the conference will be able to reach agreement quickly on effective dates that are realistic and achievable.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who hosted a forum on election reform in her city.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) did in fact come to Cleveland, Ohio, when we hosted our election reform committee. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), I rise in support of the motion to instruct.

Now, my problem is that even though we have not reached an agreement as to how this bill should come into play, States should not be waiting for us to

dot the I's and cross the T's in this instance. They should be beginning the process of putting in place programs that will assure that each and every one of the voters in their States have access to information.

I am pleased to say that in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, where I live, our board of elections has begun to try out various new automated systems. They tried out one system at the Indians game. The owner of the system came in and put in the system, and the people at the game were able to vote on their favorite baseball player. On two or three of the elections we have had, they have been able to put in systems at two or three locations throughout Cuyahoga County to give voters an opportunity to try out these systems.

As much as we want to believe that everybody is comfortable now or believes that the Florida election was kind of something that would never happen again, the reality is there are many, many voters out here across this country who are expecting that this Congress will say it will never happen again, that everyone will have the right to vote, that people will not be faced with punchcard systems or butterfly ballots or have to stand in line and be turned away because someone says I have to show my driver's license or you are not registered, or it has not been explained that if there is a problem they have the right to vote and a decision made later on as to whether their vote will count.

We should never in this country be placed in the position that we send people to other countries and say we want to check out your voting system, when our own is not in order.

So I stand here adamantly in support of this motion to instruct the conferees. If we give people more time, they are going to take more time. Let us stop this. Let us make sure that the people in the United States are not disenfranchised. Let us give them the right to vote, right away, right now.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 8½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, a leader on election reform and other matters in this House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I want to, at the outset, thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) as the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has been absolutely critical, along with the staff of our Committee on House Administration on the majority side and the minority side, absolutely critical to getting election reform to where it is right now. It would not be nearly as far along.

We passed this bill last December. Frankly, we could have passed it a year

ago July, but there was some controversy on our side of the aisle, some controversy on side of the aisle of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY); and we needed to work with our members. We came to the floor in December, and over 360 Members of this House voted for this legislation.

The instructions which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) seeks do not in any way, as the chairman has indicated, undermine the thrust of our legislation, which was to get election reform in place as soon as possible. Unfortunately, the Senate took 4 months to pass its legislation after we passed our legislation.

We have now been in conference for over a month now, and we are not moving quickly enough. We need to get this conference completed, we need to get this bill to the floor, we need to pass it, and we need to have States start implementing it.

Mr. Speaker, the effort to correct the problems that surfaced in the 2000 election has been a Herculean and often difficult one. But, then, of course, most worthwhile efforts are such. Today we are closer than ever, in my opinion, to enacting the most comprehensive voting reform legislation since the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The motion that I am supporting today is intended to ensure that, as Congress enters this final critical stage of election reform, we remember that reform delayed is reform denied. The motion before us will ensure that delay of essential reforms will not be an option.

The bill that we passed through the House did not have these extraordinarily long times, this safe harbor, this 2010 provision, this 2006 provision, this 2008 provision.

The chairman is absolutely right. We understood that time was a problem and we needed to give States a reasonable time in which to implement. Very frankly, I think the House bill as it reads continues to be a reasonable bill, and I would hope as it reads we could adopt it. That is a little short of what the gentleman wants; but it is, I think, a reasonable place for us to be.

This motion would instruct House conferees to insist on section 504(A) of the House-passed version of H.R. 3295, which requires States to be in compliance with commonsense minimum standards for the administration of elections no later than November 2004.

Americans do not want a repeat of the election of 2000. I do not mean the result; I mean the process. Every American believes, President Bush has said correctly, every American has the right to vote; but that is an empty right, a specious right, an ineffective right, if that vote is not counted and counted accurately.

The motion also instructs the House conferees to disagree to the safe harbor provision of section 104(B) of the Senate amendment to the House bill. I believe that section undermines election reform. I am opposed to it, and I will

oppose it in conference. I would hope that the Senate conferees upon reflection would support us in that effort. That provision would delay enforcement of the minimum standards until as late as 2010, three Presidential elections away. In my view, that is unacceptable.

Can States meet the 2004 deadline? Yes, they can. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) said States need to be anticipating. In fact, my State, Florida, Ohio, whose Secretary of State has been extraordinarily helpful in getting us to this point, are all looking at what we expect and what this law will require. If they are sitting on their hands, twiddling their thumbs, they are not acting on behalf of the American people. They ought to be getting right now ready to implement this legislation, as they expect it to be passed.

Will there be compromises along the way? Of course. That is the nature of legislation. That is the nature of a conference. But if there is a Secretary of State, if there is an election official, if there is a registrar who is not moving towards the reforms that this bill will require, that passed with some 363 votes out of 435, and passed 99 to one in the United States Senate, then those election officials are derelict in their duty.

So I say to them this day, through all my colleagues and through, Mr. Speaker, you, I say to them, through the Speaker of this House, start working now, if you are not far along in the process already, so that when we pass this legislation, hopefully within the next 30 days, you will be ready; you will be ready to vindicate the most important right of every citizen in democracy, and that is the right to vote, the right to have that vote counted, so that voter will participate in making policy and vision for America.

We must provide that Congress delays no more. We in Congress must complete our work on election reform soon, soon, and give States sufficient lead time to meet their obligations. I urge my fellow conferees on election reform to immediately begin the important work of reconciling the House and Senate bills.

My chairman and I do not disagree on substance. This day we disagree on the process of the expectation. But I want to reiterate as I close, without the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), this legislation would not be where it is today. Without the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), we would not have gotten it the floor as we did. Without the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the House bill would not have been as good as it was and is. And, frankly, it looks better than it looked before the Senate passed its bill, he says with some degree of pride and vindication.

Although much work remains, both the House and Senate bills are nearly identical in their basic goals, to give States the resources to improve their election systems and establish minimum standards, assuring ease of voting and accurate tabulation of results

and, yes, that there are not cheats. No one wants fraud. No one wants fraud in the election system; no one, on either side of the aisle.

So we must address that issue, but we must address that issue in the context of what the purpose of this bill is, to facilitate the exercising of the democratic franchise; to facilitate people being recognized as eligible voters; to facilitate the accurate counting of those votes; and to facilitate the will of the majority maintaining in this, the greatest democracy the world has ever known. If we do not, we will lose a historic opportunity to strengthen our democratic system at home, while, Mr. Speaker, in lockstep 435 Members of the House, 100 Members of the Senate and every American works to defend this democracy against foreign enemies and those who would undermine it from without by terror and violence.

□ 1130

But let us not here at home undermine democracy by failing to act and acting quickly to vindicate the vote for every American.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to make a couple of comments here to just restate the importance of getting this monumental piece of legislation concluded. I cannot stress that enough. I appreciate the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). It was a two-way street working with the gentleman from Maryland in being able to do something that, frankly, some people on either side on the aisle said maybe we ought not do this, but we knew it was the right thing to do. We had people that joined us in crafting a bipartisan piece of legislation that is well thought out.

I also want to restate, too, that I am sympathetic to the spirit of what is being done here today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). We need maybe some flexibility going into it, from my point of view. But I do want to stress that the spirit of what he is attempting to do is something that I fully understand. I appreciate both of the gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman's comments.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. NEY), and he has done an extraordinary job and, I think, leads our committee the way every American would want him to lead the committee, and that is in an open and constructive way, and I thank him for that.

I also wanted to focus on the sponsor of this particular motion to instruct.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is an extraordinary Member of this House. He is probably as well grounded in the law as any Member of this House. He is also a colleague of mine in participating in the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe. He is a vice president of that international organization of 55 countries, respected internationally for his fairness and for his focus.

I want to thank him for his leadership, not only in the State of Florida, but I want to thank him for his leadership in this Congress. He was the one who raised most pointedly the issue of funding for 2002. It was his leadership that allowed some of us to work with him and, I might say, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), to get the funding. So much of the year is gone, but the \$450 million which is in the supplemental is now subject to authorization, and that is the key. We have to pass this legislation so that we can get that money to the States.

So I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for the leadership and the strong voice he has been on behalf of election reform in America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Miami, Florida (Mrs. MEEK), my good friend and colleague, who has been a leader in this fight from November 2000, and even before then when we recognized that there would be significant problems.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), with whom I have worked very closely over the years and who has been a paragon of justice and fairness not only in Florida, but throughout the world. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and also the sponsor of the House's bill on the Republican side. I commend the gentleman for offering this piece of legislation.

While the Senate amendment to H.R. 3295 has many provisions that are stronger than the bill we passed last December in the Senate, this safe harbor provision which they have in the Senate bill is a significant exception that will delete and, thus, materially weaken election reform.

Now, I am from Florida and my colleagues can understand why I would not like to see any safe harbor provision that would delay the implementation of election reform. If you have ever been in another kind of ground zero for election reform, you should have been in Florida in the last election.

If the House provision is adopted by the conferees and the Congress passes the conference report and the President signs the bill, we get real election reform by November 2004. People have told us to let it pass. We cannot. We have to do it now. We cannot delay this any longer. We cannot go through

many of the political shenanigans we go through when we want to delay something. This has to happen now. Too many people have suffered. We die for the right to vote and we demand it now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time, which I shall not use, again to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I especially am indebted to the gentleman from Maryland not only for his gracious comments, but for his mentoring with reference to matters that he and I are working on overseas; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for agreeing with me in spirit with reference to this matter. We appreciate that spirit. Perhaps had the gentleman from Ohio been with me in Florida, you would understand how spirited I am with reference to all of these matters.

Speaking of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe that the gentleman from Maryland is leader par excellence in, and I happen to, because of him, be an elected officer in that organization, immediately following the election just passed, I went to a meeting in Europe, and many of our colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland was unable to attend that particular meeting, but many of our colleagues in Europe were waiting for me to walk into the room so that they could ask me about those free, fair and transparent elections that took place in the State of Florida. In many instances, including good friends from England, they found it amusing that we had these problems and I know are going to find it equally amusing that we have not settled this controversy with reference to the legislation federally that we should have passed.

This place continues to amaze me on a day-to-day basis. I come in here and we have these knee-jerks on what is going on now. Now, we have had some serious interventions in this country: 9-11, to be sure; the economy overall is something that all of us are concerned about. Today's flavor is prescription drugs. Next week it will be fast track. And during all of that time, election reform has been sitting around here. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), other people; the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the chair of the Black Caucus, and I, all of us waiting and yelling that we need to do something, and yet we find ourselves in the position of asking no more in this particular motion to instruct the conferees than what we already passed in the House of Representatives and insisting that that language, which was offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and those of us that cosponsored it, be included in the ultimate bill.

Quite honestly, the House measure, in my judgment, is the more enlightened of the two, but our failure to undertake it is a lack of enlightenment on all of our behalfs.

All of us ought to find this non-controversial, and I would ask our colleagues who are listening back in their offices to support this motion to instruct conferees.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague from Florida, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS for offering this motion to instruct conferees.

The two instructions that Congressman HASTINGS is offering are crucial to getting our election system in order.

First, it is important that conferees make any effective date for election reform be in time for the next Presidential election in 2004.

Actually, it should have been in time for our congressional elections, but we will go forward unfortunately with the same system that tore America apart in the November 2000 election.

And for the second instruction, it is important that the government have the ability as soon as is it feasible, to legally check to see if States are in fact making the necessary changes that the final election reform bill stimulates.

Election Reform is the number one legislative priority for the Congressional Black Caucus, and I sincerely hope that it is a top priority for every Member of the 107th Congress.

As a national legislative body, the Congress has the power, authority and absolute obligation to assure that the apparent disenfranchisement, which occurred in several places throughout the United States in our last Presidential election, does not ever happen again.

Allegations of voter intimidation; inaccurate voter registration lists; subjective, vague or non-existent ballot counting standards; and flawed ballot designs, all led to confusion before, during and after the election.

What happened is no way to elect the President of the United States of America—the most powerful position in the world.

This is not a black, white, or brown issue. It is an American issue. It is a red, white and blue issue. It should be of great concern to each of us if any one of us is improperly denied access to the ballot box or if every ballot cast is not counted. The survival of our democracy depends on the accuracy and integrity of our election system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this sensible motion to instruct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2002

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 446 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 446

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3389) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose of clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Science. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. This obviously is a very fair rule, Mr. Speaker, that will allow Members all possible opportunity to debate this important issue.

The underlying legislation of the National Sea Grant College Program Act is amended to include an emphasis on ocean and coastal resources conservation and management, as well as collaboration between academia and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, known as NOAA.

Sea grant colleges support applied research at the local level and support major crosscutting research initiatives. This is a bipartisan bill that makes changes to the act that will enhance cooperation between Sea Grant and other executive programs with similar missions, promote funding disbursements based on competitive merit review, and increase authorization levels.

Florida has enjoyed great success with this program, through research and education in the areas of aquaculture, fisheries, coastal process, and hazards, marine biotechnology and estuaries.

The underlying legislation provides not only important research, but also resources to communities and academic institutions. I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, and I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support not only the underlying legislation, but this open rule and very fair rule as well.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule is a fair one. It is an open rule, and it is one that I will be supporting. I only wish that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would make it a habit of bringing these types of fair and open rules to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the National Sea Grant College Program was established in 1966 to improve the science, conservation, and management of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources through the use of academic grants. There are currently 30 designated sea grant programs which utilize a network of 300 universities and scientific institutions.

Those of us in the Florida delegation know all too well the benefits that

have come as a result of the national sea grant program. Primarily housed at the University of Florida, Florida's Sea Grant College Program currently enjoys the support of 15 Florida universities, both public and private.

Included in this 15 is my alma mater, and that of the gentlewomen from Florida (Ms. BROWN) and (Mrs. MEEK), Florida A&M University. In addition, Florida Atlantic University, and I am proud to say that I will be receiving an honorary doctorate from that institution soon, the University of Miami, Florida State University, and Nova Southeastern University, that is in my district and that of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), all are active participants in the Sea Grant College Program, as well.

A footnote there: I overlooked the fact that that university, as well, is in the district of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Under the National directorship of Dr. Fritz Schuler, the National Sea Grant Program has continued to grow every year since its conception. Florida universities are privileged enough to have people like Jim Cato, William Seaman, and Ed Harvey working for them. I applaud the hard work of these individuals and their colleagues and commend them for a job well done.

H.R. 3389 reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program from fiscal year 2003 through fiscal year 2008. It sends a clear message that the National Sea Grant College Program is one that must be sustained. Provisions in the bill increase current funding in the program every year.

Further, the bill reauthorizes the Coastal Ocean Program, providing \$35 million per year through fiscal year 2008. This is a program that the people of our respective districts, and certainly mine, benefit directly from. I applaud the good work done by the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science for continuing this much needed program.

I commend the work done by the two committee chairpersons, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), as well as the ranking Democrats, my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Finally, the bill includes a provision requiring equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students. Such provisions in many of our bills make it possible for minority and economically disadvantaged students to achieve in areas and fields where they might not otherwise succeed.

I applaud my colleagues for including this provision in H.R. 3389, and I urge them to never forget the immediate and long-term benefits of these practices.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. The substitute is a fair substitute, as is the amendment being offered by my colleague, the gentle-

woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding time to me; and I should say Dr. HASTINGS, given the honorary doctorate the gentleman will be receiving shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act. This is a comprehensive piece of legislation which will contribute greatly to the valuable work that the sea grant programs across the Nation continue to do every day.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for his leadership on this in introducing this legislation, and other bipartisan cosponsors, including the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA). I thank him, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the first district of Rhode Island. Rhode Island is known as the Ocean State. For hundreds of years, my State has made its living on the sea, from fishing in the waters to utilizing them for transportation. We have now added ocean exploration and science to our tasks.

I am proud to say that Rhode Island has always been at the forefront of ocean science. I have worked extensively with the folks at the University of Rhode Island Sea Grant Program. They realize that this legislation, which will reauthorize the sea grant program for another 5 years, will allow them to leverage Federal funds in order to continue their study of our oceans. This allows us to make valuable strides forward in not just ocean exploration, but in biomedical sciences.

How many people realize how much we derive from the ocean in terms of biomedical sciences and advances in pharmaceutical drugs, all found because of the sciences we do on our oceans?

The Coastal Environmental Restoration and Preservation programs are also part of this ocean science sea grant program. Food production and responsible economic development through the utilization of our waters is key, and the sea grant program works with the Aid to International Development to help those countries around the world develop their coastal ways to feed their people. We have great hunger in the world, and the ocean can be a great resource for foodstuffs and fish protein.

Additionally, this legislation promotes strong relationships between the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and the sea grant. I look forward to seeing passage

of this rule and also seeing passage of this legislation. Ultimately, I will work on the Committee on Appropriations to see that its laudable goals are adequately funded.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing this bill forward; I look forward to passage of this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), or Dr. HASTINGS, for yielding me the time.

I also want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), for reintroducing the legislation and for the leadership that he has provided, as well as the leadership that the Chair and the ranking members on the appropriate committees have given this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise as a strong supporter of the rule, as well as for H.R. 3389, the bill to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act. While my district is far from either coast, the State of Wisconsin is host to some of our Nation's most important fresh water resources. With the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River as our borders, and more lakes, actually, than the State of Minnesota, water-quality issues are central to the lives of Wisconsin residents and the residents in the upper Midwest region.

Mr. Speaker, the sea grant program provides Wisconsin with valuable tools for research and education associated with our unique natural resources. Through the University of Wisconsin system, support from sea grant enhances scientific research, education, and outreach throughout the entire State. In fact, the University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute is nationally recognized as a leader in marine science education.

I also have a personal interest in the sea grant program. Since I was first elected to Congress, my office has benefited as a participant in the Sea Grant Policy Fellowship Program. Serving in 1-year fellowships, sea grant Fellows have provided invaluable knowledge and experience to my office.

As a co-chair of the Upper Mississippi River Basin Congressional Task Force, these Fellows have had their hands full working not only with water resource issues that affect my congressional district, which has more miles along the Mississippi River than any other congressional district in the Nation, but also have been helping to coordinate efforts throughout the entire five-state basin area in the upper Midwest.

The United States has thrived through scientific achievements, and we must continue to encourage our students to pursue math and science education. The sea grant program is a great example of our efforts in this area, and noted accomplishments by the participants in the program represent how valuable this investment is.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to again thank the former sea grant Fellows that have served in my office, Jeff Stein, Ed Buckner, Allen Hance, and Laura Cimo, for their outstanding work. I would also like to thank the Members of this body for their past support of the sea grant program, and I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, reiterating my support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and asking all of our colleagues to support both, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Pursuant to House Resolution 446 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3389.

□ 1157

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3389) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. SUNUNU in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002 which we introduced last fall. The bill before us is a bipartisan substitute worked out between the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science. It reauthorizes the sea grant program for 5 years within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and makes some minor improvements to the program. It also reauthorizes the Coastal Ocean Program, but does not consolidate the two programs. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in 1964, the concept was created to understand the relationship between the oceans, the environ-

ment, and the economy, and the best way to deal with those issues that would benefit all of us. In 1966, the idea was put into a statute called the National Sea Grant College Program.

What sea grants do essentially are five very important things. One of the aspects is research so we understand the marine ecosystems from around the world and human impacts to that ecosystem and the benefits that humans can derive from the marine ecosystem if we understand how nature works.

Number two is an education component which deals with colleges and universities from around the country. This impacts about 300 institutions and disseminates and educates a lot of young people to have a sense of understanding toward the marine ecosystems and their impact on people.

□ 1200

The third component are advisory agents, and these are mostly those young people that are educated through the sea grant program in the Nation's universities to go directly to communities to help those coastal communities understand how their economy can improve while the environment improves. So it has been an extremely successful operation over the last almost 40 years now.

The fourth component affects the U.S. Congress in a very, very positive way, and many Members of Congress, especially on this particular committee, as was spoken by the gentleman from Wisconsin, has the advantage of sea grant fellows, and these sea grant fellows offer the kind of data, information, science and understanding into these very complex issues so that we as Members of Congress can weave our way through the very complex dynamic maze of the mechanics of nature.

The third thing that this particular reauthorization does is to once again emphasize the very important aspect of this Congress into developing ways that the economy of this country and the environmental aspects of legislation can and must be compatible, and this legislation goes a long way into doing that.

The fourth thing this legislation does is to understand the very nature and difficulty with environmental degradation and loss of dollars to the economy of invasive species, what invasive species need to be addressed first, what invasive species are the most problems with this country and how invasive species arrive on our shores. Also, the research deals with marine biotechnology and agriculture.

The fifth thing, we ensure that there are dollars for 30 institutions and over 300 programs around the country.

We have worked in a very bipartisan fashion, and I want to thank my colleagues on the Democratic side for their cooperation. I want to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation. I also want to thank the

gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) on the Committee on Science for their collaboration into this effort.

Our amendment strengthens the act by calling for an increase in collaboration between the ocean research funding entities and the National Research College Program to limit duplication of efforts and enhance related research. This legislation increases authorization levels that have remained painfully stagnant over the past decade almost.

The amendment also ensures that the quality research and management within the sea grant college system is rewarded through a competitive, merit-based disbursement of funds, and finally, because of the great importance of the coastal and ocean resources of the territories and freely associated States within the Pacific Ocean, the act calls for a reporting of their efforts in developing the infrastructure and expertise necessary to become sea grant institutions.

I want to thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for their cooperation through this process, and also once again the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his cooperation, and to the patience of the staff on both sides of the aisle with Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I too am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 3389, a bill to reauthorize the national sea grant program. I would also like to take this time to express my strong support for the National Sea Grant College Program, my support for the manager's amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3389 which requires an annual report of the progress of institutions and regional associations seeking to develop sea grant status, and my opposition to the administration's plan to move the National Sea Grant College Program from NOAA to the National Science Foundation.

Before discussing my specific concerns, I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and their staffs for their sincere efforts to work cooperatively to develop a consensus bill which represents a fair and satisfying compromise to improve the act.

On a related aside, I find the consideration of the sea grant legislation

today to be somewhat ironic. I say this because the majority has scheduled this bill for consideration today, yet we intend to mark up next week in the Committee on Resources that legislation which may weaken provisions of the law under the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, I am involved with the oversight of programs vital to the interests and jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources, including programs at NOAA. I continue to be impressed by the National Sea Grant College Program, which has been pointed out repeatedly on the floor today, has served since 1966 to promote applied marine research, education, outreach and extension services.

The national sea grant program sponsors peer-reviewed academic research, transfers technology and results from this research to industry and management agencies, and acts to educate the public about marine and coastal issues. It achieves environmental and economically important results through fostering partnerships among scientists, managers, industries and local, State and Federal Governments.

These partnerships are further strengthened through sea grant's funding requirement that one-third of a program's grants must come from non-Federal sources. Sea grant has proven itself a very effective tool to leverage limited Federal dollars and, as a result, has built an outstanding network program that can use its remarkable research education and extension services to serve State and territorial needs.

Considering the widespread success and support for the National Sea Grant College Program, I was amazed to discover that the administration had actually chosen to cut funding and transfer sea grant from NOAA to the National Science Foundation.

Many researchers believe that the sea grant's priorities of applied research, outreach and education are incompatible with the fundamental mission of the National Science Foundation to support basic scientific research, and while I approve and certainly respect NSF's mission and scientists, and while I continue to support full funding for NSF, I, like many Members, believe that the national interest is best served by keeping sea grant in NOAA. This legislation, and gratefully I might add, to both the majority and minority Members, unequivocally reaffirms that commitment.

It is important because I believe in the importance of the sea grant program that I continue to support as well as the development of a sea grant regional program in the Western Pacific. I am proud that colleges and universities in that part of the world, in that region, College of the Marshall Islands, the College of the Micronesia and the

FSM, Northern Marianas College, University of Guam and Palau Community College, have chosen to organize themselves as a consortium working towards attaining program status that would bring sea grant research, education and extension services to an ocean area equivalent to the total land area of the contiguous United States. With fully 100 percent of our residents living within 10 miles of the ocean, it is clear that the development of a regional sea grant program would flourish and serve both regional and national interests.

I continue to strongly advocate that the sea grant program designation process, especially for institutions in areas that are overlooked and lacking in the necessary infrastructure, such as the U.S. territories, requires Federal financial and technical assistance. More importantly, the manager's substitute amendment made in order under the rule includes an important benchmark provision to help guide the development of future sea grant programs.

The bill before us would also allow any developing programs access to a portion of moneys appropriated beyond the appropriated level funding in fiscal year 2002.

I do support the manager's amendment to H.R. 3389. However, I believe that the National Sea Grant College Program could play an even more important role in developing and protecting marine resources in the U.S. territories and freely associated States.

In closing, it is important that the House act expeditiously to pass H.R. 3389 and reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program. To do so at this time would be a strong commitment, reaffirmation of Congress' unwavering commitment to maintain the National Sea Grant College Program as a vital element within NOAA. It would also represent a rousing endorsement of sea grant's marine research, education and extension services that benefit millions of Americans annually.

The bill before the House is non-controversial, supported by the National Sea Grant Association. Moreover, it would make several improvements to the National Sea Grant College Program at a critical time in its history. This is good legislation. I strongly urge all Members of the House to vote yes on final passage of H.R. 3389.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3389, which reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program. The bill before us today is a result of a bipartisan compromise between the House Committee on Resources and Committee on Science. The interaction of the two committees produced a better bill than either of us could have done alone, and I am pleased with the outcome.

The national sea grant program is unique in connecting research results with coastal communities through the combination of research, extension and education. Currently, there are 30 sea grant college programs which fund and incorporate research from hundreds of universities throughout the country.

I am especially proud of my home State program, the Michigan sea grant program. It plays a vital role in enhancing our Nation's knowledge and understanding of Great Lakes issues. Projects that Michigan sea grant is working on include ballast water clean-up and management strategies, remote sensing of pollution in Lake Superior, effects of community development on wetlands and fisheries, and changes in the Great Lakes food web and the effects on commercial and sport fishing.

Sea grant's importance is not solely in its funding of research but also in the education and outreach activities that ensure the research is conveyed to State and local decision-makers, commercial and recreational interests and future marine scientists.

While many have criticized the administration's fiscal year 2003 budget proposal to transfer the National Sea Grant College Program from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to the National Science Foundation, I saw it as an opportunity to more fully examine and improve the program, and H.R. 3389 does just that.

H.R. 3389 does not move sea grant to NSF. Rather, it reauthorizes sea grant within NOAA. The legislation does, however, mandate that sea grant better coordinate its activities with other programs within NOAA and with NSF. To this end, the bill requires NOAA to provide a strategic plan that establishes the priorities for the National Sea Grant College Program and must jointly submit, with NSF, a report about how the oceans and coastal research activities of both agencies will be coordinated.

H.R. 3389 provides much-needed increases in overall funding levels for sea grant. The authorization gradually increases from a total of \$78 million for fiscal year 2003 to \$103 million for fiscal year 2008. Included in that amount is \$18 million a year specifically for research into aquatic nuisance species, harmful algal blooms, oysters and fisheries extension activities.

