

We hope we can count on you to take up the cause. If you would like to show your support to our troops by sending letters, cards and care packages, it would be most appreciated. May you know you have no need to worry, for our service members have your back covered. Sleep well.

I want to repeat that. "May you know," may you know, "that you," you, "have no need to worry, because our service members," our men in the military forces, "have your back covered."

These are the kind of letters that, in my opinion, express what is so, so fundamentally important about this country. This Nation truly is the lead country in the world, closely followed by many of our allies like the British, as a country that believes in freedom but understands that freedom requires sacrifice, freedom requires a price.

Look at what that says for a Nation like ours, when we have young people, voluntarily, voluntarily join our armed forces to make sure that the people that are not on the front line but that are home will get to enjoy security, liberty, justice for all, freedom.

Think about it. It is so important that the time has come for people to put down their signs of protest and raise their signs with simply two words: "Thank you." Thank you. It would not be too much to ask of Martin Sheen to take the tape off his mouth that he had on there yesterday. It wouldn't take too much to ask those people in San Francisco carrying a big banner that says "support our troops, shoot their officers," it would not be asking too much of those people to put down their sign and replace it with a sign that simply says "thank you." It would go a long, long ways.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of you, all of you, say a prayer to whatever supreme being you believe in, say a prayer for these men and women that are standing on the front line so the rest of us can be back here and feel secure. They are there for the right reason. They are there on a mission. They will accomplish their mission. It is not going to be done in 7 days. There will be casualties. In war, you have good days and you have bad days. You have good days and you have bad days.

A weakening of our resilience, a weakening of our resilience, those of us not on the front line, those of us back in this country, that weakening will be sensed by these people. We cannot allow our resolve to weaken. We must stay strong, as we have, and we must send our prayers and our hopes to these young men and women over on that front line.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, once again, I would be awful proud of Martin Sheen and Sean Penn and many of those other people, Julia Roberts, the Dixie Chicks, people like that, I would be awfully proud of them if, just for a change, they would carry that sign that said "thank you."

#### KEEP TITLE IX INTACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, about 30,000 women played college sports. Today, that number has increased by more than 500 percent.

In 1972, about 200,000 girls played high school sports. Today, that number has increased by more than 80 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that women and girls have more opportunity today than they did 30 years ago. That is not because they have more interest than they used to, and it is not because they have more ability than they used to. The increased opportunities are attributable to one law, Title IX.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is the Federal law that prohibits sex discrimination in education. It states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

In essence, Title IX requires schools and colleges receiving Federal funds to give women and girls equal athletic opportunities, including athletic scholarships, equipment, coaching and facilities, among other benefits.

Unfortunately, Title IX has come under assault. Those who favor changing Title IX argue, mistakenly, that it has led to the disappearance of athletic opportunities for male athletes. While both sides of the debate over Title IX athletics policies agree that they should allow for gender parity and overall fairness in sports, the real question that begs to be answered is, what constitutes fairness?

For those who wanted to alter Title IX and how it has been implemented, fairness means that male athletes should have a monopoly over opportunities and resources for their programs, regardless of how underfunded or non-existent similar programs for female athletes may be.

For these challengers to Title IX, it is fair that, while more women than men attend college, only 42 percent of all college athletes are women. For them, it is fair that females currently receive 1.1 million fewer, 41 percent, opportunities at the high school level and 58,000 fewer, 38 percent, opportunities at the college level than do their male counterparts.

This ill-conceived notion of fairness that opponents of Title IX put forth justifies the fact that men currently receive \$133 million more than women in athletic scholarships. Division I-A colleges and universities allocate on average 71 percent of their scholarship money for men's athletics, and their recruiting dollars for male athletes double those spent on female athletes.

Opponents of Title IX charge that the law takes money and opportunities away from men's athletics. What these people fail to realize is that Title IX does not deprive men of athletic resources. The real problem is that the resources that male athletes receive are distributed inequitably among men's sports.

Take these statistics, for example. Football and men's basketball consume 72 percent of the total men's athletic operating budget at Division I institutions, leaving other men's sports to compete for the remaining funds.

Sixty-eight percent of the increased expenditures for men's Division I-A sports programs from 1998 to the Year 2000 went to football alone. The increase for football exceeded the entire operating budget for women's Division I sports in 2000 by over \$1.69 million.