One issue that was raised during the Committee on Science's hearing on sea grant is the seemingly unfair nature of allocating Federal funding to sea grant programs. Currently, about 80 percent of the Federal funding goes directly to the State programs, based mostly on historical averages. Fifteen percent is for national competitive projects, and no more than 5 percent can be used for national administration of the program.

The Office of Management and Budget was highly critical of this process, and that seems to be one of the main reasons for proposing to move sea grant to NSF. Currently, only about \$3

million of the total that is directly distributed to the State programs is based on the merit review process. This is the process by which each State program is reviewed by an outside panel and given a rating on how well its program is conducting its research, education and extension activities.

I understand that each State program needs a consistent level of funding to ensure it can adequately maintain its extension and education activities. However, I believe the system needs to be more transparent and based more on competition. Therefore, H.R. 3389 will require that any moneys appropriated above the fiscal year 2002 level shall be distributed to the State sea grant programs on a merit review, competitive basis, or distributed to national strategic initiatives.

We also allow this funding to be used for sea grant programs designated after the enactment of this act and for those universities trying to become new sea grant colleges or institutes.

Finally, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for introducing this bill and for his efforts on behalf of the sea grant program. All of us benefit greatly from his leadership on these issues. I also want to thank his staff who helped to quickly and amicably bring resolution to the differences between our two versions of the bill, and I also thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), for his great assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the manager's amendment and for H.R. 3389. Our Nation's coasts and Great Lakes are depending on it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1215

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) to control the 10 minutes allocated to the minority on the Committee on Science.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments of 2002. This bill reauthorizes a program of great importance to our Nation and to my home State of Michigan, and I too want to extend gratitude to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), for his important work on this vital issue, not only to the Great Lakes region but to the entire Nation and beyond.

Since its establishment in 1966, the National Sea Grant College Program has expanded our knowledge about Great Lakes and coastal ecosystems, trained thousands of professionals in areas of resource management, marine technology, aquaculture, and fisheries, and has facilitated the transfer of research results to resource users throughout the country. This partnership between the Federal Government and participating States has truly been a success.

The Great Lakes and coastal areas play a vital role in our daily lives and in our economy. Information-based management of these important resources is essential if we are to continue to enjoy the recreational, environmental, and economic benefits that they provide.

The Sea Grant Program has supported research, education, and extension activities for over 30 years. Sportsmen, State and local officials, commercial fishermen, recreational users, and business people alike have come to rely upon the information and outreach services provided by the Sea Grant Program. In Michigan, sea grant researchers are working to tackle important problems that have emerged in the Great Lakes regions with invasive species, such as zebra mussels and the round goby. Researchers are also working to develop improved fisheries models for use by Great Lakes fisheries managers. These are only two examples of the important research being done in the Great Lakes region through the cooperative efforts of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University and the Sea Grant Program.

One of the most important aspects of the Sea Grant Program is that it is structured to ensure the transfer of research results into practical use. Extension offices, like the one in my district, in Tawas City, and throughout the State of Michigan, assist local communities, businesses, and citizens to tackle difficult issues such as coastal development, aquatic invasive species, and the development of aquaculture.

This bill provides modest increases in the authorization level for this important program through the year 2008. Members of the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science cooperated in a bipartisan fashion to resolve the discrepancies in the two versions of the bill to produce a result that offers improvement to this important program. I urge my colleagues to endorse the fine work being done through the Sea Grant College Program throughout the country by supporting the passage of H.R. 3389.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) will control the balance of the time designated to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002; and, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say at this time that the hard

work of the chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, should be noted here. To bring this bill as expeditiously as he did to the floor, I am sure, took a great deal of effort. My hat is also off to the ranking member, who works in a great bipartisan partnership with my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. Chairman, this bill reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program for 5 years, encouraging more cooperation between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, and the sea grant researchers and outreach personnel. It also incorporates the Coastal Ocean Research Program into the National Sea Grant Program and provides funding for research on zebra mussels, harmful algal bloom, and oyster diseases and their possible human health effects.

The National Sea Grant Program was created in 1966 to improve the conservation and management of marine resources. Currently, there are 30 sea grant programs that represent a network of researchers, educators, and marine advisory agents at over 300 academic institutions. The program provides effective assistance to these schools for research, education, and advisory services.

Under this act, marine advisory staff educates the general public about marine conservation efforts as well as provides technical research findings to user groups. The program has been highly successful during the more than 40 years since its inception. It has enabled the education community to conduct important research on a variety of important marine conservation issues and then share their findings with the public in order to educate our people on the importance of ensuring we can work together to protect these important and often fragile ecosystems in our Nation's oceans and waterways.

Mr. Chairman, I commend all those who have participated in this program and committed themselves to the preservation of these ecosystems and habitats. I applaud Chairman GILCREST in reauthorizing this important piece of conservation legislation and look forward to its passage out of this House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Amendments Act of 2002, and I certainly want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), for their support and initiative in bringing this legislation for consideration at this time. I also want to thank the chairman of our

Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and our ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for their support and endorsement of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced H.R. 1071, a bill which would increase authorization for the National Sea Grant Program, last year. Our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), was kind enough to hold a hearing on the matter, and subsequently introduced H.R. 3389 as an alternative to my legislation. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3389 and am also pleased to support the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3389.

This amendment reflects a compromise between the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science. This amendment also includes provisions from the Senate companion bill, Senate bill 2428. The amendment maintains funding increases for core programs and research regarding zebra mussels, oyster diseases, et cetera, and \$90 million to \$100 million annually from fiscal year 2004 through 2008.

I am particularly pleased that this amendment also includes a provision which directs the Secretary of Commerce to report annually to the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, Transportation of the Senate on efforts made by colleges, universities, institutions, associations, and alliances in the United States territories and freely associated States to develop the expertise necessary to be designated as sea grant institutions or colleges.

This provision also directs the Secretary of Commerce to report the administrative, technical, and financial assistance provided by the Secretary to those entities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly thank the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), for his leadership and his outstanding service not only to his people but certainly to this institution. Although he intends to run for another office, I will say personally that I will sorely miss him, and I really wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

I have worked for some time with the gentleman from Guam in bringing attention to the unique and singular needs of the U.S. territories and the freely associated states. For most Pacific Islanders, the ocean is our farm, Mr. Chairman, and we are in dire need of administrative, technical, and financial assistance to develop sea grant affiliations within the region.

I would also like to note that the University of Hawaii's Sea Grant Program has been instrumental over the years in assisting Pacific Island communities in developing sea grant extension activities. And I would like to per-

sonally thank Dr. Gordon Grau, the director of the Hawaii Sea Grant Program, for his commitment to our remote communities. I also want to thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from the State of Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), for their support of this program and legislation.

Mr. Chairman, despite the bipartisan support, current funding for the National Sea Grant Program is only about 7 percent of the equivalent Federal funding of the Land Grant College Program. Land Grant receives approximately \$900 million in Federal funding per year. Sea Grant receives approximately \$62 million. And yet approximately 54 percent of our Nation's population lives along the coastlines. I believe this is a fact that bears repeating. Nearly 54 percent of our Nation's population lives along the coasts, but we devote only pennies to marine research.

In 1994, the National Research Council review pointed out that Sea Grant has been virtually the only source of funding in the United States for marine policy research. Yet, on average, there are fewer than seven extension agents per coastal State. In many cases, there is only one extension agent serving a major urban area. For example, in Los Angeles, there is only one extension agent serving 14 million people. In New York City, there is only one serving 12 million people.

Sea Grant funds, on an average, are less than \$2 million per State program. Many geographic regions are not represented, including the western Pacific, which alone has a huge economic exclusive zone. Some States, like Mississippi and Alabama, share funding with others eligible States like Pennsylvania and Vermont, which have no institutional sea grant programs.

Although this authorization continues to fall short of Land Grant funding, Mr. Chairman, I do believe it is a movement in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank both the chairman of the Committee on Science and our ranking member of the Committee on Science as well as our Committee on Resources.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the outstanding chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to thank our colleagues on the Committee on Resources, and especially my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), for working with us to reconcile the different versions of the bill that emerged from our two committees.

This is an important bill that reauthorizes a program that is vital to the Nation and to my home State of New York. In New York, the Sea Grant Program conducts important research that has helped preserve commercial and

recreational fishing from the Long Island Sound to Lake Erie. The Sea Grant Program, through its research and extension activities, funds good science; and most importantly, it ensures that that good science is put to use. It is a model program.

Like any program, the Sea Grant Program can be improved; and this bill takes critically important steps to reform it. These steps will, among other things, address the concerns that lead the administration to suggest moving the program to the National Science Foundation.

The most significant feature of this bill is that it will ensure that more Sea Grant Program funds are distributed through the merit-reviewed competitions. Under the bill, any new money the program receives can be used solely for national strategic investments and/or competitive awards to the State Sea Grant programs.

We expect the competitions among the State programs to mirror National Science Foundation merit-reviewed competitions. Only those programs that are the best run and the most successful, and that can make the clearest case for why they need the additional money, should share in any funds that Sea Grant receives above the fiscal 2002 level. The amount of funding a meritorious State receives should be based on its demonstrated needs and not on any previous assumptions about funding formulas.

This competition will ensure that the taxpayers are getting their money's worth out of Sea Grant, and will create an incentive for every one of the State programs to ensure that their research and extension activities are exemplary.

Mr. Chairman, Sea Grant is an excellent program that we are making even better. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1230

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science for this legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002. This important legislation reauthorizes the Sea Grant Program in Texas and its counterparts around the country to continue the important work done.

When Congress passed the Sea Grant College Program in 1966, it intended to apply the successful attributes of the Land Grant College Program to coastal and marine issues. Today, the National Sea Grant Program represents the bridge between government, academia, industry, scientists and private citizens to help Americans understand and maintain the oceans and Great Lakes for long-term economic growth.

Sea Grant also serves as a bond uniting 350 participating institutions in 35 States, U.S. territories and the District of Columbia and millions of people. In short, Sea Grant is an agent for scientific discovery, technology transfer, economic growth and public education as they involve coastal, ocean and Great Lakes resources.

Every day, Sea Grant scientists make progress on important marine issues of our time. A network of outreach professionals takes this information out of the laboratory and into the field, working to enhance a coastal business, a fishery, or a resident's safety and quality of life.

The dedicated corps of communication specialists builds public understanding, and bring discoveries into our Nation's schools to pioneer better ways of teaching.

Through these research, education and outreach activities, Sea Grant has helped position the United States as a world leader in marine research and the sustainable growth of coastal resources.

Mr. Chairman, Texas A&M University was among the first four institutions to be designated a Sea Grant College in 1971, and its researchers had been involved since passage of the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1968. As a Sea Grant College, Texas A&M provides research support for university-level faculty throughout the state through a competitive grants process. A great amount of this research is conducted at the Texas A&M—Galveston, Texas campus.

In Texas, the Sea Grant program has conducted research in hyperbaric physiology, endangered species ecology, marine aquaculture, coastal processes, fisheries biology and ecosystem health.

As a result of these and other Sea Grant efforts, we have seen development of a major shrimp aquaculture industry in South Texas, marina initiatives to adopt best management practices and minimize water pollution, non-point source pollution reduction from residential landscapes, improvements in seafood handling to reduced loss in the retail markets and expanding marine educational opportunities in support of the state's, and nation's teachers and students.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002.

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for yielding the time to me, but I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for his tireless efforts on behalf of this program. I thank the gentleman personally for bringing this bill before us today.

Sea Grant enables us to understand our complex coastal and marine environments, and to develop these natural resources without overextending them.

The United States' jurisdiction over marine environments is the largest of any country in the world. It covers an area greater than the entire U.S. landmass. Proper stewardship of the vast resources contained within these waters are of great concern both to the economic and environmental health of our Nation, and Sea Grant plays a pivotal role in the proper management of these areas.

Within Maryland, Sea Grant plays a vital role in maintaining the Chesapeake Bay. As many Members know, we have sorely abused this resource and mismanaged it in the past. Sea Grant is providing the science that is needed to return the bay to its former health and productivity. Sea Grant is improving our understanding of key fisheries issues, including the renowned blue crab stock and the return of the oyster reefs, which provide important food stocks to the region and the country as a whole. Sea Grant plays a lead role in the control of invasive species by studying ways to control the spread to foreign aquatic life and microbial organisms through ballast water and on ship hulls. And Sea Grant makes important contributions to the overall environmental condition by studying and monitoring various pollution and contamination issues through the entire watershed such as urban runoff and industrial waste.

Mr. Chairman, Sea Grant is an important educational program. In Maryland, Sea Grant alone has supported more than 150 graduate research fellows and a similar number of undergraduate fellows. Other programs include research opportunities for high school students, outreach and educational efforts all of the way down to kindergarten. Sea Grant also provides opportunities for public service, sponsoring programs which allow marine scientists to put their skills to practical use in governmental agencies and in the Congress. These programs provide a vital link between the policymakers and scientists, and enrich the decision-making process.

I hope I have convinced Members. Along with continuing these efforts, this bill also makes fundamental changes in the Sea Grant allocation process. Most notably, the Committee on Science, working in a bipartisan manner, has increased the amount of money allocated through merit-based review as opposed to historical involvement.

The best ideas and the most effective programs are most deserving of our limited resources, and should be given priority. Also, competition will allow new ideas and perspectives to gain a foothold in the grant process. These are very positive changes, and I am proud to have played a role in their inclusion. Sea Grant has been very successful, affected our Nation's economic and environmental health in a profound way. It deserves our support. I thank Members on both committees on both sides of the aisle for bringing this

bill before us, and particularly the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3389, and I commend Members for bringing forth this outstanding reauthorization bill for the National Sea Grant College Program. I should note that I am a cosponsor of this important legislation.

H.R. 3389 makes significant improvements in the Sea Grant program. It reauthorizes the Sea Grant Program within NOAA for 5 years, increases the authorization for appropriations, extends the term of office for members of the Sea Grant Review Panel from 3 to 4 years, and specifies how funds appropriated above fiscal year 2002 levels shall be allocated.

The National Sea Grant Program is a nationwide network of over 300 colleges, universities, technical schools and research institutions that respond to issues and opportunities of national, regional, and local importance. Sea Grant engages partnerships with the public and private sectors to maximize the environmental, economic, and social value of the country's coastal, marine and Great Lakes resources, resulting in an extraordinary return on a small Federal investment.

Studies show that each Federal dollar is leveraged tenfold or more in private sector economic development, often in small businesses. For instance, the Sea Grant Program in my home State of South Carolina has been instrumental in supporting the involvement of students with diverse backgrounds in careers in marine science and others. South Carolina State University, my alma mater, was awarded a 3-year grant from Sea Grant in a national competition to encourage minority students to pursue education and careers in marine and related sciences.

Over the last year and a half, minority students have been supported with internships and mentored by scientists from the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources; the Oak Ridge National Laboratories; a fish hatchery in Orangeburg, South Carolina; and South Carolina State University.

In total, Sea Grant in South Carolina has supported more than 400 graduate and undergraduate students in the successful completion of their theses and dissertations over the last 2 decades, adding significant human and intellectual capital to the State and national workforces. Nationwide, Sea Grant has supported more than 14,000 college students in similar situations.

The southeastern region of the United States is subject to a variety of coastal natural hazards, including hurricanes during the summer and coastal storms during the fall and winter. Risks to life and property will only become more severe with the anticipated growth of coastal populations over the next several decades.

Since 1989 when Hurricane Hugo struck South Carolina, South Carolina Sea Grant has been supporting the work of wind engineers at Clemson University to develop low-cost methods to reduce the loss of lives and property. Many of these solutions can now be observed at the 113 Calhoun Street Sustainability Center, a regional educational and training facility dedicated to extending coastal hazards research information to a diverse group of users.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to recognize and acknowledge the many contributions of the National Sea Grant College Program to the Nation's economic development and resource conservation by voting in support of this important legislation.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for yielding me this time. It is sad that the gentleman will be leaving us when he gets elected Governor of Guam, and we will not have the privilege of his great leadership on the floor.

I rise in strong support of the Gilchrest substitute amendment to reauthorize the Sea Grant Program. I think we have all benefited here in Congress from the Sea Grant Program because they are also providing us with interns or fellows who are essentially people trained with master's degrees and above on ocean issues. They come and work in and around the legislature, and I have always thought there is a great need to have an understanding of science and politics. When we think about it, we rely on the facts of science in order to make public policy, and so often scientists do not have much knowledge about how public policy is formed or funded. This is a tiny way in at least on marine issues we can bring together scientists and policymakers.

Over half of the Sea Grant funding comes from non-Federal sources, so we are not the only ones that participate, and that means we get a better deal for the Federal buck. I support the Gilchrest substitute because the gentleman is a leader on ocean issues, and I would urge all Members to support it.

The increase in appropriations is necessary to face the growing challenges of the marine environments. We have talked about how important the ocean is to the world. Particularly, the ocean is the birthplace of weather on the planet. We know that we have to understand more about the ocean in order to protect not only our national security, but the world in itself, to be able to live peacefully on this planet.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has taken the pains to produce a substitute bill which took into consideration the concerns of both the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science, and even incorporates helpful parts from the Senate version.

Finally, this amendment strongly affirms that the place for the Sea Grant Program is in with NOAA, and I urge Members to support the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest that some of us agree with the President in where it is appropriate to have the Sea Grant Program administered. I just would like to reinforce for our future consideration the possibility and the logic of having this under the National Science Foundation because research is so important as part of the Sea Grant Program as we most effectively and efficiently move ahead with this issue.

It is especially important to the State of Michigan, and I am sure the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) will counsel with NSF as we proceed under his jurisdiction for Sea Grant.

□ 1245

But as we look at next year and the year after, I think it is important that we acknowledge what the administration has suggested in the most appropriate place for the jurisdiction of this program.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to acknowledge that one of the most important features of the Sea Grant Program is the Sea Grant fellows. Certainly there have been a number of Sea Grant fellows that have served the Democrat Members on the Committee on Resources. In addition to former fellows Dave Jansen and Jean Flemma, Mindy Gensler in my office and Catherine Ware on the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, other past Sea Grant fellows include Sarah Morison, Matt Huggler, Cynthia Suchman, John Fields, Debbie Colbert, and many, many others dating back to the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just wish to respond to my good friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) in regard to his comments, because I also am a very strong supporter of the National Science Foundation and the way they handle their research efforts.

But I want to point out that a century and a half ago, this country established one of the landmarks in research efforts in this country, and that is the land grant university system. That system has worked very well precisely because it not only did the research but also through that system we developed a cooperative extension service that literally gets the results from the laboratory to the farmer's fields within 1 year. It is the best technology transfer program we have in the United States.

The reason that I did not support transferring Sea Grant to NSF is simply because they also have an extension service. The Sea Grant Program is modeled not after programs in NSF, but rather it is modeled after the land grant system. For that reason it is better to remain where it is and continue to operate as it is. However, what this bill does is move the Sea Grant Program in terms of its research grants into the NSF model. That is why we are requiring Sea Grant to work cooperatively and coordinate their work with the National Science Foundation and, furthermore, to report back to us on their progress on that score.

Furthermore, this bill also no longer will allocate all the money on an historical basis but, rather, the new money put into this activity from now on will be assigned on the basis of peer review and merit-based evaluations, which again is the model followed by the National Science Foundation.

In view of that, I believe it is better to have the Sea Grant Program remain where it is and not move to the NSF. The NSF is simply not equipped to do the extension and education activities that are included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted the opportunity to ratify what the gentleman from Michigan has just stated. The Sea Grant Program makes an enormous contribution not simply because of its applied research, but because of technology transfer and an excellent extension service. Going back to an earlier point made by the gentleman from American Samoa, it is a tremendous vacuum in terms of providing those level of services for Sea Grant in comparison to land grant.

Having worked, I am sure, like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) in a university in my previous existence, I am very personally familiar with the enormous benefits given to the community, given to applied research, given to technology transfer, given to general community awareness provided by land grant institutions, and certainly one would hope that eventually not that Sea Grant would reach that level but approximate that level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has said and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has said concerning the issue of the National Sea Grant Program falling under the umbrella of the National Science Foundation, both very reputable scientific organizations, and the administration's

hope to improve the type of research in the science by connecting the National Sea Grant Program to the National Science Foundation and the peer review that is so respected that comes out of the National Science Foundation. But what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) made a comment on in reference to the land grant programs and the agricultural extension agents is also true with the Sea Grant Program so that whenever there is a strange disease with a particular species called striped bass or a problem between the economics or the ecosystem approach to protecting crabs or dealing with a very difficult situation with a toxic microorganism known as physteria, the quick reaction time of the Sea Grant Program is second to none.

We respect the administration's proposal and we will continue to work with them on this issue, and we have in this legislation, to tie those two organizations more closely together. We feel that the independence of the National Sea Grant Program has affected this country in a very positive way.

I want to also thank the gentleman from Guam for his collaboration on the bipartisan work on this and also to work with him, perhaps even after the votes today, to talk about some of the issues dealing with Magnuson, because this is an outstanding piece of legislation that we have here this morning. We want to make sure that the Magnuson bill that we deal with next Tuesday is equally a bipartisan approach to protecting the Nation's fisheries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, a friend of mine that I have not seen since May 14, 1967, as colleagues in the Marine Corps fighting for democracy in Vietnam, Mr. Gary Downs, is present this afternoon in the House of Representatives. He has worked, as a young man, for freedom for this country and as many years have passed, he has worked to continue that tradition and also to enhance the quality of life for all Americans through his environmental work. I thank Mr. Downs for being here today, and his family.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program Act. I am pleased that we are acting expeditiously to reauthorize this important program in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration so that Sea Grant programs can continue their work encouraging sustainable development of coastal and Great Lakes resources through education, research and outreach.

I believe that we need to strengthen our understanding of the coastal and marine environment given the ever-increasing pressures that threaten to harm these sensitive areas. In order for policy makers and managers to best understand how to direct the use and conservation of aquatic ecosystems and their resources, it is imperative that we have a strong scientific understanding as well as the support of local communities. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of environmental issues, partnerships with Sea Grant have proven to be highly successful in tackling problems that face our

nation's oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes. As a Sea Grant extension agent myself, I had the opportunity to see first hand how successful this program can be.

Another reason that I support this bill is due to my concerns over the Administration's proposed transfer of the Sea Grant program from NOAA to the National Science Foundation. I am concerned that the applied science, management, as well as the education and outreach components of Sea Grant will be sacrificed in such a transfer. Sea Grant plays an important role in NOAA's ability to fulfill goals like building sustainable fisheries, protecting coastal and marine resources and mitigating the impacts of natural disasters. This bill calls for the reauthorization of Sea Grant within the Department where it belongs, NOAA.

In my home state of New Jersey, the benefits of the Sea Grant Program are innumerable. New Jersey Sea Grant facilitates technology transfer of research through constituent driven programs of instruction, publications and workshops that are all focused on outcome-based objectives. As a result, thousands of residents have been positively impacted. For example, New Jersey Sea Grant has been able to promote pollution prevention technologies and strategies that protect coastal resources from point sources and non-point sources of contamination.

Sea Grant is a unique program that has been successful over the past 30 years and should continue to grow. H.R. 3389 not only supports, but also strengthens the National Sea Grant College Program. I will vote today in favor of this bill and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3389, the National Sea Grant College Program reauthorization. I thank Chairman EHLERS for his leadership on this important issue, as well as my colleagues on the Resources Committee for their work on this import legislation.

My district is home to the New York Sea Grant College program, of which I am extremely proud. Housed at the State University of New York at Stony Brook and in partnership with Cornell University, this program has conducted cutting edge research on many marine issues throughout the First Congressional District of New York. New York Sea Grant has also studied seafood safety and barrier beach breaches and the surrounding ecosystem, as well as many various marine science projects. Recently, my district experienced a severe die-off of lobsters in the Long Island Sound, a situation that had a serious effect on my constituents and the local economy. I am pleased that Sea Grant received \$1.4 million to investigate this important issue and have been working to solve this baffling problem. New York Sea Grant extension and research specialists collaborated to produce a report on the "Economic Contribution of the Sport Fishing, Commercial Fishing, and Seafood Industries to New York State," estimating the combined economic contribution of these three industries at approximately \$11.5 billion in New York State. As you can see, the research done at New York Sea Grant is crucial to not only the natural resources but also the economic wellbeing of my constituents. This research is repeated in coastal communities throughout America, helping to understand our waters and marine ecosystems and make our natural resources vibrant and healthy.

H.R. 3389 is a strong, bipartisan bill that authorizes the Sea Grant College Program with its much needed resources. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to refrain from referring to individuals in the galleries.

All time for general debate has expired.

In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Resources and Science printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 107-514. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002".

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO FINDINGS.**

Section 202(a)(6) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121(a)(6)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting ", including strong collaborations between Administration scientists and scientists at academic institutions."

**SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM.**

(a) QUADRENNIAL STRATEGIC PLAN.—Section 204 (c)(1) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123 (c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the panel, sea grant colleges, and sea grant institutes, shall develop at least every 4 years a strategic plan that establishes priorities for the national sea grant college program, provides an appropriately balanced response to local, regional, and national needs, and is reflective of integration with the relevant portions of the strategic plans of the Department of Commerce and of the Administration."

(b) RANKING OF PROGRAMS.—Section 204(d)(3)(A) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)(A)) is

amended by inserting “and competitively rank” after “evaluate”.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR.—Section 204(d)(3)(B) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) and by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) encourage and promote coordination and cooperation between the research, education, and outreach programs of the Administration and those of academic institutions; and”.

#### SEC. 4. COST SHARE.

Section 205(a) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1124(a)) is amended by striking “section 204(d)(6)” and inserting “section 204(c)(4)(F)”.

#### SEC. 5. FELLOWSHIPS.

(a) ACCESS.—Section 208(a) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall strive to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students to the program carried out under this subsection.”.

(b) POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS.—Section 208(c) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1127(c)) is repealed.

#### SEC. 6. TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP FOR SEA GRANT REVIEW PANEL.

Section 209(c)(2) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1128(c)(2)) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “The term of office of a voting member of the panel shall be 3 years for a member appointed before the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002, and 4 years for a member appointed or reappointed after the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002. The Director may extend the term of office of a voting member of the panel appointed before the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002 by up to 1 year.”.

#### SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 212 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1131) are amended to read as follows:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title—

“(A) \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

“(B) \$75,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

“(C) \$77,500,000 for fiscal year 2005;

“(D) \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

“(E) \$82,500,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

“(F) \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

“(2) PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—In addition to the amount authorized under paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2008—

“(A) \$5,000,000 for competitive grants for university research on the biology and control of zebra mussels and other important aquatic nonnative species;

“(B) \$5,000,000 for competitive grants for university research on oyster diseases, oyster restoration, and oyster-related human health risks;

“(C) \$5,000,000 for competitive grants for university research on the biology, prevention, and forecasting of harmful algal blooms, including *Pfiesteria piscicida*; and

“(D) \$3,000,000 for competitive grants for fishery extension activities conducted by sea grant colleges or sea grant institutes.

“(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—No more than 5 percent of the lesser of—

“(A) the amount authorized to be appropriated; or

“(B) the amount appropriated,

for each fiscal year under subsection (a)(1) may be used to fund the program element contained in section 204(b)(2).