What is more, large football and basketball programs are not as revenue producing as Title IX proponents claim. The vast majority of NCAA football and men's basketball programs spend more money than they bring in. In fact, 64 percent of Division I and II football programs do not generate enough money to pay for themselves, much less any other sports. In 1999, these programs reported annual deficits averaging \$1 million for Division I-A athletics.

Now, do not get me wrong, I love football, and I graduated from the University of Kentucky, so I love basketball. I just do not believe that our little girls should be denied the opportunity to play sports so that football teams can dip from a bottomless fount of funds.

Opponents of Title IX not only feel that this gross imbalance is fair, but they oppose any efforts to salvage the progress that has been made. It bothers me deeply that opponents of Title IX say that male athletes are treated unfairly. Although 30 years of progress since Title IX have seen sports participation for males and females grow, female athletes are still not treated equitably.

I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor House Resolution 137, expressing the sense of Congress that changes to Title IX athletic policies contradict the spirit of athletic equality and gender parity and should not be implemented and that Title IX should be kept intact.

My resolution has been signed by both Republicans and Democrats, by men and women.

□ 1530

It is receiving this wide support for one simple reason: it is the right thing to do. Most Americans know that it is the right thing to do. A Gallup poll in early January reported that seven out of 10 adults who understood the law supported keeping title IX intact and rejecting any changes. In fact, a Wall Street Journal poll from January found that 66 percent of Americans go so far as to favor cutting men's teams

in order to ensure equal athletics opportunities for women.

Any changes to title IX must be rejected on their face because tinkering with the law in any way implies that title IX does not work and that it needs improvement.

I come from the "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" school; and, Mr. Speaker, title IX is not broken. Title IX has been the dam that holds back gender discrimination in educational programs for 30 years, allowing millions of young women the opportunity to pursue goals of which their predecessors, including me, could only dream.

I am standing here to defend the integrity of this landmark civil rights law because it is the right thing to do, but I also rise in honor of my dear friend and beloved colleague, Patsy Mink. In 1972 Patsy helped to enact title IX and in honor of her valiant work, Congress renamed title IX the "Patsy Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act." She would be standing right here beside me if she were alive today. She struggled for 30 years to protect educational equity for men and women, and it is the memory of the beautiful legacy that she left behind that we must not give up on the fight to preserve equality for women.

Opponents of title IX are trying to redefine what America sees as fair. As a consistent defender of gender equality and protection of equal rights for all of our citizens, male and female, I am outraged by this particular brand of fairness. Patsy would have been outraged as well, and she would not have tolerated it.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me with our Republican and Democratic friends who support this legislation as we all fight to preserve the integrity of this landmark law. Please cosponsor this title IX resolution for Patsy Mink, for our Nation's girls, and for the sake of equality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for title IX. As my colleagues may know, title IX is facing sharp criticism from the Bush administration for being discriminatory. Despite the overwhelming successes and support that title IX enjoys, Secretary Rod Paige created the Commission on Opportunity and Athletics to determine whether this measure needs to be updated for the 21st century. The commission's recommendations could result in the loss of thousands of slots on teams for female athletes and millions of scholarship dollars.

Donna de Varona and Julie Foudy, Olympic Gold medalists and members of the commission, refused to sign the proposed changes to title IX. In their minority report, Foudy and de Varona cited various problems in the commission's process, including the omission of representatives of high school athletics, failure to examine potential remedies for discrimination against women and girls, and profound imbalance

of viewpoints in panelist testimonies. Even though Secretary Paige said he would not consider certain controversial proposals to alter the landmark legislation, there is growing concern over his sincerity, since he did not withdraw the recommendation to use interest surveys to estimate how many girls are available to participate in sports. Both de Varona and Foudy withdrew their support of this proposal.

There is concern from the Bush administration that title IX has adversely affected men's sports programs, such as gymnastics and wrestling. However, these sports faced the greatest decline since 1982 and 1992, when there was little enforcement of title IX. There are reports that programs such as football and men's basketball take more than their fair share of the athletic budget, leaving insufficient funds for other sports, regardless of gender.

When rethinking title IX, we must go back to its original purpose, and that is to ensure that "no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." I support, Mr. Speaker, equal opportunity for both sexes and believe resources can be allocated under title IX to both male and female athletic programs in an equitable manner.