“(2) USE FOR OTHER OFFICES OR PROGRAMS.—Sums appropriated under the authority of subsection (a)(2) shall not be available for administration of this title by the National Sea Grant Office, for any other Administration or department program, or for any other administrative expenses.

“(c) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—In any fiscal year in which the appropriations made under subsection (a)(1) exceed the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2002 for the purposes described in such subsection, the Secretary shall distribute any excess amounts (except amounts used for the administration of the sea grant program) to—

“(1) sea grant programs that, based on the evaluation and competitive ranking required under section 204(d)(3)(A), are determined to be the best managed and to carry out the highest quality research, education, extension, and training activities;

“(2) national strategic investments authorized under section 204(b)(4);

“(3) a college, university, institution, association, or alliance for activities that are necessary for it to be designated as a sea grant college or sea grant institute; or

“(4) a sea grant college or sea grant institute designated after the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002.”.

#### SEC. 8. ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRESS IN BECOMING DESIGNATED AS SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND SEA GRANT INSTITUTES.

Section 207 of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (16 U.S.C. 1126) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON PROGRESS.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, on efforts and progress made by colleges, universities, institutions, associations, and alliances to become designated under this section as sea grant colleges or sea grant institutes, including efforts and progress made by sea grant institutes in being designated as sea grant colleges.

“(2) TERRITORIES AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.—The report shall include description of—

“(A) efforts made by colleges, universities, associations, institutions, and alliances in United States territories and freely associated States to develop the expertise necessary to be designated as a sea grant institute or sea grant college;

“(B) the administrative, technical, and financial assistance provided by the Secretary to those entities seeking to be designated; and

“(C) the additional actions or activities necessary for those entities to meet the qualifications for such designation under subsection (a)(1).”.

#### SEC. 9. COORDINATION.

Not later than February 15 of each year, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall jointly submit to the Committees on Resources and Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on how the oceans and coastal research activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including the Coastal Ocean Program and the National Sea Grant College Program, and of the National Science Foundation will be coordinated during the fiscal year following the fiscal year

in which the report is submitted. The report shall describe in detail any overlapping ocean and coastal research interests between the agencies and specify how such research interests will be pursued by the programs in a complementary manner.

#### SEC. 10. COASTAL OCEAN PROGRAM.

Section 201(c) of Public Law 102-567 is amended by—

(1) striking “Of the sums authorized under subsection (b)(1), \$17,352,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992 and 1993 are authorized to be appropriated” and inserting “There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce \$35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2003 to 2008”; and

(2) striking “to promote development of ocean technology.”.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of section 5(a), after the first period insert the following: “Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Act Amendments of 2002, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress describing the efforts by the Secretary to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students to the program carried out under this subsection, and the results of such efforts.”.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all acknowledge the wonderful partnership that has now been established between the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources. I am delighted of the words Chairman GILCREST mentioned with the partnership of the Sea Grant College program under the National Science Foundation to be able to enhance the college for the work that it already does but to provide those standards and accountability. I look forward to working with the Committee on Resources. I appreciate the work of Chairman GILCREST. I do thank the distinguished gentleman from Guam who, I do not know if we allow a contempt of Congress, but we do not want him to leave. We thank him for his great leadership on these issues, and my colleagues on the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for their leadership. I am a member of the Committee on Science and have seen the good work of this college.

I live in a coastal community, though many people would argue with me. I come from Houston, but we are 50 feet under sea level and certainly as our neighbors in Galveston saw the most horrific and maybe notorious hurricane in the early 1900s that literally took the island away, we know what it

is to face the sea in all of its challenges. But we also realize the bounty that the sea offers. Therefore, this particular college and its program, I believe, is very vital.

My amendment is simple, but it also reaffirms the good work that this amendment does. For example, I am very pleased to note that this amendment, the substitute amendment, provides fellowships. In particular, the Secretary shall strive to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students to the program carried out under this subsection. So we have seen the difference with the access to fellowship in working with institutions in our Nation that reflect both Hispanic serving and African-American youngsters as well as other minorities and, of course, hard-to-serve areas. I cite in particular Texas Southern University, Prairie View A&M, all of the universities in Texas, in the Valley area in South Texas, who are outstanding, that the Pan-American and others that are reflective of the diversity of our State will have the ability to access this program.

The amendment I have calls for a report to Congress describing efforts by the Secretary to ensure equal access to the Sea Grant Program. Education opportunity is the fundamental principle behind the National Sea Grant College Program Act. This program enhances the careers and future of students interested in marine science, marine policy issues, by placing them in a position to take advantage of a national network of Sea Grant colleges and research institutions. When these students thrive in the study of marine science, we all benefit. They provide the cutting edge for scientific information that will help improve the outcome for our environment, increase the potential of our oceans to offer medicines and food, and save the precious resources that are so valuable to America.

All of us are in awe of the oceans and seas. They obviously take their place by being the dominant, if you will, element of this world's structure. Because of the importance of the Sea Grant, we understand more about our oceans and seas. We must ensure that all students with a potential to excel also have access to study the ocean and the seas.

According to census projections, minority groups will make up 50 percent of the United States population by 2050. What we want is all of America to be prepared to be able to tell the story that is so important and do the research that is so important to make this Nation better, but also to take advantage of our resources. It is vital that this partnership between the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science go forward with the enhancement of the Sea Grant Program. I am particularly pleased as well that the partnership includes coordination with related activities of the National Science Foundation, the Coastal Ocean Research Program of the Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and a lot of other Federal agencies that have the ability to cooperate.

Let me acknowledge that we in America are looking more now for cooperative sharing of information. That usually is attendant to the tragedy of September 11, knowing more, cooperating more, exchanging information, exchanging intelligence. This is a legislative initiative, I believe, that will help us do so. My amendment, then, follows up by saying as we give access to minorities in underserved areas, let us have accountability. This amendment will require the Secretary to submit a report to the Congress describing the efforts by the Secretary to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students to the program carried out under this section and the results of such efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment inasmuch as it will provide accountability and good works on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 3389, The National Sea Grant College Program Act. This amendment calls for a report to Congress describing the efforts by the secretary to ensure equal access to the National Sea Grant Program.

Educational opportunity is the fundamental principal behind the National Sea Grant College Program Act. This program enhances the careers and future of students interested in marine science and marine policy issues by placing them in a position to take advantage of a national network of Sea Grant Colleges and research institutions. When these students thrive in the study of marine science we all benefit. They provide the cutting edge scientific information that will help improve the outcome for our environment, increase the potential of our oceans to offer medicines and food, and save the precious resources that are so valuable to America.

Because of the importance of the Sea Grant we must ensure that all students with the potential to excel have access. According to census projections, minority groups will make up 50% of the U.S. population by 2050. Unfortunately, these groups are traditionally underrepresented in the sciences and more specifically marine sciences. This reality is especially concerning in Texas and similar states where we have a large and rapidly growing minority group such as Hispanic students and teachers. As the demographics of our Nation change we must do everything possible to have all of America involved in the decisions affecting our U.S. coastal resources.

Sea Grant programs have worked hard to change the trend of under-representation of minorities by providing the help and scaffold necessary to increase the participation of minority students at all levels of the educational system. To bring minority students into the sciences, Sea Grant has developed marine science projects that directly involve middle and secondary school students, train teachers, and create educational materials. At the undergraduate and graduate level, Sea Grant program have provided scholarships, research assistantships, and fellowships to undergraduate students.

I believe this amendment will ensure that the hard work and meaningful efforts of the

Sea Grant to encourage and support minority participation will have the broad reach that is so critical to equal access to the sciences. This amendment will help to monitor progress in reaching and providing opportunities for under-represented groups in undergraduate and graduate education.

The Sea Grant has played a major role in educating a significant portion of marine and Great Lakes scientists who hold research and policy degrees in the United States. More than 12,000 graduate assistants have been supported by the Sea Grant and have become a major factor in the Nation's marine sector. These scientists have the skills that will benefit our environment and build our economy. They will help communities address issues of erosion and flooding, improve public access to our marine resources, and shape tourism expansion in ways that protect the environment while enhancing the economy.

The Sea Grant is a relatively small annual appropriation yet it is an investment that yields a large return for our Nation. As a result of Sea Grant research and extension efforts, hybrid striped bass pond culture has expanded in just 10 years from a small demonstration project to an industry producing 10 million pounds of fish valued at \$25 million annually. Sea Grant investigators have developed sterile oyster that can be grown year round and now makes up one third of the \$86 million U.S. oyster market. Sea Grant research and outreach on Manila clams and blue mussel have resulted in new industries worth \$19 million annually. Sea Grant's efforts to develop underwater preserves have boosted the economy of a wide range of businesses in Great Lakes coastal communities. A recent study suggests that diving activity provided an economic stimulus of at least \$1.5 million over a two-year period for small towns near the preserves.

The present bill already reflects the need to have equal access of minorities and under-represented groups to Sea Grant programs. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will support the Sea Grant's current efforts to encourage minority participation and ensure accountability and progress in the endeavor to sustain racial, and socio-economic diversity of the Sea Grant Awardees.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her beautiful statement about this legislation, about the intent of the legislation. I also want to emphasize that in our legislation we have assured equal access to this program but her addition to that ensures that in an enhanced way and we are prepared to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science. As a member of the Committee on Science, I came in with the commitment that we should open up science and math and the understanding of our resources to all of our Nation and have often offered these amendments to expand the outreach.

□ 1300

But I want to applaud the committee for having the access provision. This amendment will hopefully complement it to the extent of providing the accountability.

Might I also say that this is the first amendment of a new staff person of mine, Sophia King. I wanted to acknowledge that and hope she will have many more to open up the opportunities for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman so very much.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as part of the compromise before us, we have agreed to amend the John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship Program to encourage the Secretary of Commerce to strive to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students. There was broad agreement that this was a worthy refinement to this outstanding program.

The amendment offered by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), would simply amend this provision to require the Secretary to provide an initial report to describe the level of minority and disadvantaged student participation within the Knauss Fellowship Program and also require subsequent reports every 2 years thereafter on progress in providing opportunities for under-represented groups to participate.

I agree with the intent of this amendment, and I congratulate our colleague for this excellent amendment. Certainly we want to encourage NOAA to reach out to under-represented groups to offer them the opportunity to compete for Knauss fellowships like every other graduate student.

Additionally, NOAA has implemented a commendable program of outreach to historically black and minority institutions of higher education, higher learning over the past few years. I would add that all of the institutions I mentioned in the Western Pacific are minority institutions. This amendment would appear consistent with that overall initiative as well.

I believe that the Jackson-Lee amendment will improve the bill, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. All those in favor of taking this by a recorded vote are asked to stand and remain standing.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, since there will be a recorded vote on the entire bill, I thought it was going to be voiced, if there is going to be a recorded vote on the entire bill, I withdraw my request for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is withdrawn.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOEKSTRA) having assumed the chair, Mr. SUNUNU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3389) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 446, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Barcia	Biggert	Boyd	Graham	McCarthy (MO)
Ackerman	Barr	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)	Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Aderholt	Barrett	Blumenauer	Brady (TX)	Graves	McCollum
Akin	Bartlett	Boehmert	Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	McCreery
Allen	Barton	Boehner	Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	McDermott
Andrews	Bass	Bonilla	Brown (SC)	Greenwood	McGovern
Baca	Becerra	Bonior	Bryant	Grucci	McInnis
Bachus	Bentsen	Bono	Burr	Gutknecht	McIntyre
Baird	Bereuter	Boozman	Burton	Hall (OH)	McKeon
Baldacci	Berkley	Borski	Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Baldwin	Berman	Boswell	Callahan	Hansen	McNulty
Ballenger	Berry	Boucher	Calvert	Harman	Meehan
			Camp	Hart	Meek (FL)
			Cannon	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
			Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Menendez
			Capito	Haves	Mica
			Capps	Hayworth	Millender-
			Capuano	Hefley	McDonald
			Cardin	Herger	Miller, Dan
			Carson (IN)	Hill	Miller, Gary
			Carson (OK)	Hilleary	Miller, George
			Castle	Hinchey	Miller, Jeff
			Chabot	Hinojosa	Mink
			Chambliss	Hobson	Mollohan
			Clay	Hoeffel	Moore
			Clayton	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
			Clement	Holden	Moran (VA)
			Clyburn	Holt	Morella
			Coble	Honda	Murtha
			Combest	Hooley	Myrick
			Condit	Horn	Nadler
			Costello	Hostettler	Neal
			Cox	Houghton	Nethercutt
			Coyne	Hoyer	Ney
			Cramer	Hulshof	Northup
			Crane	Hunter	Nussle
			Crenshaw	Hyde	Oberstar
			Crowley	Inlee	Obey
			Cubin	Isakson	Olver
			Culberson	Israel	Ortiz
			Cummings	Issa	Osborne
			Cunningham	Istook	Ose
			Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Otter
			Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Owens
			Davis (IL)	(TX)	Oxley
			Davis, Jo Ann	Jefferson	Pallone
			Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Pascarell
			DeFazio	John	Pastor
			DeGette	Johnson (CT)	Payne
			Delahunt	Johnson (IL)	Pelosi
			DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
			DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)
			DeMint	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)
			Deutsch	Jones (OH)	Petri
			Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Phelps
			Dicks	Kaptur	Pickering
			Dingell	Keller	Pitts
			Doggett	Kelly	Platts
			Dooley	Kennedy (MN)	Pombo
			Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
			Doyle	Kerns	Portman
			Dreier	Kildee	Price (NC)
			Duncan	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)
			Dunn	Kind (WI)	Quinn
			Edwards	King (NY)	Radanovich
			Ehlers	Kingston	Rahall
			Ehrlich	Kirk	Ramstad
			Emerson	Knollenberg	Rangel
			Engel	Kolbe	Regula
			English	Kucinich	Rehberg
			Eshoo	LaFalce	Reyes
			Etheridge	LaHood	Reynolds
			Evans	Lampson	Riley
			Everett	Langevin	Rivers
			Farr	Lantos	Rodriguez
			Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Roemer
			Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
			Filner	Latham	Rogers (MI)
			Fletcher	LaTourette	Rohrabacher
			Foley	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen
			Forbes	Lee	Ross
			Ford	Levin	Rothman
			Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
			Frank	Lewis (KY)	Royce
			Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Rush
			Frost	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
			Gallely	Lofgren	Ryan (KS)
			Ganske	Lowey	Sabo
			Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Sanchez
			Gephardt	Lucas (OK)	Sandlin
			Gibbons	Luther	Sawyer
			Gilchrest	Lynch	Saxton
			Gillmor	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
			Gilman	Maloney (NY)	Schiff
			Gonzalez	Manzullo	Schrock
			Goode	Markey	Scott
			Goodlatte	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
			Gordon	Matheson	Serrano
			Goss	Matsui	Sessions

Shadegg	Sullivan	Walden	Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Jones (NC)	Paul	Skeen
Shaw	Sununu	Walsh	Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pascrell	Keller	Pence	Smith (MI)
Sherman	Tancredo	Wamp	Brown (OH)	(TX)	Pastor	Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Sherwood	Tanner	Waters	Capps	Jefferson	Payne	Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Shimkus	Tauscher	Watkins (OK)	Capuano	John	Pelosi	Kerns	Petri	Souder
Shows	Tauzin	Watson (CA)	Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps	King (NY)	Pickering	Stearns
Shuster	Taylor (MS)	Watt (NC)	Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Pomeroy	Kingston	Pitts	Stump
Simmons	Terry	Watts (OK)	Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Price (NC)	Kirk	Platts	Sullivan
Simpson	Thomas	Waxman	Clay	Kaptur	Quinn	Knollenberg	Pombo	Sununu
Skeen	Thompson (CA)	Weiner	Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall	Kolbe	Portman	Tancredo
Skelton	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)	Clement	Kildee	Rangel	LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Tauzin
Slaughter	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)	Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Reyes	Latham	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Smith (MI)	Thune	Weller	Condit	Kind (WI)	Rivers	LaTourette	Ramstad	Terry
Smith (NJ)	Thurman	Wexler	Costello	Klecza	Rodriguez	Leach	Regula	Thomas
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Whitfield	Coyne	Kucinich	Roemer	Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	Thornberry
Smith (WA)	Tiberi	Wicker	Cramer	LaFalce	Ross	Lewis (KY)	Reynolds	Thune
Snyder	Tierney	Wilson (NM)	Crowley	Lampson	Rothman	LoBiondo	Riley	Tiahrt
Solis	Toomey	Wilson (SC)	Cummings	Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Lucas (OK)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Souder	Towns	Wolf	Davis (CA)	Lantos	Rush	Manzullo	Rogers (MI)	Toomey
Spratt	Turner	Woolsey	Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Sabo	McCrary	Rohrabacher	Upton
Stark	Udall (CO)	Wu	Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Sanchez	Mcinnis	Ros-Lehtinen	Vitter
Stearns	Udall (NM)	Wynn	DeFazio	Lee	Sandlin	McKeon	Royce	Walden
Stenholm	Velazquez	Young (AK)	DeGette	Levin	Sawyer	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Walsh
Strickland	Visclosky	Young (FL)	Delahunt	Lipinski	Schakowsky	Miller, Dan	Ryun (KS)	Wamp
Stump	Vitter		DeLauro	Lofgren	Schiff	Miller, Gary	Saxton	Watkins (OK)
Stupak			Deutsch	Lowey	Scott	Miller, Jeff	Schroek	Watts (OK)

NAYS—2

Flake

Paul

NOT VOTING—25

Army	Gutierrez	Roukema
Baker	Hilliard	Sanders
Bishop	Klecza	Schakowsky
Blagojevich	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Blunt	Linder	Sweeney
Collins	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Conyers	Napolitano	Trafficant
Cooksey	Norwood	
Deal	Putnam	

□ 1327

Mr. PAUL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 237, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 237, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will designate the motion. The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 210, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 238] YEAS—206

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop
Ackerman	Barrett	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Bonior
Andrews	Bentsen	Borski
Baca	Berkley	Boswell
Baird	Berman	Boucher
Baldacci	Berry	Boyd

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Coble	Gillmor
Akin	Collins	Goode
Army	Combest	Goodlatte
Bachus	Cox	Goss
Baker	Crane	Graham
Ballenger	Crenshaw	Granger
Barr	Cubin	Graves
Bartlett	Culberson	Green (WI)
Barton	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bass	Davis, Jo Ann	Grucci
Bereuter	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Biggert	DeLay	Hansen
Bilirakis	DeMint	Hart
Blunt	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Boehert	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Boehner	Dreier	Hayes
Bonilla	Duncan	Hayworth
Bono	Dunn	Hefley
Boozman	Ehlers	Heger
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hilleary
Brown (SC)	English	Hobson
Bryant	Everett	Hoekstra
Burr	Ferguson	Hostettler
Burton	Flake	Houghton
Buyer	Fletcher	Hulshof
Callahan	Foley	Hunter
Calvert	Forbes	Hyde
Camp	Fossella	Isakson
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Issa
Canon	Galleghy	Istook
Capito	Ganske	Jenkins
Castle	Gekas	Johnson (CT)
Chabot	Gibbons	Johnson (IL)
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Johnson, Sam

NOT VOTING—19

Barcia	Hilliard	Roukema
Blagojevich	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Conyers	Linder	Shays
Cooksey	McHugh	Sweeney
Deal	Moore	Trafficant
Edwards	Norwood	
Gutierrez	Putnam	

□ 1340

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for: Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act; however the voting machine apparently did not register my vote. Please let the RECORD reflect that I intended to vote "aye" on House Vote 238.

ESTABLISHING THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 449

Resolved, That there is hereby established a Select Committee on Homeland Security.

SEC. 2. COMPOSITION.—The select committee shall be composed of nine Members appointed by the Speaker, of whom four shall be appointed on the recommendation of the Minority Leader. The Speaker shall designate one member as chairman.

SEC. 3. JURISDICTION.—The select committee may develop recommendations and report to the House on such matters that relate to the establishment of a department of homeland security as may be referred to it by the Speaker and on recommendations submitted to it under section 6.

SEC. 4. PROCEDURE.—(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), rule XI shall apply to the select committee to the extent not inconsistent with this resolution.

(1) Clause 1(b) and clause 2(m)(1)(B) of rule XI shall not apply to the select committee.

(2) The select committee is not required to adopt written rules to implement the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI.

(b) Clause 10(b) of rule X shall not apply to the select committee.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.—To enable the select committee to carry out the purposes of this resolution, the select committee may utilize the services of staff of the House.

SEC. 6. REPORTING.—(a) Each standing or permanent select committee to which the Speaker refers to a bill introduced by the Majority Leader or his designee (by request) that proposes to establish a department of homeland security may submit its recommendations on the bill only to the select committee. Such recommendations may be submitted not later than a time designated by the Speaker.

(b) The select committee shall consider the recommendations submitted to it on a bill described in subsection (a) and shall report to the House its recommendations on such bill.

SEC. 7. DISSOLUTION.—(a) The select committee shall cease to exist after final disposition of a bill described in section 6(a), including final disposition of any veto message on such bill.

(b) Upon the dissolution of the select committee, this resolution shall not be construed to alter the jurisdiction of any standing committee.

SEC. 8. DISPOSITION OF RECORDS.—Upon dissolution of the select committee, the records of the select committee shall become the records of any committee designated by the Speaker.

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution allows us to move decisively in a bipartisan manner to establish an empowered Department of Homeland Security. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) and my colleagues on the Committee on Rules for helping us proceed in a bipartisan manner in dealing with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed legislation to create this new Cabinet-level agency represents a call to arms for each of us. It is the battle cry of a Nation determined to preserve its hard-won and fundamental belief that its people have an inherent right to freedom.

Today, we take the first important step in answering that call by readying our government to confront a faceless enemy, an enemy attempting to pene-

trate our borders, threaten our towns and cities and, overall, to rob families and communities of the sense of security that they enjoyed before the attacks of September 11. This is an unprecedented category of war on the home front, and it requires a new approach to securing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about protecting American lives, not protecting the turf of those here in the Congress. I take very seriously our institutional responsibility to protect the integrity of the congressional oversight process and the ability of committees to exercise their will on matters within their jurisdiction. This resolution facilitates our ability to fulfill those responsibilities without compromising our ultimate and most critical objective of keeping Americans safe from terrorism. Mr. Speaker, as we know, terrorism is an ever-present enemy.

This resolution ensures that we are moving forward with a sense of deliberative urgency, permitting the House to condense the legislative process in a way that will foster a thoughtful and carefully crafted legislative product. In so doing, it establishes a process for considering the President's initiative similar to one that was used a quarter of a century ago by Speaker Tom O'Neill in addressing the energy crisis.

The resolution provides a clearinghouse for ideas, an ad hoc body with the expertise to resolve jurisdictional disputes, and the authority to compile a final package. Instead of potentially lengthy struggles on overlapping jurisdictional issues, the select committee will operate as a type of conference committee for all relevant committees of jurisdiction. Every committee is ensured to have a voice in the process.

Mr. Speaker, with very few exceptions, regular order will be applied to the select committee, meaning it will have to comply with all rules of the House. The select committee is limited in its scope, authorized only to consider legislation creating a Homeland Security Department, and will dissolve once that duty has been completed. The membership will be a small group comprised of elected leaders from both sides of the aisle.

In the President's transmittal message to Congress accompanying the homeland security initiative, he referenced President Truman's previous reorganization of our military forces under the new Department of Defense as an analogy to today's homeland security initiative.

What is also somewhat similar is the philosophy laid out earlier by the first Hoover Commission established in 1947 to study the organization of the executive branch and to come up with recommendations for its reorganization. The commission noted in its report on the general management of the executive branch that "we must reorganize the executive branch to give simplicity and structure, the unity of purpose, and the clear line of executive authority originally intended."

Mr. Speaker, one of the commission's underlying principles was that policy-making and standards-setting should be centralized by the President, central management agencies and department Secretaries, rather than controlled at the individual agency level where bureau and subdivision fiefdoms had evolved to create a mass of policy and functional confusion.

While there was no direct or pending security threat at the time, it is appropriate to compare the philosophy of the Hoover Commission to the motivations of the homeland security initiative. The President notes a number of similar themes in his message: "Our Nation needs a unified homeland security structure;" "transforming the current confusing patchwork of government activities into a single department whose primary mission is to secure our homeland;" the Department "would have a clear and efficient organizational structure . . ." And finally, "history also teaches us that critical security challenges require clear lines of responsibility and the unified effort of the U.S. Government."

Mr. Speaker, it demonstrates that America is the great Nation that it is because we have been able to look inward at the appropriate times and unify to transform to and adapt our government to changed circumstances.

We have an opportunity to implement a framework that will produce effective and functional changes to the organization of our Federal Government's national security infrastructure. That is why it is absolutely essential that we work together, both here in the House and with the other body, to proceed as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, even more important, we must do it the right way, in order to guarantee that our end product is the best solution for addressing our Nation's security needs.

Right now, agencies charged with protecting our borders, enforcing our laws and keeping Americans safe are grouped with those responsible for overseeing the Nation's finances and maintaining the Federal highway system. For instance, the Customs Service plays an important role in protecting America's borders, in the air, on land and at sea, and it has its own intelligence component. Yet, it is housed under the Treasury Department where the primary mission is to manage the government's money and promote stable economies both here and abroad.

Another well-known example is the overlapping roles of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the State Department when it comes to regulating permanent and temporary immigration to the United States. While the INS has overall responsibility for immigration matters, the State Department is in charge of issuing visas to foreign nationals coming to the United States. The homeland security initiative moves both the INS and the State Department's control

over visa issuance to the new Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard is the principal Federal law enforcement agency with jurisdiction in both U.S. waters and on the high seas. It is also prepared to function as a specialized service within the U.S. Navy, and it has command responsibilities for the U.S. maritime defense zones. Yet it reports to the Secretary of Transportation, whose primary mission is to oversee the formulation of national transportation policy.

Without a doubt, securing our homeland is going to require more than the creation of a new agency. Yet there is no question that we must establish an entity that is singly devoted to that purpose, with no distractions and no conflicting objectives.

Rather than the multitude of agencies and bureaus that currently hold homeland security authority, the President's plan charges one agency with responsibility for securing our borders, accessing and analyzing intelligence information, working with local and State governments to manage Federal emergency response activities, and developing chemical, biological and radiological and nuclear countermeasures.

Mr. Speaker, this presidential initiative represents bipartisanship at its best. As we address the security needs of our homeland, passage of this resolution is a bold and important step toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of September 11, the people of this Nation have pulled together to meet the first great challenge of the 21st century.

Across the globe in Afghanistan, the men and women of the United States Armed Forces prove their courage and skill on the battlefield once again, and here in Washington, Democrats and Republicans put aside partisanship to support the war on terrorism.

Still, Mr. Speaker, much remains to be done, especially in the area of homeland security. For months, Democrats and a few Republicans have argued that homeland security must become a Cabinet-level priority. I myself am a cosponsor of a House bill to do just that. So there was bipartisan support for the President's decision a few weeks ago to reverse his prior opposition to a new Department of Homeland Security.

By itself, reorganizing the Federal Government will not ensure Americans' safety, but it is an important first step, and the short 35-page bill submitted by the administration yesterday provides a useful starting point, even as it raises a lot of important questions.

How will it improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Government's intelligence operations? How will it change the relationship between individual Americans and the Federal agencies, FEMA and the Coast Guard, for instance, that now provide them with crucial services?

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we must work through important questions about the nature of the agency itself. We must ensure that Americans' fundamental values, rights and liberties are not sacrificed on the altar of this new governmental structure. That includes the employment rights of the public servants who will work in this department and devote their lives to protecting their fellow citizens.

We must honestly address the question of how much it will cost taxpayers to set up and operate this new Federal department. America's national security is not cheap and neither is its homeland security. Just yesterday, for instance, the Republican staff director of the Senate Budget Committee pointed out that additional costs seem likely.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must answer these and other questions to ensure that creating a new Department of Homeland Security accomplishes more than just moving Federal employees around Washington but actually makes Americans safer in this new war against terrorism.

That is why it is so important that we follow regular order and draw upon the tremendous experience and expertise in the standing committees of jurisdiction. Many of our Members have literally decades of experience with these matters. Simply put, they know what works and what does not work in the real world.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic Leader GEPHARDT was right to set September 11 of this year as the deadline to create the new Department of Homeland Security. That deadline is less than 3 months from today, but is a full year from the infamous day when terrorists made clear America's new homeland security needs.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, we can meet that goal, but it will require the type of bipartisanship we saw immediately after September 11. Fortunately, the Speaker seems to understand that, and so today the House is taking an initial step down the long road toward the real and substantive cooperation necessary to create an effective Department of Homeland Security.

Of course, sticking to the path of bipartisanship will require determination at all stages in the process, in the initial work of the standing committees, as the select committee itself reconciles their approaches, and as the Committee on Rules sends that product to the House floor.

Indeed, the end of the process will be as important as the beginning. So I urge the Speaker to commit to bringing the final bill to the House floor

under an open rule. That way we can ensure that the will of the entire House is reflected in what we pass.

Mr. Speaker, we all understand how absolutely critical it is that partisan politics play no part in our deliberations. This is no time for any political party's agenda. It is time to prove that we are worthy of this monumental task to protect our Nation and its citizens, and to reassure them that their government is part of the solution, not part of the problem.

Democrats are eager to get to work reorganizing on this critical task. So I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Irving, Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and this resolution simply authorizes the Speaker to appoint a Select Committee on Homeland Security consisting of five House Republican Members and four House Democrat Members.

The purpose of the select committee, which will have hearing authority and the same markup and reporting authority as standing committees, is to review the various recommendations from the standing committees of jurisdiction and report to the House one comprehensive bill that will create the Department of Homeland Security.

This resolution carries an authorization for the select committee to utilize the services and resources of the staff of the House of Representatives and shall cease to exist after final disposition of the bill, including final disposition of any veto message on such a bill.

The precedent for such a select committee is clear, and thanks to the bipartisan support I have received from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democrat minority leader, I am confident that we can meet the President's deadline for enactment of this session.

With respect to timing, tomorrow I will introduce the bill sent up by the President and that will be referred to the select committee. Standing committees with a legitimate jurisdictional claim will receive an additional referral, with the understanding that they will provide recommendations to the select committee no later than July 12, 2002.

Finally, it is the Speaker's goal to schedule this legislation for floor consideration in the House the week of July 21, 2001. At that time, it is the Speaker's intention that he and the Democratic Leader propose to the Committee on Rules a resolution governing the consideration of the select committee's product and jointly recommending that it be adopted.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to join the majority leader in support of this effort. The fight against terrorism is our most urgent national security priority, and the creation of a Department of Homeland Security is a big step in the war against terrorism. However, it will take a great deal of our effort beyond just the formation of this department to protect our Nation.

Let me thank the gentleman and the Republican leadership for the bipartisan manner in which this process has developed so far. We believe that bipartisanship should continue throughout this process, during the committee markups, within the select committee that we are creating, and during the floor consideration of our final work product.

Many of our Members have developed proposals along these lines. It is our intention to do everything we can to make this department an effective tool in the war against terrorism. It is also imperative that the 170,000 workers who will be affected by this transition continue to receive all of the rights they now enjoy as employees of the Federal Government. Agencies that do a highly-effective job for the American people, such as the Coast Guard and FEMA, must be empowered so that they can continue to do their crucial work and that work beyond homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a few clarifying questions of the majority leader. First, the rule governing consideration of this legislation will be jointly recommended by the Speaker and the Democratic leader and then brought to the Committee on Rules. The rule will preserve minority rights protected by the House and will be a fair process; is this correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman; and let me say, yes, and I will restate that it is the Speaker's intention that he and Democrat Leader GEPHARDT propose to the Committee on Rules a resolution governing the consideration of the select committee's product and jointly recommend that it be adopted.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the majority leader, and if he will continue to yield for a second question:

Nothing in this process will restrict the traditional rights of the minority or the rights of the committee in being named as conferees for the final product; is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Again reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her question, and I will advise the gentlewoman that under House rules the Speaker will retain all of his prerogatives under this resolution with respect to the naming of conferees.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and once again express my appreciation for the bipartisan cooperation we have had here today.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank the gentlewoman for the spirit of cooperation we have already enjoyed working together on this very important matter before the American people, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I may be in a small minority in this House, but I just heard the majority leader say that this was to be done on the recommendations of all the standing committees, with reference to this consolidation, effective by July 12. We are going to adjourn next Friday, presumably, on June 28. We are going to come back on July 9 or 10 from our July 4 break. As I compute it, therefore, that leaves about 9 legislative days to consider the consolidation of agencies which have under their aegis almost \$39 billion in expenses and have over 160,000 Federal employees.

I have great reservations about what I perceive to be a rush to judgment on this issue. Do I believe we need to organize well to confront those who would undermine our country? I do. Do I believe that reinventing and reassessing the operations of the government on a periodic basis are necessary? I do. Do I believe, however, that in the face of threats, that we ought to do something that we might not otherwise have done? The answer to that is an emphatic no.

Now, I may well support this effort, but I think it is a serious effort. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is seated here. He participated in a major effort, not to redeploy one of our largest departments, the Internal Revenue Service, but to reorganize it internally and to make it run better. He and I had some disagreements on that, but ultimately we all supported that effort and he did great work. But he will tell my colleagues that that one department, substantially less than 160,000 people, with no cross-jurisdictions because it was one department, was a complicated effort that needed time to effect.

I would hope that everybody in this body would take this responsibility very seriously and give it the time necessary to effect an end that in a year from now or 10 years from now we will be able to look back on and say we did our work well, we did it thoughtfully, we did it carefully, and we did it well.

Mr. Speaker, let me also observe that I have great concerns about the general waiver that is accorded to the Secretary of the Department in this legislation with reference to protections of Federal employees incorporated in law, in other words, not rule or regulation, but passed by this Congress, signed by a President of the United States, to ensure that our Federal employees have

the kinds of protections and benefits that we believe were necessary not only to recruit and retain those Federal employees but to treat them fairly within our system.

The legislation, as I understand it, that has been proposed by the President gives to the Secretary the power to waive those. I do not think that we ought to do that, and I hope that we do not do it. I will be focused on that as we move along in consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me this time to express some caution as we approach this weighty and difficult task.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say very briefly, in response to the gentleman's statement, that I believe in my opening statement I made it very clear that while we want to do this in an expeditious manner, we want to make sure that it is done right. We have certain constraints with which we have to deal if we are going to successfully meet the September 11 goal that was first set forth by the minority leader. And in light of that, the July 12 deadline, then our goal of trying to begin reconciling differences as we head towards the August break are dates that have been put forth.

But I do believe that first and foremost, as I said, we must do this correctly. So in that light, I do agree with my colleague.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments because I think we agree on that issue. The important issue will be that we do this right, and to that extent I agree with my friend.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who has long been a hard fighter on behalf of our homeland security and other national security questions.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 449. Yes, it will permit us to do the job right because we are committed to doing this job well, but it will also permit us to set the task of doing this job expeditiously, as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) noted.

Why should it be done expeditiously? Because we are at war. Let us not forget what this is all about. Three thousand of our citizens were slaughtered by a hostile foreign enemy. We are at war. Our military is in action in Afghanistan, in the Philippines, and perhaps in the near future in Iraq. Our intelligence agencies have been mobilized. That is what one expects in war.

But as in past wars, especially in this new type of war, what the defense of the homeland is about is about winning that war. It is part of the strategy of victory. And to accomplish the security of our homeland and the safety of

our people, we need a restructuring and we need to do it in an expeditious fashion. That is what this effort is all about. But it is more than just redrawing the lines on a flow chart. We must also have a change in attitude, a new sense of vigilance that comes with the creation of a new Department of Homeland Security.

I am personally pleased to see, for example, that the INS will reorient their job toward protecting our borders and protecting the security of the United States of America in dealing with the illegal alien problem. Our homeland is in jeopardy, and a restructuring is absolutely necessary; and we have begun today with this effort to provide the restructuring that will be necessary to legal procedures. George Bush is providing the aggressive leadership on the executive end. We are providing this restructuring on the legislative side, and we are working under the aggressive leadership of our President in this wartime situation. And what is necessary for victory is a unity, not just between the executive and legislative branch, but also between the political parties; and that is what this effort is about today. It is a bipartisan effort. It is a team effort. We are proposing a select committee to expedite the creation of a Homeland Security Department.

So let the terrorists of the world know we will pursue them overseas and we will protect our homeland and we will win this war against this evil that threatens our people, our homeland, and the world.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Rules for yielding time.

Protecting the American people is our first obligation, and I know that we as Democrats are committed to working with all of our colleagues here in the House to protect our families, our cities, and our way of life from the enemies of freedom. In this work, maybe the most important work of our generation, there are no Democrats, no Republicans, only patriots. Following September 11, I assumed the chairmanship of the Democratic task force on homeland security, which introduced two comprehensive bills that addressed the threat of bioterrorism and future terrorist attacks on our Nation. We successfully united the entire Democratic caucus behind our legislation, and we are proud to see that major provisions of that legislation has in essence been enacted into law. Now as we pursue the select committee and its proposed work along with the committees of jurisdiction, we Democrats have, I believe, certain principles that will seek to guide us. We strongly embrace and support the reform and reor-

ganization of departments and agencies with responsibilities for homeland defense, but we seek a continuing and thorough review of the events and factors that led to the tragic and unfortunate deaths of September 11.

□ 1415

Such reform and reorganization, coupled with a comprehensive threat assessment and strategy to address threats to the American homeland, is the best way to improve the safety and security of the American people. We are glad that the President has come to agree with Democrats that the head of Federal homeland security efforts must have the requisite statutory and budgetary authority to effectively and efficiently protect America from terrorism.

But we also believe as we protect and defend our country, we must protect and defend the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and our civil liberties which collectively is the rock upon which we have built our life as a society. We also believe when the hometown is secure, the homeland is secure. So as we consolidate the Federal Government's homeland security functions, we need to ensure that the hometown is secure.

The democratic principles of getting more money out of Washington and into our communities for police, fire, emergency management and public health will be a guiding principle as we try to succeed in this reorganization.

Finally, the select committee is a continuation of our efforts to address the challenges ahead. Yes, we need to do it expeditiously on behalf of the American people, but we need to do it well. 170,000 employees, \$39 billion in the budget, these are very significant items, which is why we seek to have the White House submit an amended budgetary process in order to make sure that we do this in an open and fiscally responsible manner.

Those are some of our challenges. They are legitimate public policy issues. These are trying times; but as a united Congress, and with the support of the American people, we can rise to that occasion, we can make our homeland secure, and we can do it in a way in which the American people will be proud.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us today. I was delighted to hear the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) talk about some of the principles that the gentleman feels strongly about, that he identified as principles on his side of the aisle. They are principles that I think both sides of the aisle support: Focusing on first responders, focusing on the rights of American citizens, focusing on doing this in an expeditious manner, and doing it right.

For me, this reminds me a lot of where we were right after September 11

when there was a certain urgency, and in the House and Senate we came together across party lines and did the right thing for the American people. I see that again with regard to this proposal to create a new Department of Homeland Security, and I am very supportive of the Speaker's resolution today to create a select committee that helps us get to that process, chaired by the majority leader.

I believe the need for this department is very clear. There are over 100 government agencies now responsible for homeland security. In a sense, everyone is in charge; so no one is in charge. One of our tasks is to align authority with responsibility. By doing that, we can ensure some accountability so that someone is in charge and someone is accountable to ensure that we are doing all we can to protect the homeland.

It is a complicated and important task. I think again united in a bipartisan way, there is no reason we cannot get it done. As I see the reaction in the House and Senate, and yesterday when the President brought his proposal forward and Tom Ridge presented it, I see that kind of unified response that will help us get this done.

I am pleased the Speaker has set up a process that will allow all the authorizing committees to have input into the process. After all, that is where the expertise resides, and it will be those committees that will provide that expertise and put together recommendations as to how to reorganize these departments and agencies.

We need to be sure that the creation of the Department of Homeland Security is not oversold. This will not make us immune from terrorism. What it will do is it will maximize our ability to protect our citizens. After all, that is the fundamental responsibility of the Federal Government, to protect our country and citizens.

Congress is not generally known for getting things done quickly. There is a joke that it takes us 30 days to make instant coffee around here. But as we have demonstrated after the tragic events of September 11, when we work in a bipartisan fashion to get things done, we can. We are called on today to do that again. This resolution will help us do it.

Mr. Speaker, let us roll up our sleeves and get to work to reorganize the Federal Government to best protect our country and our citizens.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 449, a resolution which calls for the establishment of a temporary Select Committee on Homeland Security. The committee will review the recommendations of standing House committees and create a comprehensive bill for House floor consideration.

The President's goal and the ranking member's goal, the minority leader's goal is to sign this bill into law on September 11, 2002.

This is a goal, Mr. Speaker, that I believe is attainable, but difficult to do. There are an estimated 33 subcommittees that can legitimately claim jurisdiction over the President's proposal to establish a Cabinet-level department. Under H. Res. 449, the select committee will be composed of only nine members. My concern is that a nine-member select committee is too small to incorporate the expertise that will be required to consolidate the recommendations of the standing committees.

These nine members will be required to have expertise in areas as far ranging and diverse as government reform, intelligence, transportation, agriculture, and chemical and biological warfare, just to name a few. This is an awesome task for nine mere mortals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President's initiative to create a new department which consolidates national security missions is long overdue. The concept is not a new one. Actually a plethora of legislation, including a proposal which I introduced, H.R. 3078, has been brought forward. My bill would have established the National Office for Combating Terrorism. It includes an initiative to develop policies and goals for the prevention of and response to terrorism and for the consolidation of local, State and Federal programs.

I am pleased to see that the administration is incorporating some of our ideas into a comprehensive plan to streamline the workings of the executive branch, and let us have on notice that it took the administration quite some time to come to this view.

I share the concerns of the President and the rest of the Nation. We need to consolidate our efforts to ensure that we are prepared for terrorist threats or attacks. However, we must balance this priority with caution and common sense. We must not lull our Nation into a false sense of security by implying that we have fixed a problem that indeed we have not.

The threat of another terrorist attack is foremost in our minds, and in our rush to protect ourselves, the President has requested that we complete this legislation as quickly as possible. Including weekends and holidays, September 11, 2002, is 82 days away. Even if we remained in session for our scheduled August recess, I believe that this time frame is hard to achieve. It will take nine members more than a few weeks to design a Department of Homeland Security capable of reducing America's vulnerability to terrorism and preventing future attacks against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have a word of caution for my esteemed colleagues: If we do not take the time to do it right, we will have to make the time to do it over.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Geor-

gia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this resolution today. I am one of those who has resisted and been opposed to the legislation that has been filed in this House to this point in time, attempting to create and legislate the Office of Homeland Security. The reason I have resisted is as a member of the intelligence community, and one who has worked closely with Governor Ridge and his staff, I felt like the Governor, who has done a superb job as the Director of Homeland Security, needed to have the flexibility given to him by the executive order coming out of the White House to walk through the minefields and find out where the potholes are in homeland security. And once he has done that, let us come back and craft legislation. As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) stated, we can then know we are doing it right.

Well, the time has now come to do that. I applaud our President for making a bold decision to create a new Cabinet-level position and to restructure government, to meet this long-term issue of homeland security, and in order to ensure that we win this war on terrorism, it is now necessary that this office be created.

This resolution is the first step towards doing it right. I applaud the leadership for their bold initiative to structure this committee the way it is. I think in order to get the job done, that is the way the committee should be structured. Every committee is going to have the ability to exercise their jurisdiction over their particular turf. Again, that is the way it should be done to do it right. This is the right way to do it. I support this legislation, and I urge its adoption today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) particularly for the gentleman's wisdom in the immediate hours after September 11, to help organize for the Democratic caucus the Homeland Security Task Force. Many Members gathered within 24 hours outside of the Capitol to be able to discuss the immediacy of responding to the crisis and the tragedy of September 11.

I would also like to add my appreciation for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) who served as the chair of that task force, as I served as the vice chair on one of the law enforcement subcommittees. This was an effort to recognize the importance of congressional oversight and involvement in addressing these questions. So

it is without a doubt that I support the Department of Homeland Security that has been offered by the President in his legislative initiative presented to this Congress just yesterday.

As I begin to review it, I believe it is a very effective first look at how that department will be created. But, Mr. Speaker, I am a believer in the tenets of the Founding Fathers and the basis of the People's House. The design of this House of Representatives is that to be reflective of the people of the United States of America. They want us to be responsible for the decisions made to govern this Nation. Our Constitution clearly designates three branches of government: Judiciary, executive and legislative.

I believe the House of Representatives has an imperative duty in accordance with the words of Madison and the rest of our Founding Fathers to do our job. That means that those who represent the people of the United States should be engaged in the oversight and the design of this department.

It is very clear that there are a number of committees who have jurisdiction, and I would offer to say in light of the backdrop of the tragedy, not one of us is claiming turf. There is no argument of turf. There is a question of jurisdiction and oversight.

My concern about this particular legislative direction is a select committee of nine individuals who will not have the encompassing experience to address the totality of the issue. I believe it is important for the committees of jurisdiction to be able to do their job, and let me give an example. The Committee on the Judiciary shortly after September 11 was called to the task to pass the Patriot Act. And although it may have changed on the floor of the House, we did it expeditiously and with consensus. Whether one agrees or disagrees with that legislative initiative, it is now in place.

□ 1430

We were then called to do the restructuring of the INS, now named the Barbara Jordan Immigration and Naturalization Reform Act. That was done expeditiously and voted on the floor of this House by a vote of 405-9. It disturbs me that we have legislation now that precludes the input, if you will, in a more effective manner from the members of the committees of jurisdiction. Not that there is not some value to the culling of the work to be done by the House in a select committee.

I worked for a select committee, the Select Committee on Assassinations that investigated the assassinations of President Kennedy and as well Martin Luther King. Select committees can be effective. Mickey Leland, my predecessor, encouraged the Select Committee on Hunger. But this is too important an issue to narrowly focus the decision-making around a body of just nine.

I would ask my colleagues to consider the expertise needed in this particular legislative initiative. I would

also welcome any further explanations as to how the committees of jurisdiction will provide their insight, their expertise. As I look at the creation of the department, at least as proposed by the President, the Department of Border Safety and Transportation, this begs the question of how you will organize the Border Patrol agents whom I just visited with in El Paso, Texas, around this particular concept. The expertise of the committees of jurisdiction are needed. We can do this together. We can do this timely. But do not shut us out. Do not shut the expertise of the Members of Congress out and realize that we do have the responsibility of oversight to make this a better piece of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very important proposal before us today, and it is in fact a bipartisan proposal; and I think it speaks well of this institution that we can work on a bipartisan basis on something this important. I also am pleased that the leadership on both sides has now agreed that once the select committee has acted that the matter then will be brought to the Rules Committee and that the Rules Committee will then handle this in the normal way, adopting a rule for consideration on the floor. I would hope that when we do that, that we would adopt an open rule so that the key issues can be joined on the floor.

This is a very important decision that we will be making. There are many people in the House who have some very good ideas. I hope they will be given the opportunity to offer those on the floor during consideration of this important piece of legislation.

I would point out to the House that in the late 1970s when the Department of Education was created, that was considered on this floor under an open rule procedure. Everyone had the opportunity to offer their ideas, votes were held and we ultimately adopted the legislation creating the new department. Certainly that is an appropriate model for the decisions that we will be making later this year. I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11 this Nation and the world faced one of the most extraordinary challenges in our Nation's history. It was a tragedy that caused tremendous loss of life and suffering all over the world. People from 80 nations were in the World Trade Center when we saw the attack that took place.

In the days and weeks and months that have followed September 11, it has been very gratifying to see a silver lining in that dark cloud of September 11. That silver lining has been the sense of solidarity among the American people, and that has been represented very well here in the United States Con-

gress, the greatest deliberative body known to man. We saw President Bush act swiftly following September 11 by asking our former colleague, Governor Tom Ridge, to lead the effort to deal with homeland security. We have now taken that next step to begin today to put into place an effort which will establish a Department of Homeland Security. As the President has said, it is not designed to expand the reaches of the Federal Government. Instead it is designed to take these multifarious agencies which fall under the rubric of a wide range of entities and bring them together, consolidate them, so that in fact there will be a level of accountability, accountability so that in fact our homeland security will be more effectively addressed.

In 1854, Henry David Thoreau said, "For a thousand hackings at the branches of evil, it is worth nothing to one strike at the root."

Mr. Speaker, we have seen our great President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, our national security adviser, the Secretary of State and others focus on that root of evil, the al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations around the world. What we are doing here with the Department of Homeland Security is we are focusing on these branches that still need to be addressed because we are working diligently to get at the root, but at the same time we still face a threat here in the United States. I believe that the vote which we are going to take momentarily will be the first step towards dealing with this very important issue of establishing a Federal Department of Homeland Security. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the leadership for working quickly to address the legislative requirements needed to begin the process to take up legislation regarding the creation of a new Department of Homeland Security. I praise the White House for its swift delivery of the proposed legislation and now it is the House of Representative's turn to move forward on this monumental proposal by drafting and overseeing the legislation that will make this all a reality.

I am pleased that the leadership has made the needed provisions to take up the President's proposal in a way that will lessen the prospect of jurisdictional gridlock and perhaps the untimely implementation of the new Department of Homeland Security. H. Res. 449 will allow for a temporary House Select Committee on Homeland Security to receive and review individual recommendations of current House standing committees to create a new Department of Homeland Security, and for consolidating these proposals into a comprehensive bill for House consideration.

This is a great first step, and I look forward to working with the leadership and the White House to move the legislation through Congress and to implement the President's historic proposal. However, we must unite to ultimately form a permanent standing committee in Congress with an adjoining appropriations subcommittee to oversee our domestic security. This is a permanent Department and we need a permanent committee to oversee it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Without objection, and pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 449, 107th Congress, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Committee on Homeland Security:

Mr. ARMEY, Chairman,  
Mr. DELAY,  
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma,  
Ms. PRYCE of Ohio,  
Mr. PORTMAN,  
Ms. PELOSI,  
Mr. FROST,  
Mr. MENENDEZ,  
Ms. DELAURO.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

#### PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO RISK OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-228)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive order 13159 of June 21, 2000.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 2002.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY REGARDING PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-229)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 2002.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO RISK OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-230)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation is to continue beyond June 21, 2002, to the Federal Register for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on June 14, 2001, (66 FR 32207).

It remains a major national security goal of the United States to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The accumulation of a large volume of

weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation and maintain in force these emergency authorities to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 2002.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in light of yet another suicide bombing in Israel yesterday, I think it is incumbent that all of us reflect on the targeting of innocent civilians in a reign of terror carried out by the Palestinian Authority and other organizations under its control. We can no longer, if we ever could, stand idly by and allow these suicide bombings targeting innocent civilians to take place time and time and time again, and every time say that Mr. Arafat has to do more to prevent terrorism, Mr. Arafat has to show that he can step up to the plate and combat terrorism.

At what point do we simply say enough is enough and move beyond Mr. Arafat? I think that point has come and gone a long time ago.

□ 1445

President Bush is supposedly going to make a statement within the next few days talking about a so-called "provisional" Palestinian state. I would say to the President and to my colleagues and to everyone concerned that there ought to be no declaration of any kind of Palestinian state, provisional or otherwise, as long as Palestinians continue their reign of terror against innocent civilians. In a civilized world, supposedly, there should be no talk of rewarding terror with a state, provisional or otherwise.

When President Bush several months ago said to the world, you are either

with us or you are with the terrorists, that was very clear. Black and white, no shades of gray. And, if it applies to us, it should apply to Israel and every other nation on this Earth.

If we are justified, and we are, going halfway around the world to destroy the Taliban in Afghanistan because of terrorist attacks upon our Nation, and let me say as a New Yorker and as someone who works in Washington, no one feels the pain of those attacks more than I do, if we are going halfway around the world to root out terrorism in Afghanistan, then Israel should be allowed to do the same thing in her own backyard.

Mr. Arafat has shown that he is a terrorist, that he has never grown out of being a terrorist, that he always has been a terrorist, and he will continue to be a terrorist. Therefore, I think that this country should not talk with him, should not recognize him, should not discuss anything with him; and we ought to tell the Palestinians, come back and talk to us when you get some responsible leadership. Come back and talk to us when there are reforms in your leadership. Come back and talk to us when you have a leadership that does not use terror against innocent civilians as a negotiating tool.

This is something that cannot be tolerated. I do not want to hear about grievances on both sides or perceived hurts. It is never an excuse for terrorism against innocent civilians.

As to this notion put forward in some of the Palestinians corridors that if only Israel would withdraw, everything would be wonderful, there would not be a problem, and peace would reign supreme, the fact of the matter is that 21 months ago Israel agreed to withdraw. There was a plan that was being negotiated which would have given the Palestinians a state of their own, on 100 percent of Gaza and 97 percent of the West Bank, with billions of dollars of aid, a state of their own, the end of the occupation. Israel said yes, the United States said yes, the Palestinians said no. Yasser Arafat rejected it and walked away, did not come forth with a counterproposal, did not stay and negotiate a proposal that might be better for him. He said no, and unleashed the intifada, unleashed terrorism and unleashed violence. That ought not to be rewarded.

I would hope that we would make it very clear again that the time has come to say good-bye to Mr. Arafat. It is not a matter of whether he can control the terrorism, whether he wants to do so. He is the terrorist. Three-quarters of the terrorist attacks against Israel during the past 21 months have come from organizations that he controls. The al-Aksa Brigade, the al-Aksa so-called Martyr's Brigades, which our State Department has declared as a terrorist organization, is under Mr. Arafat's control. They have taken credit for the bombings. Tanzeen, 4/17, the Fata Umbrella Group. They have been responsible for three-quarters of the bombings.

So it is time for us to say good-bye to Mr. Arafat. It is time to tell the Palestinians, no state, unless you have responsibility, unless you show responsible leadership; and it is time for the United States to continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Israel in fighting the terrorism around the world.