Title IX does not apply solely to athletics. It includes access to educational programs too. Title IX and the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 have opened doors for women seeking a college or postgraduate degree. In 1972, the year title IX was signed, women earned just 7 percent of all law degrees. By 1997 they received 44 percent. Five years after title IX was signed, women earned only 9 percent of all medical degrees. But because of title IX, 41 percent received medical degrees.

So we see title IX indeed can work.

Education is the key to a better life, and title IX has greatly aided a woman's ability to achieve the American dream. I will continue to support title IX and to encourage my colleagues to do the same. It is a question of equity, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a tireless fighter for gender equity.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in support of title IX, and I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for organizing this afternoon's effort.

As we stand here today, title IX is being threatened by recommendations from the commission on title IX, a commission appointed by President Bush and his administration to study title IX, hoping to alter the law.

Before title IX, fewer than 30,000 girls participated in intercollegiate ath-

letics. Today, more than 100,000 women compete. In high school, fewer than 7 percent of girls played various sports prior to title IX, and today, the number of participants has increased to 40 percent, over 40 percent, as a matter of fact.

Do these gains mean that the work of title IX is finished, and that it is time for the supporters of title IX to take their balance and go home? Absolutely not.

Contrary to the scare tactics being used by opponents of title IX to say that women's sports are using up athletic funds needed for men's sports, the facts show that women, even with title IX, continue to receive far less funding for their sports than men. It is a fact: title IX does not deprive men of athletic resources.

In fact, the real problem is that the resources that the male athletics receive are distributed inequitably among men's sports. In addition, schools choose to eliminate teams for many reasons, and all of those reasons are not related to title IX.

In fact, I had a very interesting experience as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce when we had a hearing on title IX quite a few years ago, I think it was about 5 years ago, as a matter of fact. I sat there and I listened to the witnesses at this hearing tell us that men's wrestling, men's football, and every sport that the guys are interested in were being threatened because of women's sports and because of an investment in title IX.

Somehow or another, they made a big mistake. They brought forward an individual representing San Francisco State University who sat before us and told us that the men's football program at San Francisco State was eliminated because of title IX. Well, I had my ability at that point to contradict, because, Mr. Speaker, one of my sons, I have three sons and a daughter, all athletes, including my daughter. One of my sons was an all-American football player from San Francisco State University. He was a tackle. He was the captain of the defensive team, and I went to every single game. Mr. Speaker, I loved cheering for that kid and that team. Well, there were no programs at the games, there was no band, there were no food vendors, and the reason was, nobody at that school was particularly interested in football. And I knew that, we knew that, and a few years after my son graduated from college, the program was discontinued. But it had nothing to do with title IX; it had to do with the fact that at that time in San Francisco at that particular university, it was a State University, there was just no interest in the program.

Title IX, therefore, must continue to be defended. We cannot have it used as the reason for men's sports not getting their due when they get more than their due. In my own State of California where women make up over 56 percent of the full-time students at our

108 State and community colleges, women's sports receive 35 percent of the athletic budget. And let me remind my colleagues, they make up 56 percent of full-time student bodies.

In Georgia, more than 86 percent of the legislative branch for stadiums, for lighting and equipment at public schools went to boys' sports projects; 86 percent. So while title IX is transforming the playing field for men's and women's sports in general, it is not level yet.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep title IX strong. We need to fight any attempts by this administration or Congress that will weaken its effectiveness. It is not just because we want girls to get to play; it is because when one plays on a team or when one is in an individual sport and that sport is valued at all, one learns. One learns competitiveness; one learns how to compete with one's self and do better the next time; one learns how to win and one learns how to lose, and one learns how to play on a team. All of that plays out later when one is involved in the business world, when one is involved in raising children, when one is involved in knowing how important one's own self-esteem is and how important it will be to raising one's children. So we must strengthen title IX. We must never weaken its effectiveness.

#### MORE SUPPORT FOR TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for the remaining time of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of title IX. Title IX of the educational amendments of 1972 have really been instrumental in prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex by mandating gender equality and educational programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

Before the passage of title IX, when I and most of our colleagues were in college, many schools saw no problem in maintaining strict limits on admission of women or in simply refusing to admit them, or in denying them access to much of the opportunities within colleges and universities.

□ 1545

This has changed dramatically since the passage of Title IX. The effects of the legislation are evident in the success of women in the classroom, on the campus, and in our society at large.