#### HOLDING CORPORATE AMERICA ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I read the following quote from Matthew Ruane, director of listed trading at Gerard Klauer Mattison and Company: "There's a lack of liquidity, a lack of reason to buy, terrorism fears and earnings issues out there, especially in the drug sector."

The statement was in response to a question regarding the continued decline of the major stock indexes in America. I have no quarrel with the facts included in this statement. It is the omission that troubles me. In the mind of many Americans, this American included, there is an integrity crisis on Wall Street and in corporate America.

I am a businessman of 34 years, former director of two banks, an investor in the stock market and a strong believer in the power of the free enterprise system. Yet with that power comes responsibility. In the past year, the American investor has seen a host of disturbing news stories centered on the issue of corporate integrity and few, if any, have been encouraging.

I have great confidence and respect for American businesses and the men and women who run them. But the silence of these good men and women is becoming deafening. Enron, Arthur Andersen, Wall Street brokerage houses, executive compensation, document shredding, insider trading and other stories confront the average American every day, with little or no response from corporate America, other than an explanation.

Corporate America is not a fraternity, nor should it be. Neither should Wall Street brokerage houses be a fraternity. I acknowledge they have common interests, but those interests are secondary to the interest of the American economy, the American investor and their individual stockholder.

What is my point? Simply put, corporate America and Wall Street face a crisis that will not pass on its own; and just as the shareholders of Enron were the big losers in their crisis, many Americans now fear that they, not the corporate boardroom, will be the big losers.

It is time for corporate executives to speak out. Wall Street needs to look in the mirror and ask itself serious questions, the answer to which is not "this too shall pass."

Unlike 20 years ago, more and more Americans depend on their 401(k) and investments for their retirement; and, because of that, more Americans than ever are in the stock market. Wall Street has become an insider's game played with outsider's money. The strength of the market has become more dependent on individual confidence of average Americans, but that confidence is eroding.

Endless reports of questionable practices and alleged crimes have only served to accelerate investor concerns that began with the market's decline in the first quarter of 2000. It is my judgment there is too little accountability on Wall Street. Some will tell you that corporations and their leaders are accountable because they lose equity and lose value when their stock declines. While true to an extent, individual investors lose too, and collectively far more than corporate executives.

If corporate America wants to improve the environment on Wall Street, then it is time for corporate executives and corporate directors to hold themselves more accountable and demonstrate to the market a zero tolerance for questionable practices and poor judgment. Every investor understands, or should understand, that investing in the market involves risk; but that risk should not be compounded by moral and ethical failure in the corporate office, executive office, or the corporate boardroom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SAVE THE CAPITOL'S OLDEST TREE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a minute or two about an issue that may not be the most pressing issue before the Nation today, but it is one that is, nonetheless, important for the historical nature of the U.S. Capitol and its grounds.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and I have been made aware recently that the oldest tree on the Capitol grounds may be cut down on the recommendation of the Architect of the Capitol and his arborist advisers.

Frankly, despite earlier assurances to Congress that many trees planted by Frederick Law Olmsted, one of the Capitol's earliest landscape architects, would be saved, far too many trees have been sacrificed for this new visitor's center.

The oldest tree, which, by the way, is right outside the door here, if you go outside the door and look at about 1 o'clock you will see it there, it was planted by Frederick Law Olmsted, as I said. He was the Capitol's earliest Architect. We were told it would be saved.

Now, this tree is a rare English Elm, reputed to be over 175 years old, and it was never slated in the original plans to be removed. In fact, earlier assessment by a notable national tree company employed by the Architect of the Capitol said that it should be preserved.

Reports now that the tree is "dangerous" seem to have little factual foundation, other than a more recent report by the same arborist. Furthermore, other old trees on the Capitol grounds are no more or less dangerous than this elm tree.

I would point out that recently these fences have been built around these trees, and it is impossible for the tree really to be dangerous, unless some kind of typhoon moved through.

Far more alarming to the tree's health is the news that the visitor's center contractor wants to dig a 60 foot hole at the base of the elm along the drip line, to dig a hole for whatever purpose, for a possible staging area for construction, or as part of the new paved area for temporary parking for Members of Congress.

I think this is totally indefensible, the idea we would cut down one of the oldest trees on the Capitol grounds so that Members of Congress can have a temporary parking place while they are building the visitor's center.

I hope my colleagues will join the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and me in urging that this tree be saved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and other Members of the House for their support of protecting this very famous English Elm.

Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives works to protect the U.S. Capitol building and all symbols of our democracy, we need to be mindful that such changes must be reasonable and respectful of our history. Our Capitol continues, as it always has been, to be accessible to millions of people who visit each year.

It is estimated that nearly 20,000 visitors up to September 11 entered the building daily, and Congress has addressed the new security and safety demands of this many people visiting, especially during the construction of a new Capitol visitor's center to facilitate their entrance into the Capitol proper.

This center project has already resulted in changes to what Frederick Law Olmsted, the Landscape Architect of the Capitol, a very famous American, envisioned and implemented back

in 1874, where lawns, trees, and shaded walks were first put into his plans. Many trees have already been removed. Some have been saved for the new center.

But I join with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and other colleagues to focus our attention in Congress on one particular tree, an English Elm, the oldest tree on Capitol Hill, on this campus, that some here, as the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) has said, would like to cut down to make room for a construction site, for use of the construction materials, or a temporary parking lot for Members of Congress.

This oldest tree, a rare English Elm, is reputed to be over 150 years old. It was never slated to be removed. In fact, an earlier assessment by the Davey Tree Company employed by the Architect of the Capitol said it should be preserved. Reports now that the tree is dangerous seem to have little factual foundation, other than a more recent report by Davey. Furthermore, there are other old trees on the Capitol campus that are no more or less dangerous than this elm.

As the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) has said, there is news that the contractor for the visitor's center would dig a 60-foot hole at the base of the tree. This would virtually kill the tree.

This is a tree that deserves to be preserved and protected. We urge all Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats and citizens, to urge the Capitol Preservation Committee to direct the Architect of the Capitol to save the tree.

---

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

---

#### SALUTING THE NBA CHAMPION LOS ANGELES LAKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the victorious world champion Los Angeles Lakers from my congressional district. It is challenging enough to win the championship title once, and it is extremely rare to repeat and win the title a second time. Nevertheless, the world champion Lakers have in fact three-peated by sweeping our friends, the New Jersey Nets, in the

2002 NBA finals and winning the title for 3 consecutive years.

In all of NBA history, only three teams have achieved this feat, including, of course, the Minneapolis Lakers. I extend my special congratulations to Lakers Coach Phil Jackson and the most valuable player for the third year in a row, Shaquille O'Neill, for their impressive accomplishment.

□ 1500

No one alone can achieve this "triple crown" of excellence in basketball. The Los Angeles Lakers' victory was a triple team effort consisting first of the talented players themselves; second, the coach and management staff; and third, the Lakers' fans in Los Angeles and across the Nation.

Today the Lakers' sweet taste of victory brings with it the sweet taste of New Jersey Italian treats: cannoli and biscotti. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), wagered these treats against my Los Angeles wager of tamales, guacamole and salsa. Today he delivered the fruits of the Lakers' victory. I congratulate the Nets, their fans, and their coach, Byron Scott, who, by the way, is a Los Angeles native and former Laker himself, for their valiant effort.

Angelenos, it is time to make room in the rafters of the Los Angeles Staples Center for yet another banner. The Lakers are NBA world champions again.

Mr. Speaker, next year I look forward to cheering for the Lakers to "four-peat" or, in the words of Coach Jackson, the "four-sweep."

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

---

#### PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES HONORED GUESTS AT GOP FUND-RAISING EVENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, those who are watching might be puzzled, because it does not seem there are too many Members on the floor of the House, and that is because the House has completed its work day. It is about 3 o'clock. Now, why is the House out of session at 3 o'clock when it has yet to do a single appropriations bill, when many other important measures and needs of the American people have yet to be met?

Well, it could be because tonight is the biggest fundraising gala, perhaps the largest single fundraising event in the history of the United States. Downtown, the Republican Party is holding a special fundraising event, and the chair, the fundraising chair of that event is a guy named Robert Ingram.

Why is that relevant? Well, he happens to be the chief operating officer of GlaxoSmithKline, which happens to be the largest drug manufacturing pharmaceutical firm in the world.

Now, why would he give \$250,000 and agree to raise millions of other dollars from other pharmaceutical companies who are also contributing: Pfizer, Eli Lilly, Bayer AG, Merck & Company, they are cheapskates, they are only ponying up 50,000 bucks each for a table, but then PhRMA, their organization, is ponying up \$250,000.

Now, you have to give it to the Republicans. I mean they, the Republican leadership, either has the most incredible sense of irony and humor, or no shame. Here we are at a time when we are supposedly about to consider legislation to provide or not provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit to seniors in the United States of America, 54 percent of whom pay more than \$1,000 a year out of pocket for their drugs; who are charged the highest prices of any customers of the pharmaceutical companies; the uninsured seniors are charged the highest price, prices that exceed those of Canada by 100 percent and other developed nations. Of course, many of those drugs were manufactured in the United States by these very same firms who are throwing this big gala tonight and contributing millions to the Republican Party.

So we have to wonder if there is any connection between the draft of the Republican proposal and the timing of it, because they are considering it right now, and tonight's event.

The Republican proposal is a free market approach. Of course, we have had the free market; it has not been serving our seniors very well, and prescription drug costs have been going up at 2½ times the rate of inflation. Many seniors have to make critical decisions about getting their prescriptions filled. I have actually met seniors, couples who had to decide who was going to get their prescription one month and who was not, even though they are all necessary and prescribed. These are real problems.

The Republicans have decided they cannot ignore this issue anymore, so

they have gone to their sponsors, the pharmaceutical companies, the insurance companies, who say, look, how about we phony up a bill that continues the status quo and we pretend it is a new benefit for seniors, and the pharmaceutical companies love it. That is why they are giving a quarter of a million bucks from this one company and millions in addition to that at tonight's gala.

There is no guaranteed benefit under the Republican plan. Mr. Speaker, \$20 billion over 10 years would go to the pharmaceutical companies as an inducement for them to offer free market, private policies. God forbid we should extend Medicare. They do not want to do that. No, they are very worried about that, because they know if we extend a Medicare benefit to the seniors, then we might begin to question the absolutely obscene prices they are charging for some of their drugs and we might even take steps to rein in those costs like Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Mexico. In fact, every other industrialized country on Earth has taken steps to rein in their obscene pharmaceutical charges. No, but not the United States. We are going to take a free market approach. First give them the \$20 billion as an incentive to maybe offer a program and under this "maybe" program, this is what the Republicans estimate they would provide, a benefit that would total, of the first \$1,000 of drug expenses, which is half the seniors in America spend \$1,000, they would get a \$182 benefit after their premium, their deductibles, and their out-of-pocket costs.

Wow. Wow, \$182. Now, that is really going to help out the seniors who are having trouble today meeting these costs. Of course, remember, this is only recommended. It is not required. God forbid we should put a mandate on the insurance companies. No, no, no, no, no requirement. This is just a suggestion, a suggestion, as opposed to a real Medicare benefit that the Democrats are providing as an alternative. The emperor has no clothes here. Have a good fundraising dinner tonight, guys, but I think in the end the champagne you are toasting tonight might taste like vinegar.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### JUNETEENTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be with you here tonight as we gather here in remembrance of a day that has become a symbol of African-American freedom and culture. On June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Maj. Gen. Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, Texas with news that the war had ended and that the enslaved black Americans were now free. Granger's message came two and a half years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

Upon his arrival, Granger's first orders of business was to read to the people of Texas, General Order Number 3 which began most significantly with:

The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection heretofore existing between them becomes that between employer and free laborer.

On the evening of June 19, 1865, thousands of African-Americans filled the streets of Galveston, celebrating their newly announced freedom. Throughout the night, the sweet smell of barbecue, combined with the sounds of dancing feet, and harmonic spirituals, permeated the air. For the slaves freed in Galveston and across America, June 19th, would and does forever commemorate African-American freedom.

Juneteenth became an official State holiday through the efforts of Al Edwards, an African-American Texas legislator, making Juneteenth the first emancipation celebration granted official state recognition. Juneteenth celebrates African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures.

Across the nation and even the world, thousands will participate in activities and events in remembrance of Union soldiers' arrival in Texas. Let us reflect and rejoice on this monumental event in history. Let us come together and join hands across races, nationalities and religions to acknowledge a part of American history that has, does, and will continue to shape our society as we know it today.

African-Americans' history is America's history and the events of 1865 will not be forgotten as the celebration of Juneteenth takes on a more national and even global perspective. For that reason, I am supporting the establishment of a commission to commemorate those enslaved Americans that fought so vigilantly for their freedom. I am also proud to be an original sponsor of a bill that would support the erection of monument honoring African-American slaves.

A day such as Juneteenth enhances the importance of the War on Terrorism and the importance of fighting the evils that threaten human rights and freedoms across the globe. Just as the slaves in Galveston and President Lincoln recognized the value of freedom in 1865, so too, should we realize the importance of remembering that day and taking its lessons with us as we confront the current political climate.

I urge you all here, if you haven't already, please take a moment to reflect on the meaning of this day. Reflect on its meaning for Afri-

can-Americans, and its meaning for oppressed persons around the globe. Take the opportunity to participate in the various activities and events organized in celebration of Juneteenth, and I urge you to never forget what the day June 19 means to American history.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### CELEBRATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am here on the floor today to mark the 30th anniversary of title IX, which was a part of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 signed into law on June 23, 1972, 30 years ago. The few pages of title IX set a policy for the United States in all areas of education: elementary, secondary, higher education, graduate education; a policy that set forth explicitly that no institution should discriminate against girls or women in the courses and programs that they offered at these institutions, if that institution received Federal funds. That was 1972.

Remarkably, in a very short period of time, the institutions across America paid attention to these few words in title IX and we began to see some very remarkable changes in our schools, in the programs that were being offered, the number of women that were enrolled in programs that prior to that, one could rarely ever see women students, especially in graduate programs. And they won fellowships and they had opportunities made available to them that were unheard of before 1972.

A number of Members of the House had indicated to me that they were going to join in this recognition of title IX and the celebration of the 30th anniversary. But because we were called earlier and the program of the House ended at an early hour, many of these Members probably are not here to be a part of it, but I know that they will be including their remarks as part of this celebration today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues to commemorate title IX's 30th anniversary. First I commend my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), as well as former Oregon Congresswoman Edith Green for their invaluable contributions and commitment to improving the lives of women in this country. These two incredible women were the guiding spirit behind title IX, the landmark legislation that bans schools from discriminating on the basis of sex in academics and athletics.

Title IX was necessitated by the fact that many of our schools were denying young women the opportunity to develop to their full potential by putting strict limits on their enrollment or by refusing to admit them at all. While the law applies to all education programs and schools receiving Federal aid, it is best known for expanding athletic opportunities for women.

Since title IX's passage in 1971, girls' participation in high school athletics has increased an astonishing 847 percent. As a result, today, one in three girls play varsity sports, compared to only one in 27 in 1972.

The impact on collegiate athletics level has also been incredible. For instance, when title IX was first passed, there were 31,000 women participating in intercollegiate athletics. Today, over 150,000 women compete in college-level sports, an increase of over 400 percent.

Athletic activity has been a key component in helping young girls to develop important skills such as competitiveness, teamwork, and perseverance, qualities that are so critical to succeeding in today's society. As a result, since the passage of title IX, we have seen significant increases in women's educational achievements as well.

For example, in the year 2000, 43 percent of medical degrees were awarded to women, compared to 9 percent in 1972; 46 percent of law degrees were earned by women, compared to 7 percent in 1972; and 44 percent of all doctoral degrees went to American women, up from 25 percent in 1977.

Furthermore, title IX has proven that athletics is also a catalyst for success in the workplace. A recent study entitled "From the Locker Room to the Board Room: A Survey on Sports and in the Lives of Women Business Executives," surveyed America's top business executives and found that more than four out of five executive business women played sports growing up.

Further, the vast majority of these women reported that lessons learned on the playing field have contributed to their success in business.

For instance, of the women who played organized sports after grade school, 86 percent said sports helped them to be more disciplined, 81 percent said sports helped them to function better as part of a team, and 59 percent said sports gave them a competitive edge over others.

Clearly, title IX's influence on the lives of girls and women extends far beyond the playing field. It has provided them with the opportunity to gain so many of the skills that are essential to succeeding in life.

Therefore, on the 30th anniversary of title IX, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the critical role title IX has played in securing women's equality in sports, in academics, in the workplace, and in life.

□ 1515

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. I lived with title IX every day of my life since 1972; and to understand that it has been 30 years, it is pretty hard to fathom, but I deeply appreciate my colleagues coming to the floor and sharing their own observations about title IX and helping to be a part of this recognition today.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues who will come and go to talk about title IX today, but I am particularly honored to join with the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the author of title IX, on the 30th anniversary of this great program that would not have happened without her. I thank my friend from Hawaii also for organizing this trip tonight.

When most people think of title IX, they think of women's sports; and the impact of title IX on women's sports can clearly be seen all over the Nation. Title IX has increased numbers of girls and women who participate in sports in high school and in college. Title IX has contributed to the impressive achievements of American female athletes at the Olympic Games, and we can see the impact of title IX when we watch professional women's basketball and soccer teams on television and on the field.

Title IX is an important player on every woman's sports team, but title IX has another important role to play and that is in the classroom, particularly in vocational and technical education classes. Last week The Washington Post and other newspapers reported on a survey that the National Women's Law Center did on vocational and technical education programs in America. The results of the survey reveal that pervasive sex segregation in vocational and technical education programs all around the country still exist. That is bad news. The survey found that girls are still clustered in classes which lead to traditionally female jobs such as cosmetology, child care, health or fashion technology. On the other hand, classes in carpentry, electronics, and automotive programs were 85 percent male.

There is a reason why the results of this survey made the newspaper. It is newsworthy because women make up close to half of the American workforce and many of these working women are

supporting families and many of these working women are single moms supporting families. Sixty-six percent of mothers with children under age 6 are working outside the home. Seventy-seven percent of mothers of school-age children have jobs. Most families today, whether they have two parents or a single parent, rely on a woman's income; but that income will be considerably less if the woman is earning a median hourly wage of \$8.49 an hour as opposed to working as a plumber who can earn an hourly wage of \$30.06.

While the survey reported in the newspapers collected its data from high schools, the problem does not stop in high school. A report from the National Center for Education Statistics in the Department of Education entitled "Vocational Education in the United States Toward the Year 2000" shows that in associate degree programs at the postsecondary level, women are almost four times as likely as men to major in health fields and office fields. In contrast, the male students in postsecondary vocational education programs are five times more likely than women to major in technical education and 14 times more likely, 14 times more likely to major in trade and industry programs.

Thank goodness we have title IX to address the inequities like this. The National Women's Law Center has filed legal petitions in all 12 regions of the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights, requesting investigations into whether vocational and technical high schools and classes violate title IX. They are also asking that action be taken to remedy all conduct that does not comply with title IX law.

As we move into the 21st century with employers demanding more high-skilled and better-educated workers and more families relying on a woman's income, it is a moral crime to ignore the evidence of stark and ongoing sex segregation in vocational and technical education programs. Title IX makes it a legal crime, and gives us the tools we need to right this wrong.

Happy anniversary, title IX. Much has been accomplished in 30 years, and much is left undone.

I look forward to working with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) in making some of these things right.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contributions. Certainly the challenges she has laid before the House and before this Nation need to be heeded.

I am delighted now to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Davis), who is also on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Friday morning, many Americans will be getting up early to root for the U.S. Men's Soccer Team, which quite unexpectedly has reached the final eight in the World Cup soccer competition. This is the best men's effort in more than 70 years.

But who can forget the thrilling matches and win of the U.S. Women's Soccer Team in the 2000 World Cup? We all have visions of the celebratory leaps of joy and the news magazine cover pictures that followed. While the women's success preceded the men's current victories, who can question that this prominence would never have happened in a women's sport had it not been for the passage of title IX, the tradition-breaking measure that said women deserve an equal opportunity to excel according to their talents, not their opportunity?

I am honored to speak in celebration of this 30th anniversary of title IX to the education amendments of 1972 at this podium following the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), who has been a champion of the implementation of title IX for many years, monitoring, nurturing, and nudging its realization.

Sports have grabbed the headlines as the comparison of women's opportunity with men's. Indeed, for women who graduated from college before 1972, we know full well how little girls were encouraged to succeed at male endeavors, not only in sports but in math and science, politics and economics, medicine and the law.

We can see the impact, not only of increased opportunity because of this legislation, but also of the example of those pioneering women in space, in the Supreme Court, increasingly as CEOs of major companies, and yes, as Members of Congress who serve as role models for the expectations of young women today.

But we cannot be proud. Career education received a grade of D on the report card on gender equity reported by the National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education. We must multiply our efforts to assure that girls have the same educational opportunities, and thus career opportunities, as boys.

As Members of Congress, we must reach out to young women's groups, and to those women who have tested the campaign waters to run for school boards, for city councils and county boards of supervisors; and we must mentor and encourage them to aspire to all seats in government.

In the California Assembly, I experienced the great difference it made to agendas, to leadership positions, and the style of politics when women became 25 percent of our body. I can only imagine what it would feel like here in the House of Representatives if there were 109 women out of 435, instead of 59. How important it would be to the national agenda if the Senate had moved not from nine and counting to 13 in the last election, but to 25. What if women were represented by their proportion of the population? What if there were more women Governors, and yes, candidates for President and Vice President?

Title IX has changed our culture in many ways in these 30 years. The women of America must move forward

together to assure even greater results in the next 30.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for coming to the floor and sharing with us all of her challenges and contributions.

Mr. Speaker, next I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who has joined us here today to participate in this 30th anniversary celebration of title IX.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for yielding to me, but also for bringing to light and sharing with all of America the importance of this 30th year anniversary.

I happen to be one who believes that there ought to be absolute equality in all endeavors in all walks of life. I am amazed, as a matter of fact, sometimes when I recall even the Preamble to our Constitution, when we say, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," and at the same time, we left out women. Some people would suggest that when they said "men" they meant women as well, but I am not always sure of that.

As a matter of fact, we can look at what the experiences have been, that even today women, for the same work, with the same training, earn less than 75 percent of what men earn for doing the same work with the same training, the same experiences.

America is a great Nation. We have made lots of progress and we have come a long way, but we still have much further to go. I do not think we will ever get where we need to be unless we reinforce all of those processes that we have used to get us where we are.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and congratulate and all of my colleagues who take the floor and talk about this achievement, and also let us know that we have to keep going, because if we do not, we can always slip back.

So I commend the gentlewoman and join with her and all of my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the enactment of title IX. Of course, we have to keep it alive; we have to make sure that it is well; and we have to keep working so that there is in fact equality across the board without regard to race, gender, ethnicity, or any other form of origin.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking the time to come and be part of this recognition. It is so important to recognize that in the 30 years much has been accomplished, but we still need to do much, much more in order to achieve that equality for girls and women in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased now to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is here to join us in this hour of recognition for title IX.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), in order to celebrate the 30-year anniversary of title IX. I would like to take this moment to thank her for her leadership, for what she has done for girls and women in this country.

This month, we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the passage of title IX of the education amendments of 1972. The achievements we have made since then are impressive and worth celebrating. The percentage of bachelor's degrees awarded to women has increased from 44 percent in 1971-1972 to 56 percent in 1997 and 1998. The percentage of doctorates awarded to women has increased by nearly 30 percent, from 16 percent in 1971-1972 to 42 percent in 1997-1998.

Women and girls have made strides in athletics, also. In 1971, girls comprised a mere 7 percent of high school varsity athletes. Last year, the figure had increased by 847 percent, to 41.5 percent of all athletes.

At the college level, the change is also very dramatic. There was a 403 percent increase between 1971 and 2001 in the participation of women in intercollegiate sports, from 2 percent in 1971 to 43 percent just last year.

□ 1530

Meanwhile, men's participation levels at both the high school and the college level have also increased, contrary to reports that imply the gains for women have come at the cost of losses for men.

Improvements have also been made within the government. Until recently, only four Federal agencies had complied with the requirement that they issue rules regarding title IX. However, in August 2000 the Department of Justice issued final regulations for 20 Federal agencies. These new regulations provide Federal executive branch agencies with the means to enforce title IX's prohibition against sex discrimination.

Unfortunately, not enough has changed. There are continued efforts to diminish the gains women and girls have made under title IX. For example, critics of title IX argue that colleges and universities have been forced to eliminate men's teams in order to fund women's teams. This ignores the fact that women's teams have been cut, too, as needed by school budgets, et cetera.

The argument also dismisses the fact that in 1999, for example, men's sports and intercollegiate athletics received greater funding across the board. Disparities existed for scholarships, recruiting, head coach salaries and operating expenses. In some categories, the funding for men was twice that of women.

Other efforts to dismantle title IX include funding cuts and a rise in lawsuits, seeking to roll back title IX protections. Recently, the National Wrestling Coaches Association and other groups filed suit to challenge the United States Department of Education's interpretations of title IX.

While I applaud President Bush's call to seek dismissal of this suit, I am dismayed that the President has not been supportive of title IX in other ways.

For example, President Bush's 2003 budget allocates no funding to the Women's Educational Equity Act, which is the only Federal program specifically focused on increasing educational opportunities for females. In addition, the Republican presidential agenda for the 2000 election included attacks on title IX and gender equity, and while women and girls have gained a great deal since 1972, there are still gaps in every area.

Wage parity has not been achieved. The average salary for women professors in 1971 was \$11,649, only 91 percent of women's average of earnings at that time of \$12,768. Thirty years later, the average salary for women full professors had fallen to a mere 88 percent of men's earnings. Women associates and assistant professors earned only 92 percent of what their male counterparts earned. These salary gaps exist for teachers and principals in elementary and secondary education as well.

Women continue to lag in educational degrees received. We are underrepresented in traditionally male fields such as math and science, ones that have greater earning potential. For example, women earn only 39 percent of physical science degrees, 27 percent of computers and information sciences degrees and 18 percent of engineering degrees. This disparity is even greater in doctoral degree programs. There, women received only 26 percent of doctorate degrees in mathematics, 16 percent in computers and information sciences, and 12 percent in engineering-related technologies. Not only does this negatively affect the women themselves, but also it creates a void for young girls who need role models in these fields.

Females are also underrepresented in athletics. We are drastically underrepresented in coaching positions and as athletic directors. Even head coaches of women's teams are filled by males more often than by females, in Division I, II and III schools. Girls still have 30 percent fewer opportunities to participate in high school and college sports than boys. When viewed in light of all of the positive attributes of physical activity, including psychological, sociological and physical benefits, this lack of opportunity is troubling.

As we stand here today, we can be pleased and proud of the progress that has been made in attaining gender equity in education, employment and athletics, but we must not forget that the journey certainly continues and that we must persevere in seeking equal opportunities for all women and girls.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that it is often said that one person cannot really make a difference, that unless we have millions upon millions of people moving perhaps at the same time, nothing is

going to change, but I am standing here looking at one woman, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK). Long before I came to the Congress of the United States, I was working with the gentlewoman, and I know about her efforts at that time, and if it had not been for the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), we would not have the progress that we have today with title IX.

So in addition to celebrating this anniversary, I stand here to commend my colleague and my friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), for being the leader in this area.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much. I really appreciate her tribute and kind words, recalling our work together and the tremendous difference that an individual and a commitment to a cause can make and change the whole of society.

I heard a commentator the other day on a talk show say that next to the civil rights, title IX has probably made the most difference in this country in opening up opportunities, and I certainly have to agree that a small effort, a deep commitment, and the consensus of this House in going along and enacting this title IX has made it a tremendous difference for the girls and women in our society.

It gives me great pleasure to yield time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), chair of the Women's Caucus on the Democratic side. We call her our chair, but she is the cochair for the entire House Women's Caucus.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much, and I join the voices here today in thanking a woman of great leadership, great tenacity and great stride in furthering the cause of our girls, our daughters, and our granddaughters, and our nieces to seek opportunities no matter where they want to seek those.

As a former director of gender equity, I never thought that I would be on the floor of Congress talking about the need to further opportunities for girls. I thought in this year of 2002 this would all be behind us. Thanks to our dear friend and congresswoman, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), she keeps this front and center.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to applaud her and the success of title IX in opening doors of opportunities for women and girls of all ethnic groups in this country over the past 30 years. However, there, despite the gains made by title IX, we still need to ensure that the promises of equal access to education and advancement in the workplace remain a reality for all women, particularly women of color.

I have researched this issue more carefully, and as I have researched this issue more carefully and more thoroughly, I am concerned that since 1996 Congress has eliminated funding under title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for programs that once supported title

IX and gender equity services in 49 States and their educational agencies.

About half of the States lack a dedicated employee to monitor compliance with title IX, as required, and the 10 federally funded Equity Assistance Centers have not received a funding increase in 5 years.

The Women's Educational Equity Act, the Federal Government's only program focused on creating education opportunities for girls and women, was overlooked in this President's fiscal year 2003 budget. If we are going to speak loudly and speak with a volume about our girls and giving them the opportunity, we certainly cannot overlook them in the President's budget that has been to date.

In 2001, the Supreme Court ruled that individuals cannot file lawsuits under title IX alleging retaliation.

There is clearly still a need to better educate the public about title IX and to chip away at the discrimination that impacts girls and women in education and in the workplace. We must remove any and all barriers that prevent women and girls from living up to their full potential.

The truth is, girls and women are woefully underrepresented in the critical areas of technology, and the digital divide is a glaring example of this underrepresentation.

There are glaring places in standardized testing across all races and ethnicities, therefore limiting women's access to higher education institutions, financial aid and career opportunities.

Women's employment opportunities at colleges and universities declined as the prestige of the institution increased and increases.

Women earn fewer doctoral and professional degrees than men do.

Sexual harassment is an ongoing deterrent to equal opportunity for women students, and gender bias is pervasive on many campuses. Ask our daughters, ask our sisters, ask our nieces. They are still plagued with this type of discrimination.

Female students of color, those who are disabled, and girls from poor families are all faced with special challenges that have not yet been fully addressed. We must do more to enable our girls to grow up to become more empowered women.

We know that women comprise almost 60 percent of part-time students and 58 percent of students ages 24 and older.

Women attending a post-secondary institution are twice as likely as their male counterpart to have dependents and three times as likely to be single parents.

Financial aid budgets offer little allowance for dependent care, making many student parents reliant on friends and family and causing them to drop courses or to leave school altogether.

From 1999 to the year 2000, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, NCAA, found that women athletes get

only 40 percent of scholarship funds in some athletic divisions, though this figure is an increase over the past 9 years. We are addressing that issue right now.

Another area of education where women are lagging behind men is in the education profession. When we look at elementary and secondary schools, fewer than 35 percent of principals are women, and only 21 percent of full professors are women, and a mere 19 percent of women head up our colleges and universities. Do they not recognize that there are more women in this world than men? Do they not recognize that women are making up the majority of votes in every congressional district in this country? Women must be represented more fully. The numbers are no better at elite institutions where women make up only 22.6 percent of all the faculty. This is another issue we are addressing.

We have got to do more to encourage our girls to consider well-paying careers in nontraditional fields that will broaden their career options and earning potentiality. Too many of our girls choose fields like cosmetology where the average hourly wage is \$8.49, and it is amazing to me. There is nothing wrong with that, but when men get into cosmetology, they rise to the really great presence. They then do the big stars' hair and all the others, and they become an institution in and of themselves, while the women are still in these low wage jobs.

Look at child care, where pay is about \$7.43 an hour, as opposed to becoming plumbers, electricians or mechanical drafters who earn about \$20 per hour.

If we want our girls to flourish and grow into self-sufficient women, then we must knock down the barriers to their success in the classroom, whether they choose to work in technology, the trades, or pursue professional endeavors.

My granddaughters Ayanna, Ramia and Blair want to play football, and I have encouraged them to go for it, and I have even said if they wanted to be the quarterback. We have got to encourage our girls to find those non-traditional careers where they are making much better earnings than that of the old traditional careers that women have fallen into. We must do that as women become a larger segment of this population of this country.

□ 1545

So on this, the 30th anniversary of title IX, we salute our dear friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK). We tell her that we celebrate with her on this endeavor, 30 years of advancing women and girls; that we should celebrate how far we have come and how far we have to go, but we must also be mindful of the distance we still need to travel to ensure optimal educational and vocational opportunities for all of our young women

and girls. We can do better than this. We must do better than this. We, as the women of the House, will do better than this.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contributions to this celebration, and I appreciate all of her comments. We do have challenges ahead, and I hope the House will rise to the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gracious gentlewoman from Hawaii for this opportunity to join with her today as we are commemorating the 30th anniversary of the passage of title IX of the education amendments of 1972.

This title has been instrumental in prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs and sports activities that receive Federal funding. This law applies to admissions, recruitment, financial aid, academic programs, grading, vocational education, recreation, physical education, employment, athletics, and much more. This title continues to present many opportunities for girls to acquire new skills, friendships and make their dreams a reality.

Before title IX, many schools saw no problem in maintaining strict limits on the admission of women or simply refusing to admit them at all. Since the passage of title IX, this has changed dramatically. In 1994, women received 38 percent of medical degrees, 43 percent of law degrees, and 44 percent of all doctoral degrees. In 1972, women received only 9 percent of medical degrees, only 7 percent of law degrees, and a mere 25 percent of doctoral degrees.

Title IX has provided unprecedented opportunities for young women interested in pursuing a competitive athletic career. The U.S. Women's Soccer team won the World Cup victory in 1991 against Norway and again in 1999 against China, and this was possible because title IX funds were available to the young women earlier in their lives.

I had the opportunity to share a remarkable experience with the team. I was able to attend Eileen Collins' launch of a NASA space shuttle with the soccer team, then First Lady Hillary Clinton, and many other supporters of title IX. This was the first time a woman commanded a NASA shuttle. It was a spectacular event that symbolized the accomplishments of the act. Commander Collins and members of the soccer team continue to inspire younger women to follow their own dreams.

Younger women are now aggressively entering many fields with more confidence and assurance because of the positive impact of models such as these and the availability of title IX funds. In my district, title IX has allowed

many young women to enter and excel in sports. Independence's Fort Osage High School's Dana Rohr was awarded a \$2,000 scholarship for her academic work and participation in sports. Angela Goodson of Blue Springs South High School won the Missouri State Girls title in swimming. Liz Pierson of Lee's Summit North won six goals and three assists for her soccer team, which finished second in Missouri. Janiece Gatson, a junior in Grandview, won fifth place at the Missouri 4A State meet for running 400 meters in 57.3 seconds. Saint Theresa's, an all girls' school in my district, became the first non-St. Louis team to win a Missouri 1A-3A soccer girls title with a 6-2 victory this past Saturday.

Thanks to title IX, more and more young women are being recognized and encouraged for their scholarly and athletic work. Since 1971, women's participation in sports has markedly increased, with more than 135,000 women presently competing in intercollegiate sports. Women currently constitute nearly 40 percent of all college athletes, compared with only 15 percent in 1972.

Recent data show that approximately 2.6 million high school girls participate in a wide selection of high school sports, representing nearly 40 percent of all high school athletes. In 1971, only 7.5 percent of high school athletes were female.

Female participation in sports, like receiving a college education, has had an unexpected benefit for women. Studies have shown that values learned from sports participation, such as teamwork, leadership, discipline, and pride in accomplishment, are important attributes as women increase their participation in this workforce as well as their entry into business management and ownership positions.

My love of sports throughout my schooling gave me confidence and a sense of accomplishment. The friendships I made with teammates and the memories we share keep us in contact in our adult lives. My experience in sports enabled me to attain leadership and professional skills and gave me the confidence that helped shape my career.

Thirty years after the passage of title IX, we recognize and celebrate the profound changes this legislation has helped to bring about in America and the resulting improvements in educational and related job opportunities for millions of Americans. More and more women are entering and graduating from college and graduate school, more women are entering and excelling in sports activities, and more women are entering the corporate world and holding management positions.

I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for her leadership in enacting title IX. Thanks to her courage and her persistence, the country is better because more women are able to achieve their full potential. I am

pleased to join with her and my colleagues today in celebrating the 30th anniversary of title IX and promise to work with them to uphold and enforce this legislation in order to ensure equal opportunity for all Americans.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her contributions towards the recognition of title IX and the 30th anniversary. Her thoughts and expressions about what has happened, what it has meant to the country, and what is still yet to do, I hope, is the challenge of today's event. I thank her very, very much for coming.

Mr. Speaker, there are many others who wanted to be here, but because of the advance of the time that we had informed the offices that they would be heard, many are not here. But I wanted to say that the most important message that I believe we all want to say in the 30th anniversary of title IX is that while we can give the impact of what title IX has meant to this country up to now, we who have lived all of the problems and difficulties of the last 30 years can easily understand and appreciate the importance of this legislation but are concerned that the young people coming up still in schools, elementary, secondary school, perhaps some even in college, do not quite understand the importance of this legislation.

Those that are participating in athletics, in soccer, basketball, whatever, probably assume this is the way it always was and that opportunities for girls and women were always assured under our democracy, under our Constitution, under our concepts of the 14th amendment, 15th amendment, and so forth. There is not a perception out there among young people that this ability that they have to participate in this way could be challenged. In point of fact, it is being challenged, as some of the speakers have said today.

There is a lawsuit that has been filed by the wrestlers association and some others challenging the rules and regulations that were put in place by the Department of Education to implement the law. They are saying that the rules and regulations have been implemented and applied so as to discriminate against men's teams. They refer to them as the minor teams, such as wrestling and so forth; and they allege that the regulations have caused the institutions to eliminate many of these men's sports on college campuses.

I am pleased that the administration chose to respond to this lawsuit by arguing that it is not the obligation of the Federal Government; that none of the allegations that were made in the litigation are true. And that if, indeed, men's teams were eliminated, it was the responsibility of the individual universities and institutions to justify why they did it.

There are many reports to indicate why this happened, and that is because the big sports at these universities, the football and the basketball and base-

ball, and so forth, have consumed the revenues and the attention of the administration. And because they are reserving huge blocks of manpower and money and resources to their high visibility, high revenue sports, some of these sports activities have had to go.

So I think it is time for the institutions and the universities to take a look at this problem and try to respond to these groups, such as the wrestlers, and explain to them that it is not because title IX is so effective, and that the women are participating and that the universities have an obligation to offer these opportunities to women, that have forced some of these men's sports to go by the wayside.

So we are constantly under challenge and under scrutiny, and it is not time for us to rest on our laurels and to simply exclaim the wonders of this legislation and how it has transformed our society. I call upon the House and every Member here to be vigilant and to recognize that this is an important law which was put into effect, and that we have to make sure that it continues to abide as the principle of this country and enables our young generations coming forward to enjoy the fruits of this legislation.

I am pleased now to yield to a distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for such comments as he may wish to make.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii, who is one of the senior Members of this House and who has seen, I think, over time, the development of title IX, the enactment of title IX, and the impact that title IX has had.

I certainly associate myself with her remarks, that while we are obviously pleased at the progress that has been made, we ought not to believe that everything that can be done or should be done has been done.

Mr. Speaker, this month, as we have said, marks the 30th anniversary of title IX of the Education Act Amendments of 1972. This legislation prohibits sex discrimination in educational institutions that receive Federal funds. It has been instrumental, in my opinion, in helping women get into educational programs where they had previously been underrepresented, such as the math and sciences. It has helped to encourage women to break job barriers and obtain careers, such as engineers, doctors and mathematicians, which in turn has diversified our workforce and infused our society with an energy and potential that had not been tapped for centuries.

It is really incredible, when we think of this country and we think of how we excluded on the basis of gender so many talented people. I am the father of three daughters. I have one grandson, but I have three daughters. And the concept that these incredibly talented, energetic people would have been excluded based upon their gender is despicable. We have come a long way in this country not only on gender but

on race, ethnicity, and national origin. Title IX was a tremendous contributor to that progress.

Perhaps the biggest achievement of title IX is the fact that it has leveled the playing field for men and women in sports. It mandates equal treatment for playing opportunities, access to athletic scholarships, equipment, facilities, and coaching. The numbers paint a powerful portrait. In the 30 years since title IX, the number of girls participating in high school sports has skyrocketed from 200,000 to almost 3 million, an 800 percent-plus increase. At the intercollegiate level, the number of participants is five times greater than before title IX was enacted.

The best athletic team that we had participate in the Summer Olympics in Rome was the girls softball team. Those young women were the best in the world. Watching women's basketball now, and the Mystics are doing very well, as the gentlewoman may know, in Washington. I think we have won six or seven straight, the best start we have had in the Women's Professional Basketball Association. I am old enough, I hate to admit, to remember the women's basketball game when there were three full courts and three back courts, as if women could not run from one end of the court to the other end of the court. It was one of the duller games I have ever seen. And not only was it dull for the spectators, it was dull for the players. Now, of course, we see the incredible athleticism the women display in playing basketball, clearly, frankly, as good as the men. The difference being the men are bigger and, therefore, with a 10-foot basket, have an advantage.

But what an appropriate thing it was to say we are going to treat people based upon, as Martin Luther King said, the content of their character or the abilities that they have.

□ 1600

We said that in the Disabilities Act. We said it in title IX, how important it is for us to continually emphasize it is what people can do that we need to focus on, not their gender or race or disability, not some arbitrary and mostly capricious distinction that we draw.

Clearly, the dated stereotype that women are not interested in athletics has been shattered as the door of opportunity continues to open.

Just think of Venus and Serena, two extraordinary sisters, the two best tennis players in the world, the Williams sisters. Clearly there is not a man on this floor, period, that would want to play them with any consequence to losing because we clearly would lose badly.

Title IX has allowed the desires and passions of millions of women to be realized. They participate in sports. They enjoy sports. They succeed in competitive sports.

My oldest daughter played 4 years of varsity basketball in high school in the

Catholic Girls League here in Washington, D.C., which is an extraordinarily good league.

Competitive athletics have increased the academic success of young women and make it less likely that they will become involved with alcohol and drug abuse. The emotional and physical benefits women and girls gain from participation are invaluable. We know that physical participation is important, not only for your physical but also your mental capacities.

At a time when many young women become critical of their appearance and grapple with eating disorders and low self-esteem, sports helps young women develop confidence and a positive body image. In the long term, athletic activities decrease a woman's chance of developing heart disease and breast cancer. So it is truly extraordinarily helpful.

Mia Hamm, and what an extraordinary athlete she is, the captain of the U.S. soccer team, which won the 1999 Women's World Cup, once stated, "What I love about soccer is the way it makes me feel about myself. It makes me feel that I can contribute." She is part of the daughters of title IX who have paved a path for millions of female athletes to follow. Her statement hits the nail right on the head, as it highlights the self-confidence and teamwork skills sports helped to develop and define.

Title IX is, of course, not without its critics, but I think for the most part they are misguided. They blame title IX for eliminating some men's minor sports, but the reality is title IX provides institutions with the flexibility to determine how to provide equity for their students.

A March 2001 GAO study found that 72 percent of colleges and universities that added women's teams did so without cutting any men's teams. In fact, men's overall intercollegiate athletic participation has risen since the passage of title IX. This truly was a win/win situation for men as well as and particularly for women.

Part of the problem lies with the larger of the men's sports, such as football and basketball, which consume a majority of men's total athletic budget. The complaint to be brought against title IX is that it does not go far enough, that the advancement for women in education and athletics, no matter how positive, must go further.

As part of today's celebration of title IX, I would like to recognize Dr. Deborah A. Yow, the athletic director for the University of Maryland. I have told this story before, and I am not sure if the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) or the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) have heard this story. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is a crusty, conservative Member of the House of Representatives; a wonderful human being, a good-hearted human being, but not one that I perceive in the forefront of feminism in America, and I say that affectionately.

He knows full well that I am closely associated with the University of Maryland. He came up and said, you know what, you have got a woman you ought to hire at the University of Maryland. She is a friend of mine, Deborah Yow, and is under consideration to be the athletic director at the University of Maryland.

Now, at that point in time there were no women athletic directors at the level 1-A schools. But the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) came up to me and said Deborah Yow could do that job, I went back to my office and picked up the phone and called the then-president of the University of Maryland, who is now our new chancellor of our system, and told him, Britt, I have just talked to a person, this Deborah Yow must be extraordinary. Shortly thereafter, Deborah Yow was hired. She is now the athletic director, and of course we finished 10-1 in football and won the national basketball championship, under a woman athletic director. Those were men's teams; and we have won numerous championships in lacrosse and field hockey for our women's teams.

Her sister is a major athletic leader in our country as well. Her outstanding career achievements serve to exemplify the important contributions made by women in the athletic arena, as well as to our entire society.

In a male-dominated profession, 91.6 percent of athletic directors in Division I universities being men, Debbie has not only met the challenges of her profession, but she has raised the bar for all. Under Debbie's leadership, the Terrapins ranked nationally as one of the top 20 athletic programs in the country, according to U.S. News and World Report. The University of Maryland under her leadership has established an incredibly strong athletic program with exemplary student athletes, coaches and administrators.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for focusing on this historic event. In 1972, when the Congress and the country said we are going to make sure that everybody, irrespective of gender, can participate equally and achieve to the extent of their character and their ability, we made a statement and adopted a policy that has made America a better country.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his contributions.

#### REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL TIME

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). The Chair may not entertain that request. Another Member may separately request time to address the House.

#### TITLE IX CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, title IX was passed by the U.S. Congress on June 23, 1972, and signed by President Nixon on July 1, 1972. This important civil rights law prohibits discrimination in education programs and activities receiving Federal funds. And as we pause to celebrate the 30th anniversary of this landmark legislation, we can easily see how the law has allowed women and girls increased opportunity to participate in athletics.

What I think has been overlooked by some is how this law has also spurred great improvements for women in the areas of access to higher education, job training, career opportunities, and math and science skills. America has focused more attention on the issues of sexual harassment and created better learning environments for women because of title IX.

I remember before the passage of title IX, schools and universities often had separate entrances for male and female students. Women seeking admission to many colleges and universities were forced to have both higher test scores and better grades than their male counterparts just to get in because there were limits on how many women were allowed, and the chances of women being admitted to medical school or law school were slim because in many cases the female students were limited to less than 15. Those who were lucky enough to get into college found themselves with curfews. I remember mine was 10 p.m., one had to be into the dorm by 10 p.m. So, so much for cramming for tomorrow's exam in the library along with male students.

Women applying for doctoral programs had explained how they would combine a career and family, but of course that question was not asked of their male counterparts, and often times men were given preferences on scholarships and women were not.

Before title IX, girls were just 1 percent of all high school athletes, and athletic scholarships accordingly were almost nonexistent. So as a result, athletic scholarships were just not available.

Title IX has expanded opportunities for girls and women to pursue career education. Many of these careers were off limits before 1972, and when school segregated vocational education by sex, and I recall that the girls all took home ec and I learned how to sew, actually I already knew how to sew, but the boys took vocational ed that could lead to really good-paying jobs, and that day is now over as well.

After 30 years, women in educational institutions have made progress. Before title IX, women often lacked tenure in colleges and universities. They were promoted at a slower rate than their male colleagues. Fewer women were employed as administrators. And that has now changed as well, and it was part of the wave of change that title IX helped bring.

One of the most significant breakthroughs that title IX has made possible is how the many barriers in non-traditional fields such as math and science have been shattered, and I cannot emphasize the importance for America of that. I recall looking for employment for the first time in the want ads and they were segregated into men wanted, married women wanted, single women wanted. That day is over in part because of title IX, and I think we can celebrate the changes that we have made and look forward to the additional changes to come.

And I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for organizing the testimony tonight, and I yield to her with gratitude for her leadership in this issue.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and for coming to participate in this recognition of the importance of title IX to the lives of everyone, not just the girls and women in our society.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say I have a very personal connection with title IX because while I was wanting to go to medical school in my time and I had written to a dozen or more medical schools to seek entry, each one of them turned me down by saying that they did not admit women to their schools. It came to me as quite a shock that in America it was not a person's grade, aptitude, tests, recommendations that got the person into the careers of their choice, but that it had to do with one's gender. So it appalled me. I did not know whether to resign myself to that situation or not. I had finished college. I did not have a place to go, had no real insights as to what I was going to do with the rest of my life.

I got a job at an art academy as assistant director, and the director said to me, do not give up, there is something there you can go to. So this is how I came to title IX. I was determined that no other young woman in this country should ever have to endure the kinds of frustrations and injustice that I had to face while I was trying to find my place in this great democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone for participating and hope that all who have had the opportunity to listen tonight will be sparked to spread the word around America that title IX is still alive and well.

#### MARKING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I missed the opportunity this afternoon to speak with my colleagues with regard to the celebration of title IX, its 30-year anniversary. I am pleased to stand in support of such a wonderful piece of legislation that

gave young women all across this country an opportunity to step up, step out and be a part of a team and have the encouragement to win.

I am particularly very proud that in the city of Cleveland we have already hosted the NCAA women's volleyball championships and I am going to be chairing the NCAA women's basketball Final Four Championships in Cleveland in 2007. In addition, in 2004 in the city of Cleveland, we will be hosting the international children's games. This will be the first time these games will be hosted in the United States, and I am pleased to have an opportunity to host them right in the city of Cleveland.

We have learned over the years that having the opportunity to participate in sports has been a way that young men and young women have an opportunity to learn how to compete, what team building means, what it means to be a part of a group, what it means to win, what it means to cheer, what it means to be disciplined, what it means to have a chance to work out and then show what workout does once you have an opportunity to work with your team.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to have an opportunity to congratulate the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) as she celebrates with all of her colleagues and this Congress as we celebrate title IX.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, thirty years ago, Title IX of the Education Amendments was enacted. This legislation represents the very best of what we come here to do.

I am proud of Title IX. I am proud of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, on which it was modeled. I am proud of the legislation which followed: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

I am proud every time our federal government reaffirms its commitment to the offer extended to us and to every one of our constituents. It invites us to come to it for assistance, for the education of our children, for the healthcare for our families, for the financial security of our parents, for the clean air and water for us all, or to simply come, participate as a citizen of this nation, and when we come to it, we know that our gender, our race, our religion, and our beliefs will not affect the treatment we receive. We are equal; we will enjoy equity.

There have been times in our history when our government has put forth a lesser offer, or an offer not extended to all. There have been times when the offer was made only after fierce debates by this body. As we do not all agree now, we did not all agree at those times. The arguments that were made against equity then had been made before, and will probably be made again. We will fight them with a conviction embraced for the principles it represents, and guided by the knowledge of past arguments, fought and won.

The equitable educational opportunities our daughters receive because of Title IX have prepared them to fight with us. They will create the legislation of which we will all be

proud. They have experienced less of the injustices experienced by their mothers before the enactment of Title IX. This is a victory, and one of which we should all be keenly aware.

Through Title IX, the federal government has made a promise to our daughters that they will not be discriminated against by it, or by any agency, organization, or institution that receives its support. Today we honor this promise, the work of all those who fought to establish it, and we recommit ourselves to its strengthening and its expansion.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the landmark Title IX legislation, which ensures that young women are given the same opportunities their male counterparts enjoy, both in academics and in athletics.

When this legislation was passed in 1972, over three and a half million boys were participating in high school athletics, while less than 900,000 girls did so. During the last school year, however, and after 30 years of Title IX, the number of girls has tripled, with over 2.7 million girls playing a high school sport. These statistics clearly demonstrate that Title IX has been enormously effective in bringing young women into sports.

However, there is still work to be done. Though female athletic participation has increased over 800% since the passage of Title IX, according to the Women's Sports Foundation, male athletes still receive 1.1 million more participation opportunities than their female counterparts.

Title IX states that, "No person in the U.S. shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid." This mission is as important today as it was thirty years ago. Together, as parents, teachers, coaches and mentors, we should continue to stress the importance of Title IX, and recognize the great strides it has made in leveling the playing field, literally, for young women in this country.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in support of celebrating the 30th anniversary of the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. As we all know, Title IX prohibits sex discrimination in educational institutions from receiving federal funds. Title IX has been a crucial part of setting a standard of equal educational opportunity in this country.

Title IX aids in the disintegration of inequitable admissions policies, increases opportunities for women in nontraditional fields of study such as math and science, improves vocational education opportunities for women, reduces discrimination against pregnant students and teen mothers, protects female students from sexual harassment in our schools, and increases athletic opportunities for girls and women and has heightened the world's awareness of the importance of women's sports.

Even though this 30-year-old legislation has done so much good in this country, it is again under fire as a result of a lawsuit filed against the U.S. Department of Education alleging that it is to blame for the elimination of some men's minor sports. The Department of Justice, fortunately, is seeking dismissal of the suit, but this case has revived discussions about gender equity and the impact of Title IX.

I stand today with my colleagues to reaffirm the necessity of Title IX and to celebrate its

success over the past 30 years. May Title IX remain a reminder to us that our legislative system is created to protect the inherent and equal rights of all of our country's citizens, regardless of race, gender, or creed.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the 30th anniversary of Title IX and I thank my distinguished colleague, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, for organizing this special order.

As a member of the Education Committee in 1972, Congresswoman MINK helped craft Title IX, and engineer its passage. The day that it came to the floor, she was called away because her daughter had been in an automobile accident. She knew the vote would be close—and in fact the bill lost by one vote. But PATSY, through sheer force of will, forced then-Speaker Carl Albert to do the unheard of—to bring the bill up on the floor again. That time it passed.

Thank you, PATSY, for your leadership and dedication and for leaving women and girls a lasting legacy of your commitment to equal opportunity for all. While Title IX is best known for participation of women in sports, its real purpose is much broader: to end gender discrimination in all education programs. I always say that the three most important issues facing Congress are our children, our children, and our children.

Education is the most dynamic investment we can make and will bring more funds into the Treasury than any tax incentive you can name. Educated students become knowledgeable, productive citizens who are able to compete in the information economy. Title IX ensures that the full range of education opportunity is available to all of our children. For 30 years, Title IX has taken down the “No Girls Allowed” signs from our schools’ locker rooms, shop classes, and career counseling centers. Today, because of Title IX, we are also taking down the signs from corporate boardrooms.