In 1972, women received only 9 percent of medical degrees, 7 percent of law degrees, a quarter of doctoral degrees. By 2000, women received 45 percent of medical degrees, 44 percent of law degrees, and 44 percent of doctoral degrees. There is a connection.

Thanks to Patsy Mink and others who fought to get Title IX into the legislation, women now have opportuni-

ties on the athletic field, throughout the campus, and throughout their lives. By participating in sports, young women realize significant benefits that often correlate to achievement in the classroom and, ultimately, success in college and in the work force.

Women who participate in athletics have higher graduation rates and develop important skills like teamwork, leadership, discipline, that stay with them throughout their lives.

Attacks on Title IX have taken on really ludicrous dimensions. I have heard some teams, male teams, blame their losing seasons on Title IX. I am sorry, it just does not wash. Title IX is a success. It is a great boon to our society, to our economy, to the education of our people.

Unfortunately, the administration is considering proposals that would dramatically weaken the important provisions of Title IX. Female athletes stand to lose scholarships, they stand to lose chances for athletic participation, they stand to lose much of what we have gained since Patsy Mink fought to get Title IX into law.

We may not allow, we cannot allow this to happen. We cannot allow the administration to diminish the opportunities afforded to American women or to undo the progress we have made over the past 30 years. Title IX has enabled millions of young women to pursue goals which their grandmothers and mothers could have only dreamed of.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will join me as we work to preserve the integrity of this landmark law.

#### QUESTIONING WISDOM OF HUGE ECONOMIC AID PACKAGE TO TURKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to speak about what I consider to be a dangerous precedent that is included in the supplemental appropriations bill. In the bill that was sent to Congress only a few days ago, the President requested an astounding \$1 billion in aid to Turkey that can be leveraged into \$8.5 billion in loan guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns about this deal which I do not believe have been addressed. Over the last few months, I have repeatedly questioned the wisdom of providing Turkey with a huge economic aid package. In a letter I wrote to Secretary of State Colin Powell on February 24, I expressed my displeasure at the size of the economic package to be provided to Turkey.

Estimates on that initial deal ranged from \$6 billion to \$30 billion. Despite the sum of money that was offered, Turkey did not provide the bases we were already using to enforce the no-

fly zones over the last 12 years in northern Iraq. It appears that, because of this decision, our forces were forced to show their flexibility and ship south to Kuwait to engage in combat in Iraq.

Only last week, after the bombing of Bagdad began, did Turkey even grant the U.S. military the ability to have overflight rights, and Turkey was the last government in NATO to provide these rights. It appears that even though they did this reluctantly, they will still benefit from a huge aid package in the supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe this package is inappropriate, given the minimum amount of assistance that Turkey is providing to the United States.

I am also not convinced that Turkey will not enter the Kurdish region of northern Iraq. Although the President and members of his administration have assured the American public that Turkey will remain on the sidelines, Turkey continues to amass large numbers of Turkish forces along their border with Iraq. These troops' mobilizations have led the Kurdish militias to set up defense positions along the border as well, creating an unnecessarily tense situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish government also has not promised to stay out of Iraq. They have stated for months that they intend to enter northern Iraq to set up a buffer zone to not have a repeat of the refugee crisis from the 1991 Gulf War. But after it became clear that the administration would be working closely with the Iraqi Kurds to deal with the impending humanitarian crisis, the Turkish government switched their stories. This past Saturday, Turkish foreign minister Abdullah Gul said his government would send forces into northern Iraq to suppress "terrorist activity."

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish government has repeatedly called their own Kurdish citizens terrorists in the last few years. The Turkish authorities have recently banned one Kurdish political party and are currently working on banning the other. They have also not fully implemented reforms to give their minority populations property and language rights, one of the many conditions that the European Union set during Turkish entrance talks.

The tragedy that would occur should the Turkish government enter northern Iraq would be immense. Turkey has repeatedly shown its inability to govern the Kurds even with marginal respect for human rights in its own territory. By calling Kurds in Iraq terrorists as they threaten to enter Iraqi sovereign territory, the Turkish government is not only risking the outcome of the current conflict between the United States and Iraq but the future of the entire region.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any money should be given to Turkey without a number of assurances. Humanitarian concerns aside, I also do not agree that the aid package to Turkey will make a significant economic