While there is much to celebrate on this 30th anniversary, there is also important work to be done. Barriers still exist to keep women and girls from achieving their full potential. Technology education is one of those barriers. Technology is the driving force of our economy and the sector most in need of educated workers. According to the Department of Labor, nearly 75 percent of future jobs will require the use of computers. Yet less than 33 percent of participants in computer courses are girls.

Girls are five times less likely than boys to consider a technology-related career path or plan to take postsecondary technology classes. We must use the power of Title IX to ensure girls are encouraged to participate in computer and technology programs that can broaden their options for the future. Before we can do that, however, we have to lay the basic infrastructure for technology educational for all our students. The first step toward preparing girls for the new economy is providing them with qualified teachers. Less than 2 percent of all computer/technology teachers today have a degree in computer science, and only 30 percent of teachers say they received any technology training.

Unfortunately, President Bush's budget eliminates the program that would help teachers effectively integrate technology into the classroom. As a mother of four adult daughters, I have seen the results of Title IX. Some

are visible, like the growing number of girls on soccer fields and basketball courts. Equally important, though less tangible, is the message that Title IX sends to women and girls: Your education is crucial and your future is limitless.

Young women today believe they can do anything. And they can. We must continue to support this belief by fulfilling and sustaining the promise of Title IX.

Mr. FALOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th anniversary of the passing of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in federally assisted education programs or activities. Since its passing, Title IX has been crucial in setting a standard of equal education opportunities. Women and girls today, tend to be better educated and enjoy many opportunities that far surpass those of previous generations.

In the past 30 years, the growing trend has been for most to equate Title IX with women in athletics. Women and girls' participation in sports has increased. By 2001 nearly 2.8 million girls participated in athletics, an increase of more than 847 percent from 1971. While the achievements of female athletes is impressive, the effects of the legislation have reached well beyond that of sports.

We have steadily seen an increase in women's enrollment in school, accessibility to funding for school, and women in fields of study generally dominated by their male counterparts. In 1971, only 18% of young women completed four or more years of college. By 2006, women are projected to earn 55% of all bachelor's degrees. Similarly, women have made significant progress in graduate and professional fields. In 1994, women earned 43% of all law school degrees, compared with 7% in 1972. And in 1999, women earned nearly 50% of all medical degrees; in 1972, only 9% of medical degrees were earned by women.

As a result of Title IX, women have the opportunity to grow and excel in areas once reserved only for men; creating a more prosperous and fruitful nation. Today we must celebrate the advancements women have made over the last 30 years as well as recognize that there is still more work to be done. Disparities in salaries continue to exist between men and women. We continue to see less women in administrative positions, hard sciences and we need to create additional opportunities for more women to enter the non-traditional fields of science and math.

Today we celebrate Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972's pivotal role in expanding women's educational opportunities and applaud the progress women have made over the last 30 years. In recognizing and celebrating Title IX's importance in today's society, we are ensuring that equal educational opportunities continue to be afforded to women and women's roles in society continue to be strengthened and appreciated.

I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the women of American Samoa, who continue to excel because of Title IX. Growing numbers of Samoan women are furthering their education, both in American Samoa and in the United States. Many return home to contribute to the island community, while others remain in the U.S. as teachers, lawyers, professors, doctors and judges. Malo lava taumafai ia outou tama'ita'i Samoa i le la outou sogasoga ma le finafinau I le su'eina o

le poto. E fia momoli atili ai le Fa'afetai tele I le porokolame o le Title IX mo le avanoa ua faia lea mo tama'ita'i Samoa.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 30th anniversary of Title IX, the Education Amendments of 1972. Thirty years ago, Title IX was proposed to prohibit sex discrimination in federally-funded education programs. Since its enactment, Title IX has made a tremendous impact in bridging the gap between gender inequality in our educational system. Title IX has made improvements in the admission process, financial aid and scholarships allocation, educational programs and activities, health insurance benefits, marital status, athletics, and employment opportunities for women. Its extraordinary efforts have enriched the educational experience for women over the past 30 years.

In June 1997, the Department of Education attributed the rise in the level of education for women to Title IX. Its statistics are striking. In 1994, for example, about 63% of female high school graduates were enrolled in college, comparing to 43% in 1973. By 1994, about 38% of women received medical degrees comparing to the year in which Title IX was first introduced, in 1972, only 9% of medical degrees were awarded to women. In the same year that Title IX was enacted, about 7% of female students in law schools received a law degree. Whereas in 1994, about 43% of law degrees belong to women.

Title IX also helps lower the drop-out rates of women in school. It increases women's chances to enter what was once male-dominated fields such as math and sciences. It gives women more opportunities to complete post-secondary, graduate, and professional degrees. Furthermore, since its enactment, Title IX has increased athletic scholarships for women and thus expanded women's participation in athletics.

A Connecticut judge said in 1972: “Athletic competition builds character in our boys. We do not need that kind of character in our girls.” Today, athletic departments around the country are required to provide athletic opportunities for women and men proportionate to their enrollment. In addition, schools are required to foster programs that meet the interests of women. No longer is athletic competition just a man's world.

As the World Cup is taking place, I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate the U.S. Men's National Soccer Team for their recent accomplishment in the quarter final. And it is my hope that they bring home the Gold, just as the U.S. Women's National Team did in 1999.

The U.S. Women's National Soccer Team is consistently one of the best, if not the best in the world. There is no doubt in my mind that their success is due, in large part, to Title IX, which gave them the support, financial and otherwise, that were not available to them prior to the birth of Title IX.

Title IX and subsequent related legislation have played a tremendous role in improving the lives of women since its enactment in 1972. And I am confident it will continue to elevate the status of women in society in the years to come.

I am proud to join my colleagues in celebrating the 30th anniversary of Title IX.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on special order of the 30th anniversary of title IX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

□ 1615

## HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for missing my earlier time slot. We were meeting with President Uribe of Colombia, the President-elect of Colombia, and we were very encouraged with his words on how he plans to address terrorism inside Colombia, narcoterrorism funded by American drug consumption. I am pleased for his initiatives and his intention to increase the Colombian contribution to the military and antidrug efforts in Colombia to address some of the concerns this Congress has had as far as who is involved in their armed forces and to have it more democratically spread through their country and his determination and will to fight the narcoterrorists in Colombia.

As I had mentioned yesterday on this floor, our subcommittee on government reform as well as other subcommittees and tomorrow the full committee will be starting to address the Department of Homeland Security. I wanted to raise a few other issues this evening. One in particular has to do with visa clearance, as we have learned, that really the Department of Homeland Security is more aptly called the Department of Border Security for Catastrophic Security. In other words, it has predominantly to deal with the meeters and greeters, those people as they are coming through ports of entry, as they are coming in airports, as they are crossing borders, as they are making decisions to come to the United States, and the primary concern of this department is catastrophic terrorism, not day-to-day terrorism. If you look at it in that sense, that is why the President has chosen to put the agencies that he has inside the Department of Homeland Security.

But there are a number of things that we need to look at hard in Congress. In section 403, visa issuance, it says in the proposed legislation that exclusive authority to issue regulations with respect to, administer and enforce the provisions of this act and all other immigration and nationality laws relating to the functions of diplomatic and consular offices of the United States will be given to this department, but it says, through the Secretary of State.

One fundamental question is, why are the people who are making the visa decisions at the embassies not considered part of the homeland security since otherwise the people at the Border Patrol, the Customs, the INS and others who are making those decisions at the border are merely reacting to what has been cleared at the embassy? Secretary of State Powell has objected with several comments and I wanted to respond to those.

He says that the Secretary of State and the State Department no longer have command over employees at the embassy. Of course not. There are other people who work at our embassies abroad, DEA, for example, and other agencies of the United States Government, the Defense Department, who work through our embassies and are not the direct employees of the Secretary of State. They have different missions. In this case, visa clearance, in my opinion, is a homeland security question predominantly and secondarily a foreign affairs question. And where it is a foreign affairs question in the case of China, the Secretary of State should be weighing in; but where it is a homeland security question, that person ought to be a line person in the Department of Homeland Security.

He says there would be conflicting information and guidelines for visa adjudication policy. No, there are currently conflicting things. Both the Justice Department and the State Department input and quite frankly homeland security ought to be the preeminent concern and then other political interests should be a concern.

He says the Secretary of State's ability to set foreign policy would be limited, only limited based on terrorism. The next question would be, Would this diminish the role of American ambassadors? No more than having DEA and other Defense Department personnel and other Commerce Department personnel in the embassy. We all recognize the importance of each ambassador being the American voice in those countries. No matter who works in that embassy, no matter who visits as a Member of Congress, our job is to back up the American voice in that country and not to cause cognitive dissonance in those countries. I do not believe it undermines the ambassador, I do not believe it undermines the Secretary of State, but if we are serious that this is at least the Department of Border Security, then we need to make sure that visa clearance comes under the Department of Homeland Security.

I also wanted to address a few questions related to Customs and illustrate a few points and challenges we have there. Clearly Customs is patrolling the border. This picture is one that I took along the Canadian border east of Blaine, Washington. This is Cascades National Park coming up on this side, which is further to the east. You can see the Canadian border running along here, a ditch that you could maybe sprain your ankle if you were running

fast, but basically it is a completely unprotected border. Furthermore when you go in through the mountains, it is even less protected. As we tighten the borders at the crossings, we have to address the broader questions of how we are going to deal with the border; and if we overtighten at the crossing which will also restrict commerce, not only will we push it to the east in some cases, to the west in others and in the mountains and into the water, we also will have slowed down commerce. So it is important to understand that while the primary mission of the customs department in homeland security will be security, it is also important that they keep the trade moving.

We will continue to discuss this in committee and on the floor because it is very important we maintain the balance in Customs and Coast Guard in addition to homeland security for trade and other missions that they have.

## MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, for the next hour I plan to visit with the Members of the United States House of Representatives, and other Members will be joining me throughout this hour, to talk about the need to truly modernize Medicare, to include medicine for our seniors. This is something that both parties have talked a lot about. They have talked about it for years. Yet we continue to live in a society where today's Medicare, if you really stop and think about it, is designed for yesterday's medical care. What I mean by that is I recently encountered an elderly woman in Glenwood, Arkansas, in my congressional district who is a retired pharmacist who just happened to have been a relief pharmacist at the pharmacy that my family used in Prescott, Arkansas, when I was a small child growing up there. She talked about how if she filled a prescription and it cost more than \$5, she would go ahead and fill the next prescription while she tried to build up enough courage and confidence to go out and tell the patient that their medicine was going to cost \$5. My, my, how times have changed. How times have changed and indeed today's Medicare really is designed for yesterday's medical care.

I have stepped across the aisle and voted with my Republican Members probably as many times as any Democrat in this Chamber. So I think I can say with some credibility and with some respect that when it comes to the need to provide our seniors with a prescription drug benefit, in my opinion the Republicans are dead wrong on this issue. This is coming from a conservative Democrat from south Arkansas, one who has crossed over that aisle and

voted with the Republican Party numerous times over the past 17 months. The reason I know that their prescription drug plan is bad is because, you see, I understand this issue. I own a small-town family pharmacy. My wife is a pharmacist. I understand this issue. And I understand what our seniors need. They need an affordable, a voluntary, a guaranteed prescription drug benefit for all seniors.

I am going to spend the next hour talking about the differences in the Republican plan and the Democrat plan, and I am proud to be one of four lead sponsors on the Democratic plan, one that will truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors. But before I get into that, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) for yielding. I came to Congress in January of 1999. In 1998 I was campaigning on behalf of senior citizens throughout these United States. I was campaigning particularly because my dad is 82 years old, my mom is 81 years old, all of my friends have parents that are octogenarians; and I talked to them constantly about what is it that I can best do if and when I go to Congress to support you. All of them said to me, save Social Security, make sure Medicare is strong, and we need a prescription drug benefit.

In my congressional district, which is the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, we have had two or three sessions with senior citizens where we have given them a chance to come out and talk about the issue of a prescription drug benefit and what it would mean for them. Many of them are talking about taking as many as nine or 10 different drugs and that as a result of having to take that many different drugs, the cost of drugs, their prescription drugs, is so significant that they are really choosing between eating and choosing between, in the twilight of their lives, having an enjoyable time versus having the chance to enjoy the benefits of all the work that they have done.

Recently on the front page of *The Washington Post*, there was an article entitled "Kicked in the Teeth," which lamented the impact of America's soccer team victory over Mexico during the World Cup competition and the implications that such a loss had upon our neighbors to the south. The article went on to discuss the embarrassment of this loss for a nation with a great soccer tradition such as Mexico.

Well, today I want to borrow from that title to discuss the GOP prescription drug plan that was marked up this week. Senior citizens in America are not unlike Mexico's soccer fans. They expected a win and what they got was a loss. But this loss was not at the hands or feet of a foe, but rather the House leadership. Once again the leadership has created an industry-based bill that further alienates and confuses senior citizens on what they can ex-

pect. According to experts, the GOP plan is, and I quote, "Hollow, highly ideological and worthless. It will roll back Medicare and leave senior citizens in the country choosing between food and medicine." So in essence they have been kicked in their teeth.

The disappointment senior citizens must be feeling cannot be measured or polled; but I would encourage all those grandmothers, grandfathers, aunts, uncles, mothers and fathers to remember that your sacrifice to build, protect and maintain the greatness of this country is not being respected by the House leadership, but rather sold to the highest bidder.

"Sold" is the word you hear at the end of a successful auction. I would like to invite all of you here in town tonight to join my Republican colleagues at the close of their prescription drug benefit auction tonight at the pharmaceutical-industry-sponsored GOP fundraiser. All you need is about \$25,000 and just no conscience at all.

However, I would impart one word of advice. The only thing they are going to serve tonight is corn on the cob, so if you have been kicked in the teeth you better find somewhere else to eat. So if you show up tonight with a hearty appetite for change and you are looking for a truly compensative prescription drug benefit, the soup line is forming to the rear. I would suggest you tell all of your congressional Members that they should support the Democratic substitute that is being offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his leadership on this issue. I am confident that once the American public has had a chance to listen to the difference between the Republican bill and the Democratic bill, they will understand that the Democrats in this House are pushing for a real prescription drug benefit.

□ 1630

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for sharing her thoughts with us on the prescription drug issue and for all that she does.

Mr. Speaker, let me just visit for a moment about my experiences, not as a Member of the United States Congress, but as someone who is married to a pharmacist, who owns a small-town family pharmacy in our hometown of Prescott, Arkansas, a town of 3,400 people. Let me talk to you for a moment as a family pharmacy owner, someone who has experienced all of the trials and tribulations that our seniors go through day in and day out.

I actively managed that business before coming to the United States Congress; and I can tell you, I can put faces and names with patients, but patient confidentiality, thank goodness, prevents that. But I can put faces to these stories in my own mind as I relay them today of seniors who would come into the pharmacy, who were literally forced to choose between buying their

medicine, buying their groceries, paying their rent, paying their light bill.

We are talking about the Greatest Generation. We are talking about seniors who have given so much to this country, who supposedly live in the most industrialized society in the world, and yet we live in a society where they cannot afford their medicine or cannot afford to take it properly.

Living in a small town, I would see seniors leave without their medicine; and living in a small town I would learn a week, 10 days later, where they are in the hospital in Hope, Arkansas, some 16 miles away from my hometown of Prescott, running up a \$10,000 or \$20,000 Medicare bill, or a diabetic who has to have a leg amputated, or a diabetic who has to have kidney dialysis, all things that Medicare pays for, and all things that could have been avoided; but they were not, because Medicare does not include medicine and our seniors simply could not afford the \$40 or \$50 prescription that could have saved the Medicare trust fund \$10,000, \$20,000, \$50,000, as much as \$250,000 for some kidney dialysis patients.

Again, today's Medicare is designed for yesterday's medical care. And it is time we did right; it is time we did right, by our seniors.

Some people say, well, the government cannot afford it. I say the government cannot afford not to, and here is what I mean by that. Health insurance companies are in the business to do what? Health insurance companies are in the business to make a profit. And then they cover the cost of medicine. Why? Because they know it helps hold down the cost of needless doctor visits, it helps to hold down the cost of needless hospital stays, it helps to hold down the cost of needless surgeries.

It is time we truly modernized Medicare by creating a voluntary, but a guaranteed, Medicare part D prescription drug benefit. What I mean by that is this. Part A covers going to the hospital. Part B covers going to the doctor, medical equipment and so forth and so on. The part D that we are proposing would be voluntary, meaning if you are one of the few seniors in America who are fortunate to have medicine coverage from a previous employer, and, by the way, there are very few that fit that category in my congressional district, but if you are one of the few that have prescription drug coverage through a previous employer, one, you ought to count yourself lucky and fortunate, because very few seniors have any coverage at all. But if you fall in that category and like what you have, you ought to be able to keep it. That is why our plan is voluntary. But it is a guaranteed part of Medicare, just like going to the doctor and going to the hospital.

Now, the drug manufacturers do not like my plan. They do not want to be held accountable. I have got bottles of pills, medicine, tablets, capsules on the shelves of my small pharmacy back

home in Prescott, Arkansas, that cost \$3,000, that are being sold in Canada and Mexico for \$300 or \$400.

I say this: if the governments in those small countries, Canada and Mexico, can stand up to the big drug manufacturers, why can we not do the same thing in the United States of America?

We may have found the answer. The Washington Post, June 19, 2002: "A senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday that Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of PhRMA, that is the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers of America, to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies."

I do not know about you, but I am appalled by that. This is the United States House of Representatives. We do not write legislation based on what is going to allow our party to raise money. At least I hope we do not. It is time we stood up to the big drug manufacturers and said enough is enough.

It is reported that in the year 2000, \$360 million was spent by the drug manufacturers on lobbying, advertising and political donations; and I say that is wrong. Do you ever see those ads on TV where they are trying to tell you which drug you need to tell your doctor you need? Have you ever thought about that? Slick TV ads put on the air by the drug manufacturers trying to tell you which drug you need to tell your doctor you need.

Many drug manufacturers spent more money in the year 2000, the numbers are not out yet, but I am quite sure and confident it is the same for 2001. Many drug manufacturers spent more money marketing their products with these slick TV ads than they spent on research and development of drugs that can save lives and help all of us to live longer and healthier lifestyles.

This 1-hour on prescription drugs for our seniors was supposed to occur tonight. Why is it occurring now? Because the leadership of this body chose to stop voting early today so they could make it to a fundraiser tonight that is being hosted by the big drug manufacturers at a time when these prescription drug bills that our seniors need and are counting on are being debated in the Committee on Ways and Means and in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Again, I am a conservative Democrat. I have crossed over that aisle and voted with the Republicans numerous times, as many as any Member of the United States Congress; but I can tell you when it comes to this issue, they are wrong. It is time for them to make a decision. Are they going to side, continue to side, with the big drug manufacturers, or are they going to join me in endorsing my bill that will truly modernize Medicare and include medicine for our seniors and start siding with our seniors, for our seniors?

It is time that this Congress united in a bipartisan manner on the need to

truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, just as we have united on this war against terrorism.

Again, a senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday that "Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers of America to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies."

This ought to be about suiting our seniors. It ought to be about giving our seniors a prescription drug benefit that means something. This debate should not in any form or fashion be about catering to the drug manufacturers.

Let me talk to you about the differences between the Republican proposal for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and my proposal, the Democratic proposal, for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

A lot of people say, well, what about the guaranteed minimum benefit? The Republican proposal, beneficiaries, seniors, must obtain coverage through private insurers who may not participate, are not required to participate, and can offer vastly different benefits and premiums. In other words, the first step at trying to privatize Medicare.

What does my proposal do, the Democratic proposal? Medicare covers prescription drugs like other Medicare benefits, with guaranteed benefits, premiums and cost-sharing for all beneficiaries. Not a complicated formula. We do not try to privatize Medicare. We simply say that going to the pharmacy and getting your medicine ought to be treated just like going to the doctor and going to the hospital. It should be covered by Medicare.

Some people say, what about guaranteed fair drug prices? Under the Republican plan for a prescription drug benefit, private insurers, again, privatizing Medicare, negotiate separately on behalf of sub-sets of the Medicare population, diminishing the program's group negotiating power.

Believe me, there is nothing the drug manufacturers want more than to whittle this thing down into small groups. If we come at them with the entire Medicare population, they know we are going to demand the same kind of rebates that they provide the big HMOs and have for years. They know we are going to demand the same kind of rebates that State Medicaid programs, and, yes our Veterans Administration, gets. And why should we not? I am sick and tired of seeing our seniors in America subsidize the cost of health care in Canada and Mexico, and that is what we are doing.

What does the Democrat proposal do? It authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use the collective bargaining clout of all 40 million Medicare beneficiaries to negotiate fair drug prices. These reduced prices will be passed on to beneficiaries. And, yes, it is time we demanded the same kind of rebates from the big drug manufacturers that the State Medicaid pro-

grams and big HMOs have been getting for years. Those rebates should go directly to the Medicare trust fund to help fund this Medicare part D prescription drug benefit.

What about premiums? In the Republican plan, they will not put it on paper, but it is estimated to be \$35 a month. In the Democratic plan, it is in writing. It is \$25 a month. That is the premium that a senior would pay for this voluntary, but guaranteed, Medicare part D prescription drug benefit, should they choose to decide to sign up for it.

The deductible. The Republican proposal is \$250 a year; the Democratic proposal, \$100 a year. Again, just like going to the doctor and going to the hospital.

Coinsurance. Get ready for this. The Republican proposal makes filling a tax return out look simple. It will be very difficult for most seniors without hiring a CPA to figure out exactly what it is they qualify for and when they qualify for it.

The Republican plan calls for coinsurance of 20 percent for the first \$1,000; 50 percent for the next \$1,000; and 100 percent for all remaining spending up to \$4,500 a year. And then something, we are not sure what, but something will kick in again.

Now, think about that a minute. The first \$1,000, you are going to pay 20 percent out of pocket. Once you hit that \$1,000, it is going to 50 percent out of pocket. Once you have hit that second \$1,000, they are going to make you pay 100 percent on all remaining spending until you hit \$4,500 a year.

I can tell you seniors who live in my district trying to get by from Social Security check to Social Security check that averages less than \$600 a month with a \$400-a-month drug bill, they will not ever get to the \$4,500 because they simply cannot afford to pay for their medicine; and as a result, they are going without their medicine or they are not taking it properly.

□ 1645

I recently had a senior tell me she did not know what she would do without her son, who is in his 50s. She said he had a good job. He had a job where he had health insurance. It just so happened that he took the same medicine that she did. It was about 3 bucks a pill, and there was no way she could afford it. So he would get the medicine filled and give it to her. He was going without his medicine so his mom could have her medicine.

I can tell my colleagues story after story. I have driven 83,000 miles in the last 17 months in those 29 counties in South Arkansas and every day I am out there I hear numerous stories just like that about seniors who cannot afford their medicine or cannot afford to take it properly.

So what does the Republican plan do? It says you are going to pay 20 percent on the first \$1,000, and then for some reason, you are supposed to have more

money as a senior on a fixed income so you should be able to afford to pay 50 percent on the next \$1,000, and after that, you are on your own when you hit \$4,500 and then we will be back and we will kick in some more.

Folks, it is time we brought common sense to the United States Congress. This is not common sense.

What does the Democratic proposal do? It is just like going to the doctor or going to the hospital: Twenty percent copayment, period. That is it.

Out-of-pocket maximum. I mentioned the Republican out-of-pocket maximum is \$4,500 a year. Again, most seniors in my district can never get to the first \$4,500 because they cannot afford \$4,500 in out-of-pocket before some kind of so-called Medicare prescription drug benefit kicks in. The out-of-pocket maximum on the Democratic plan is \$2,000. And what that means is, every time you go to the pharmacy, well, first you are going to pay a \$100 annual deductible. After you have met that, you are going to pay 20 percent of the cost of medicine; Medicare will pay 80 percent of the cost of medicine. If you have a \$100 prescription, you are going to pay \$20, instead of \$100 like you are paying today. And once you have spent out of pocket \$2,000, then Medicare kicks in and pays the full price. That is significant. And that will help our seniors who need help the most.

Some people say, what about coverage gaps? The Republican proposal says this: Beneficiaries who need more than \$2,000 worth of drugs must pay 100 percent out of pocket, but keep paying the premiums until they reach the \$4,500 out-of-pocket cap. Again, our seniors cannot afford this. They will continue to do like many of them are doing today, and that is to go without their medicine, or not take it properly.

What about coverage gaps in the Democratic plan, my plan? Beneficiaries always have coverage. There are no gaps. It is not more complicated to figure out than an IRS tax form. It is plain and simple, \$25 a month annual premium, \$100 annual deductible. After that, every time you go to the pharmacy, you pay 20 percent, Medicare pays 80 percent. And after you have been out \$2,000 a year total, Medicare kicks in at 100 percent. Nothing complicated. You will not have to hire a CPA to figure it out. You will not wonder from month to month what you do and do not qualify for and what your copay will and will not be. It will always be the same. Again, it is structured just like going to the doctor and going to the hospital is under Medicare.

Some ask about access to local pharmacies. I have to tell my colleagues, the Republican plan allows these private plans to limit which pharmacies participate in their network. There may be a senior that has used the same pharmacy for 60 years and, all of a sudden, under the Republican plan, you are going to be told that you have to use mail order, or that you have to use

a pharmacy in another town or on the other end of town.

Under my plan, the Democratic plan believes in providing you with the freedom to choose any pharmacy willing to play by the Medicare rules and accept the rate of reimbursement that is established, not by that pharmacy, but by Medicare, can participate, just like Medicare is with going to the doctor and going to the hospital. If those providers or doctors and hospitals agree to participate under the rules and regulations and fees set forth by Medicare, then you have the freedom to choose. The same thing here with the Democratic plan. Our plan does not tell you which pharmacy you must use. We let the senior decide.

Some people say, what about access to prescribed medicines? Well, the Republican proposal says that private insurers can establish strict formularies and deny any coverage for all formulary drugs. Now, what does that mean? Well, I can tell my colleagues what it means. I have allergies and I have to take a nasal spray and my doctor wrote it for one brand. I got to the pharmacy to get it filled and they wanted to charge me a higher copay or deductible, copayment. They wanted to charge me a higher copayment if I stuck with the brand that I wanted, but if I would go to the preferred brand, my copayment would almost be cut in half, meaning my out-of-pocket would be cut almost in half. Well, I got to looking and, guess what? They wanted to switch me to a drug that as a pharmacy owner, it costs me \$10 more.

Now, why in the world would a health insurance company in the business of making a profit want to punish me for going with the cheaper drug and reward me for going with the higher priced drug? The answer, unfortunately, is quite simple. Because the rebates on the more expensive drug that that health insurance company is receiving from the drug manufacturer are so huge. We are going to continue to see that game played under the Republican proposal because, again, it creates formularies and if there is not a kickback being afforded on a drug to these private insurers, again, privatizing Medicare, then under their proposal, the drug your doctor wants you to have will not be covered.

I am sick and tired of seeing health insurance companies, prescription benefit managers, accountants, bean counters, trying to play doctor. If the doctor says you need a particular drug, I think that is the drug you ought to get, and under the Democratic proposal, that is what happens. Beneficiaries have coverage for any drug their doctor prescribes, period. Under the Democratic proposal, whatever your doctor says you need is what you are going to get, not some complicated formulary based on who is kicking back to who how much, as the Republican proposal provides.

Low-income protections. Under the Republican proposal, low-income bene-

ficiaries may have to pay \$2 or \$5 as a copayment and 100 percent of costs in the coverage gap. Drugs may be denied if the beneficiary cannot afford this cost-sharing.

Under my plan, the Democratic plan, here is what we say about low-income seniors. There is no cost-sharing or premiums. When I talked about paying a 20 percent copayment, when I talked about paying the premium of \$25 a month, we waived that if you live up to 150 percent of poverty, and then there is a sliding scale for premiums phased in between 150 and 175 percent of poverty. So if you live in poverty, under the Democratic plan, you get your medicine, no 20 percent copay, no premium. Under the Republican plan, they are still going to require you to pay \$2 or \$5. Again, it is a complicated formula on what you have to do under one set of rules.

These are huge differences, I say to my colleagues, between these two proposals. The Republican plan again caters to the big drug manufacturers.

The Washington Post, June 19, 2002. A senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday that Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of PhRMA to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies.

Again, as a conservative Democrat, I have crossed that aisle and I have voted with the Republican Members of this body as much as any Member of this Congress has done. When they are right, I will stand with them. As a small town family pharmacy owner, as someone who served on the State Senate public health committee for 8 years back home in Arkansas, as someone who has a 90-year-old grandmother back home who lives from Social Security check to Social Security check, I can tell my colleagues that when it comes to the need to provide our seniors with a prescription drug benefit, they are dead wrong. You cannot side with the big drug manufacturers and still come down on the side of seniors. You have to choose.

Now, the Republican national leadership decided we were going home early today so they could go get all dressed up for their big fund-raiser tonight that is being sponsored by these drug manufacturers while at the same time we are sitting here in the United States Congress simply asking for a hearing on our bill, a bill that I helped write, that will truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors. And they are out wining and dining with the big drug manufacturers at a fund-raiser to benefit the Republican Party on the night following one of the most comprehensive hearings and markups to ever occur as it relates to the need to modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are being debated and written as we speak in the House Committee on Ways and Means and in the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. I have to tell my colleagues, I am very disappointed to see

this article today and to see what is going on in this Congress.

This should not be about the drug manufacturers. It should be about standing up to the big drug manufacturers and standing with our seniors. It is not that complicated, and the Republican plan tries to complicate it. It is more complicated than filling out a tax return. Our seniors do not need any more complications in their lives. They do not need politics in their lives. They simply need a Medicare prescription drug benefit that allows them to get their medicine just like Medicare allows them to go to the doctor and to go to the hospital.

I am very concerned about how this proposal by the Republicans privatizes Medicare. The Republican bill forces seniors to obtain coverage through private drug-only insurance plans or HMOs. It is not a true Medicare benefit like parts A or B where all seniors are guaranteed a defined set of benefits at a uniform price.

Under their bill, there will be no universal Medicare-sponsored prescription drug plan. The Republican bill moves Medicare towards a defined contribution program with the ultimate goal of turning Medicare over to the private insurance market. I, for one, think that would be a huge mistake, and so do so many other senior organizations that have endorsed my bill that takes on the big drug manufacturers, that holds the big drug manufacturers accountable, and provides our seniors with a meaningful Medicare part D voluntary, but guaranteed, prescription drug benefit.

However, do not just take my word for it. Listen to what others are saying.

□ 1700

"I'm very skeptical that 'drug only' private plans would develop." That comes from Bill Gradison, former Republican Congressman and former president of the Health Insurance Association of America.

States have tried to get the private insurers into the business of providing seniors with a prescription drug coverage. Who is going to buy the plans? Those who have the high drug bills. If one does not need drugs and is on a fixed income, one is not going to buy the plan. That is why the plan will not work. The premiums will exceed, if not cost as much as, the cost for the medicine.

With regard to the proposal to rely on private drug entities for drug benefits, "There is a risk of repeating the HMO experience." We all know the HMO experience did not work. They tried that. We have been there; we have done that. They are all getting out of the drug business, and they are all getting out of the Medicare business. That quote comes from John C. Rother, policy director of AARP, formerly known as the American Association of Retired Persons.

With regard to whether private insurance plans would participate in the Re-

publican Medicare drug plan: "I don't think it's impossible, but the odds are against it." That is Richard A. Barasch, chairman of Universal American Financial Corporation of Rye Brook, New York, which sells MediGap coverage to 400,000 people.

When asked if they favor being placed at financial risk, as the Republican plan requires, "We are not enthusiastic about that approach," says Thomas M. Boudreau, senior vice president and general counsel of Express Scripts.

With regard to their experience with accepting financial risk for providing drug benefits: "We are typically paid a fee, generally less than \$1, for each claim. But we do not bear financial risk." That is Blair Jackson, spokesman for AdvancePCS, one of the outfits that the Republican plan calls to help run this attempt at privatizing Medicare.

I hope each and every Member of the United States Congress will put politics aside, read the Republican plan on modernizing Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, read my bill, the Democratic bill that will truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, and compare them.

If they do that, I think they will agree with me that it is time for us to put politics aside. It is time for the Republicans to stop siding with the big drug manufacturers. Let us hope tonight's fundraiser that is hosted by the big drug manufacturers, that they do not belly up to the trough with the big drug manufacturers, trying to raise money in the middle of a debate on something so lifesaving and so important for our seniors.

It is time for this Congress to unite behind the need to provide our seniors with a prescription drug benefit, just as we have united on this war against terrorism. So I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: read my plan and read the Democratic plan. Read their plan. Then do what is right, not by the big drug manufacturers, but by our seniors.

Again, from The Washington Post, look it up, June 19, 2002: "A senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday that Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies. These same drug manufacturers are hosting a multi-million dollar fundraiser this very night for the Republican Party." That is from The Washington Post.

I am appalled by that. It is time for the Republicans to make a choice. Are they going to continue to side with the big drug manufacturers, or are they going to side with our seniors? I encourage them to stretch across this aisle and endorse my bill, the Democratic bill, that gives the help to our seniors, America's Greatest Generation, that they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just want to tell the gentleman what a great job he has been doing on this Special Order in pointing out what the Republican leadership is up to.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to back up what the gentleman is saying. I see he has that quote from the Washington Post: "A senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday the Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies."

I just came from the markup in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and I can assure the gentleman the quote he had up there is absolutely true. We just broke at exactly 10 minutes to 5 because the Republican leadership on the committee admitted that they were going to that fundraiser tonight. The chairman actually held up the ticket for the fundraiser, and said, maybe you guys want to join us at the fundraiser tonight. So there is absolutely no question that the reason that we could not even finish the bill today was because they had to run, the Republicans on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, had to run to this fundraiser tonight.

I do not know if the gentleman went through it, and some of these companies are even in my district, but I just have to give the gentleman a little information on that same Washington Post article.

It says: "Drug companies, in particular, have made a rich investment in tonight's event. Robert Ingram, GlaxoSmithKlein PLC's chief operating officer, is the chief corporate fundraiser for the gala; his company gave at least \$250,000. Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, that is PhRMA itself, the trade group funded by drug companies, kicked in \$250,000, too. PhRMA, as it is best known inside the Beltway, is also helping to underwrite a television ad campaign. . . ."

Basically, just what they did, just in terms of the Committee on Commerce today, they spent the last month, PhRMA and the other brand name drugs, financing this \$4 million to \$5 million TV ad campaign telling everybody how the Republican prescription drug proposal, when it came forward, would be the best thing we have ever seen since apple pie, okay?

Then they bring the bill up this week, we had it in committee today, and they have the fundraiser tonight, and they have to break the committee to go to the fundraiser. Then they are going to take that money from the fundraiser tonight, which is mostly soft money, as the gentleman knows, and they are going to use it putting on ads telling them how great the Republican members are because they voted

for the Republican plan, and how bad the Democrats are because they did not vote for it. That is what this is all about.

Today when the Democrats on the Committee on Energy and Commerce were trying to make amendments, we were told the amendments were not germane. The reason was very simple. First of all, they did not want us to have a long debate, because they had to get to the fundraiser. Secondly, since they have already decided what the bill is going to have, because it is essentially written by the pharmaceuticals, they do not want to change the bill. They already have the TV ads running saying how great the bill is. They cannot change it, because if they do, it will not be what they are saying they are going to do.

There was absolutely no way for the Democrats or anyone who had any questions about this Republican legislation to have any significant input today. I am sure tomorrow is going to be the same.

I just want to go through a little more here. I am going to turn to page A 5 in this same article that the gentleman has been talking about, just to give a little more idea, because I do not want to just mention three or four drug companies. There are quite a few.

It goes on here to say that "Pfizer, Inc., contributed at least \$100,000 to the event, enough to earn the company the status of a vice-chairman for the dinner. Ely Lilly and company, Bayer, and Merck and Company each paid up to \$50,000 to sponsor a table. Republican officials said other drug companies donated money as part of the fundraiser extravaganza."

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, we are referencing Republican sources here. These are not Democrats saying this; these are Republicans. As I said, they do not have any shame, any shame whatsoever about saying that this whole effort on the Republican side is totally bankrolled by the drug companies.

To give another idea, we had a discussion at the very end of the day, before they broke at 5 for their fundraiser, where we pointed out that all the things that they are saying about the Republican bill, like the Republicans that were here last night during a Special Order, and the gentleman may have seen them, they were saying that the bill is a Medicare benefit.

The only way it is a Medicare benefit is because the seniors over 65 are the ones that theoretically are targeted. It is not actually a benefit under Medicare. It is not a government program. It is a program that gives money to private insurance companies, hoping that they will provide some meager benefit.

Then we had questions in the Committee on Energy and Commerce today that said, well, the Republicans suggest that this program has a \$45 premium, that it has a \$250 deductible,

that it is going to pay a certain amount of money for the drug benefit; but then when asked, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who is the ranking Democrat, he said, show us in the Republican bill, because we finally do have the bill now, where it says that the premium is only \$35, where it says that the deductible is only \$250, where it says that the Federal Government is going to pay for a certain amount of the drug benefit.

There is nothing in the bill. The counsel for the committee admitted that was all speculation based on CBO estimates. In other words, they tell the CBO that they are going to throw a certain amount of money to the private insurance companies, and what do they think is likely to happen if they do that? Then they come back and say, well, maybe the premium would be about \$35 a month, or that the deductible would be \$250. But there is no guarantee that the deductible in New Jersey is \$250 or that the premium in Arkansas is \$35. It could be \$85 in Arkansas. It could be \$150 in Nevada. There is absolutely nothing in the bill, in the Republican bill, that guarantees any kind of benefit, because it is all up to what the private insurance companies want to do.

Then I asked, well, they keep talking about how they are going to have lower prices. Last night on the floor, the Republicans who did the Special Order said they are going to lower prices for drugs. I said, where is that in the bill? The Republican bill, the language says that the private insurers can negotiate lower prices, that they can provide discounts, but they may, they may negotiate, they may provide discounts, or they may pass on those discounts to seniors, but there is nothing that requires them to do so. Why in the world would we believe that they would? I have no reason to believe that they would.

This is the most or the biggest scam that I have ever seen. I do not understand how our colleagues can even suggest that they are providing any kind of benefit at all.

I do not want to keep going. I will yield back to the gentleman, but I assure the gentleman that what he has been saying, because I have been listening to some of it with one ear, is absolutely coming to fruition, particularly that quote about making sure that the Republicans' prescription drug plan suits drug companies.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, maybe we can visit a little bit about this, because it is so important. I want to make sure we use every second of every minute that is afforded to us to visit here in the United States House of Representatives about an issue that literally, for many seniors, is life or death.

It is just unfortunate to me that we have two proposals, one that sides with the big drug manufacturers, that being the Republican proposal, and one that sides with our seniors, that being the Democratic proposal.

Why can this Congress not unite on the need to modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, just as we have united on the war against terrorism? I have tried to do that. It is H.R. 3626. The gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), a Republican, and I wrote a bill; and yet the Republican national leadership, they are in the majority, they decide what bills get a hearing, what bills get a vote in committee and on the floor. For months I have begged, I have pleaded for our bill, a bipartisan bill, to get a hearing and to get a vote.

If the majority party, those who call the shots, decide what gets voted on and when, what gets heard in committee and when, if they really care about this issue, really care about helping our seniors, and if what their rhetoric is is more than just election-year politics, and it is really wanting to do the right thing and modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, why did they not let the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and I get a hearing on that bill?

Much of that bill is now incorporated into the Democratic proposal. I am a Democrat and my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, is a Democrat. But do not take our word for it. I challenge anyone to go to their hometown and visit their hometown pharmacist. Ask their pharmacist which proposal is best for America, which proposal is best for our seniors. Every single time they will tell us that the Democrats are right on this issue. They may tell us that the Democrats are not always right on every issue; but they will tell Members, according to the Gallop poll, the most trusted profession in America, pharmacist, and again, I am not one, my wife is, but they will tell us that on this issue the Democrats are right and the Republicans and the big drug manufacturers are dead wrong.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding further, and again, his comments are so appropriate.

Process-wise, let me tell the gentleman, we got the Republican bill 24 hours ago. We have never had a hearing on the Republican bill. We went straight to markup. The first thing they started to do was to amend their own bill. Before we even had an opportunity to digest the initial bill, they were making amends to the bill.

So the process that the Republicans are using on this is just outrageous because nobody knows what is going on. We literally have to read the bill and amendments as we are sitting there in the committee.

But the gentleman talked about a possible compromise or a consensus, a bipartisan effort.

□ 1715

I have no doubt that that could be done, but the will is not there on the Republican side. I have been critical of the Republican proposal because it is

not a very generous proposal. In other words, even if everything they speculate was true and they were going to have a \$35-a-month premium and they were going to have a \$250 deductible, at least it would be something if it was under Medicare and it was guaranteed.

I would suggest if the Republican leadership wanted to say, okay, we will put in a bill that has these benefits, and that has these premiums and these deductibles but it is part of the Medicare program and it is guaranteed to everyone around the country, then I think we could sit down, and we could compromise because the Democrats have a much more generous plan, and the Republican plan is pretty meager, but we could figure out the differences between the two and maybe strike a consensus or strike a compromise.

What I have been saying and I have said all along and continue to say that the problem with the Republican proposal is that it is not real. It is not a Medicare proposal. It is not providing a Medicare benefit. There is no guarantee anyone is ever going to get the benefit, not to mention the fact that it does nothing to lower prices.

So the problem here is the Republicans are not being real. They are not giving us a Medicare proposal. They are not giving us something that we can say, okay, let us see where we are going to go and we will compromise and we will come up with the amount of the benefit and what it is going to mean. No, no, no. What we are doing here is just the same old thing we saw 2 years ago with the Republican leadership. Throw some money to private insurance companies, and I really think that what they are up to is that they really do not want any bill to pass. In other words, the pharmaceuticals, the statement that was made there about a Republican drug plan that suits drug companies, essentially the pharmaceuticals do not want any benefit because they like the status quo. They like the fact that they continue to raise prices, that they continue to make big profits, that they continue to get tax breaks.

I do not think that they and the Republican leadership really want to come up with a bill that would pass here, pass in the other body and be signed by the President, because it would be very easy. Like the gentleman said, he had cooperation with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON). It would be very easy to put something down on paper that we could all agree on, but the leadership on the other side does not want to do that.

I am convinced from what I saw today they just do not want to do it. They do not want any bill to pass ultimately and go to the President.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleague for the last 17 months that I have had the privilege to serve and be a voice for the people of Arkansas' 4th Congressional District here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I have begged, I have

pleaded, I have scratched, I have crawled to try and get a hearing on my first bill, H.R. 3626. I could not get a hearing on that. Now I am pleased to be one of four of the original lead sponsors on this new plan which incorporates much of what was in my earlier bill.

It is like all we get from the other side of the aisle is a lot of games. We get a lot of games on the need to truly modernize Medicare, to include medicine for our seniors, and that is so unfortunate.

First out of the chute was this idea that what our seniors needed was a discount prescription drug card, a discount card, like it was some new novel concept. My dad got one in the mail for free 6 months ago. A person can watch any cable TV program late at night and for \$7.95 a month they can get one.

Why do they want to push a discount card? Because any savings which averages 50 cents to \$3 came at the expense of a hometown family pharmacy and did not cost the big drug manufacturers a dime.

A senior that has \$400 a month in drug costs and takes five prescriptions a month, even if they save \$3 per prescription, which is the best some do with these so-called discount prescription drug cards, \$3 a month savings, five prescriptions, that means on a \$400 drug bill they would save \$15 a month. That does not help a senior choose between buying their medicine, buying their groceries, paying their light bill and paying their rent.

Thank God when we created Medicare we did not say here is a discount card, go cut a deal at the local doctor or go cut a deal for whatever surgery someone needed. We provided them a meaningful health care benefit, and it is time we did the same when it comes to their medicine.

I am pleased to be joined by another one of my colleagues here this evening, and at this time I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I have been listening to the comments that he has been making and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and all of the work that he has done about this. I think it is obviously an extremely critical issue for citizens all over this country who are speaking out at every meeting that I go to as it being one of the most important things in their lives.

We have been working on some mechanism to assist people to get access to pharmaceuticals that they cannot afford to purchase for a long time, and we have heard unbelievable stories about people who have foregone payment of rent or purchase of food in order to buy the medicines that their doctors and other health care professionals are telling them that they have to have in order to stay healthy. Well, if a person does not eat and they do not have a decent place in which to stay

and they are buying medicine, the chances are they are going to have other kinds of problems in their life, and it is a terrible decision to have to make.

I know firsthand what some of those difficulties are. My own mother is 92 years old and is in reasonably good health right now, but unfortunately, has had problems like many elderly citizens have. She has people to help take care of her. Hopefully, she is not going to be one of those who will die in poverty, but at the same time, she expects dignity, and I think that is one of the most important things that I learned in the White House Conference on Aging a number of years ago in 1995, that people would like to be able to live out their lives with independence and with dignity.

We are going to be judged in this country and everywhere in the world about how we treat our elderly, and the youngest of us among us, but the elderly particularly, and if we wad our people up and throw them away after they are no longer productive, shame on us, and we will be paying for that for an eternity, and I certainly hope that we do not.

We need what the drug companies do for us. We need their research. We need their development. We need the ability to stay healthy, and we know they are going to be providing it. I think it is incumbent upon this House of Representatives, this government, to find a mechanism to allow people to have access to that help that they need, and our program that works through the Medicare system will give people an opportunity to have a higher quality of health and consequently a longer life because of it.

It reaches out to a significantly larger number of people than what other plans that are before the House of Representatives are doing. I think that the basic difference, at least in the way of my mind, in how we see this issue is how we are going to go about implementing this program.

I know that our time is short. Let me turn it back to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), my friend and colleague, and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), for coming over and spending the last hour with me as we talk about the differences, and that is what makes our democracy so great, that we are able to sit here in a democracy, stand here in a democracy in our Nation's capital and talk about the differences in the Democratic and Republican plan to offer a prescription drug benefit for seniors.

I would just close by simply encouraging my colleagues to go back home to their districts this weekend, stop by as many local pharmacies as my colleagues want to, chain pharmacies, any kind of pharmacy they want to go to, does not matter if it is home-owned or

if it is a chain, stop and talk to a pharmacist. I do not know if they are a Democrat or a Republican, show them what is included in the Republican plan, show them what is included in the Democratic plan, and every single time I can assure my colleagues they are going to tell them that the Republican plan must have been written by the big drug manufacturers and that the Democratic plan must have been written by our seniors.

Do not take our word for it. Regardless of my colleagues' party affiliation, go talk to the hometown family pharmacist. Talk to the pharmacist. Ask them who is right on this issue.

---

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

---

□ 1804

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3009, TRADE ACT OF 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-518) on the resolution (H. Res. 450) relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LINDER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 2:00 p.m. on account of qualifying for the Georgia congressional ballot.

Mr. MCHUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 3:00 p.m. on account of official business.

---

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ISAKSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISAKSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LOFGREN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 2002, at 10 a.m.

---

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7463. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department of the Air Force intends to award a multiyear contract for C-17 aircraft to the Boeing Company in FY 2003, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2306b(i)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7464. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2002 report entitled "International Cooperative Research and Development Program," pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7465. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's five-year plan for the manufacturing technology (ManTech) program, as required by subsection 2521 (e) of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7466. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2001, required under section 509(k) of title 32, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7467. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on Fiscal Year 2001 Funds

Obligated in Support of the Procurement of a Vaccine for the Biological Agent Anthrax; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7468. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; NAFTA Procurement Threshold [DFARS Case 2002-D007] received May 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7469. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the annual report to Congress outlining observed trends in the cost and availability of retail banking services; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7470. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Affordable Housing Program Amendments [No. 2002-15] (RIN: 3069-AB14) received May 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7471. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Office of Finance Board of Directors Meetings [No. 2002-16] (RIN: 3069-AB15) received May 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the second annual Trafficking in Persons Report; to the Committee on International Relations.

7473. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Western Balkans Transactions Regulations — received May 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7474. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the report required by the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 describing the current conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States as of March 31, 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

7475. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7476. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the FY 2001 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7477. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Brokerage Loans and Lines of Credit [Notice 2002-8] received May 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7478. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oklahoma Regulatory Program [OK-029-FOR] received May 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7479. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Technical Amendments to Qualified Trust Model Certificates Privacy and Paperwork Notices (RIN: 3209-AA00) received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7480. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80A, CF6-80C2, and CF6-80E1 Series

Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-49-AD; Amendment 39-12707; AD 2002-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7481. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321, A330, and A340 Series Airplanes Equipped With Certain Thales Avionics Digital Distance and Radio Magnetic Indicators (DDRMIs) [Docket No. 2002-NM-80-AD, Amendment 39-12724; AD 2002-06-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7482. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-31 Airplane [Docket No. 2002-NM-37-AD; Amendment 39-12717; AD 2002-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2002; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7483. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, and -700C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-12727; AD 2002-08-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7484. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No. 98-ANE-39-AD; Amendment 39-12668; AD 2002-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7485. A letter from the Trial Attorney, FRA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Changes To Conform to New DOT Transportation Workplace Testing Procedures [Docket No. FRA 2000-8583; Notice 49] (RIN: 2130-AB43) received June 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7486. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Amendment to the Customs Regulations: Reusable Shipping Devices Arriving From Canada and Mexico [T.D. 02-28] received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7487. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guidelines Construction/Real Estate Industry — received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7488. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Paul Pekar v. Commissioner [T.C. Dkt. No. 15289-97] received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7489. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Notice and Opportunity for Hearing before Levy [TD 8980] (RIN: 1545-AW90) received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7490. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule — Prohibited Transactions — Proposed Class Exemption and the Voluntary Fiduciary Correction Program (Announcement 2002-31) received May 21, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7491. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the proposed plan for the U.S. Army Communications — Electronics Command (CECOM) Research, Development, and Engineering Community (RDEC), have been approved under authority of the National Defense Authority Acts for Fiscal Years 1995 and 2001; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

7492. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of an approved proposal for the U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM), under authority of the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 1995 and 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 4703(b)(4)(B); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

7493. A letter from the Controller, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting recommendations for Statutory and Administrative Changes Under the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform, Ways and Means, Resources, and Financial Services.

7494. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund annual report and the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund annual report, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Resources, and Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 450. Resolution relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-518). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 4961. A bill to establish a National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 4962. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make rural health care improvements under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island,

Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HORN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 4963. A bill to provide for the expansion and coordination of activities of the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to research and programs on cancer survivorship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 4964. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial to slavery, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. HART, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 4965. A bill to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 4966. A bill to improve the conservation and management of coastal and ocean resources by reenacting and clarifying provisions of a reorganization plan authorizing the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 4967. A bill to establish new non-immigrant classes for border commuter students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 4968. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands in Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. RIVERS):

H.R. 4969. A bill to authorize funding for the development, launch, and operation of a Synthetic Aperture Radar satellite in support of a national energy policy; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 122: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 257: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 267: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 321: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 488: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 498: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 699: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 792: Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 950: Mr. TURNER.

- H.R. 1038: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1184: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 1296: Mr. POMBO and Mr. PHELPS.
- H.R. 1451: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 1475: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 1487: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1494: Ms. KILPATRICK.
- H.R. 1733: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. SCOTT.
- H.R. 1811: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. FROST.
- H.R. 1864: Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 1962: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 2117: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HONDA, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 2118: Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 2173: Mr. DEUTSCH.
- H.R. 2219: Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 2284: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2364: Ms. RIVERS.
- H.R. 2466: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
- H.R. 2490: Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 2521: Mrs. MORELLA.
- H.R. 2570: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DEUTSCH.
- H.R. 2974: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
- H.R. 3006: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
- H.R. 3034: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. WATSON.
- H.R. 3109: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 3132: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. PELOSI.
- H.R. 3185: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 3192: Mr. FARR of California.
- H.R. 3388: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 3464: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 3469: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
- H.R. 3496: Mr. KING.
- H.R. 3585: Mr. BENTSEN.
- H.R. 3630: Mr. BOYD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 3673: Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 3686: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. HALL of Texas.
- H.R. 3747: Ms. PELOSI.
- H.R. 3771: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. SWEENEY.
- H.R. 3814: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. LAMPSON.
- H.R. 3831: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. FORD.
- H.R. 3834: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 3880: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. MCNULTY.
- H.R. 3884: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KIND, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 3973: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 3995: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. SCHAFFER.
- H.R. 4013: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 4014: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 4018: Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 4026: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
- H.R. 4032: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 4042: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 4043: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 4066: Mr. HILL.
- H.R. 4122: Mr. SCHAFFER.
- H.R. 4205: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 4256: Mr. PICKERING.
- H.R. 4483: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 4582: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. OSBORNE.
- H.R. 4600: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. ISAKSON.
- H.R. 4601: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WU, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
- H.R. 4622: Mrs. CUBIN.
- H.R. 4623: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WICKER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MOORE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
- H.R. 4635: Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 4643: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 4665: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 4667: Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 4738: Mr. BLUNT.
- H.R. 4742: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
- H.R. 4743: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
- H.R. 4785: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 4795: Mr. HANSEN and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
- H.R. 4803: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. FARR of California.
- H.R. 4810: Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 4837: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 4843: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. LAHOOD.
- H.R. 4851: Mr. ISTOOK.
- H.R. 4854: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4864: Mr. PENCE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 4865: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. ROEMER.
- H.R. 4916: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
- H.R. 4937: Mr. HONDA, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 4950: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. BLUNT.
- H.R. 4954: Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. UPTON, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BASS, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
- H.J. Res. 23: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
- H.J. Res. 31: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
- H. Con. Res. 345: Mr. SCHAFFER.
- H. Con. Res. 355: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H. Con. Res. 408: Mr. CARDIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H. Res. 436: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 3686: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.