

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. LEE HARTWELL, 2001 NOBEL PRIZE WINNER IN PHYSIOLOGY OR MEDICINE

### HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 19, 2001

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Dr. Lee Hartwell, President and Director of the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, for winning the 2001 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine.

More than thirty years ago, Mr. Hartwell conducted his groundbreaking research on cell cycles at the University of Washington. His work has contributed to our scientific understanding of cellular biological processes that have led to new discoveries in the fight against cancer. He is an inspiration to his community, colleagues, and future scientific researchers.

Dr. Hartwell joined the University of Washington faculty in 1968 and has been a professor of genetics since 1973. In 1996, he joined the Hutchinson Center and has become president and director in 1997. He has won many national and international scientific awards for his work including the Leopold Griffuel Prize, the Albert Lasker Basic Medical Research Prize, the General Motors Sloan Award, and the Gairdner Foundation International Award for Achievements in Science.

On December 10, 2001, Dr. Hartwell will join a distinguished list of scientists who have achieved the highest honor in their field when he is awarded the Nobel Prize. His greatest achievement, however, is not measured by the number of awards he receives, but in the number of lives that he has saved. He embodies the true spirit of past Nobel Prize recipients whose contributions have inspired others and improved humanity.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1447, AVIATION AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT

SPEECH OF

### HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 2001

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has reached an agreement on the Aviation and Transportation Security Act. We should support this measure because it will restore public confidence in flying and protect the professionals who work within the airline industry. With its passage we can further our recovery from the devastating attacks of September 11th. I commend those Members, most especially Mr. YOUNG and Mr. OBERSTAR, who worked so tirelessly to reach this compromise.

As a result of this measure, airports will receive the technology needed to effectively screen passengers and baggage, airplanes will receive more secure cockpit doors, and flight crews and airport personnel will receive essential emergency training specific to terrorist and hijacking situations. Most of all, the American people will once again be assured about the safety of air travel.

As my colleagues may know, Guam is 19 flying hours away from Washington, DC. The people of Guam, in an isolated and distant territory, rely heavily on air travel for jobs, economic activity, and their own transportation to and from the mainland. Our island's economy is heavily dependent on the travel and tourism industry. Each year over 1 million Japanese tourists visit Guam. For our economy to survive, travel to and from Guam by air must continue to remain strong. Passage of this measure would support Guam's economy.

It is for these reasons that I support this conference agreement. I would add that while I urge its passage, I believe the U.S. citizenship requirements for Federal screeners should be revisited in the future. Today, many citizens of the Freely Associated States of Micronesia, a former trust territory of the United States, serve as screeners at Guam International Airport. I would hope that their eligibility would be examined in any future review of this requirement.

ANDEAN TRADE PROMOTION AND DRUG ERADICATION ACT

SPEECH OF

### HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 2001

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Andean Trade Preference Act brought to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives today is poorly written and ill-timed. As such, I was disappointed to see it pass the floor of the House.

Let there be no mistake, I am not against free trade. Trade, carried out correctly, can be of great benefit to all parties. All members of the House of Representatives have seen numerous instances where the increase of trade between equal partners is mutually beneficial. However, when we do not carefully construct our trade agreements to maximize the benefits and minimize the negative effects of trade, we do a disservice to hard working Americans and threaten their livelihood.

By failing to give due consideration to the textile industry in the United States and opening it to unfair competition from abroad, this bill fails American workers, including a great many in the 1st District of North Carolina.

While some industries and segments of the economy have benefitted from free trade in re-

cent years, the American textile industry has been hit especially hard. In fact, it has been so buffeted by the winds of economic change, a strong dollar, and competition from abroad that its very existence is threatened. If we do not act to protect this vitally important industry, it may disappear altogether. That is not acceptable.

In just the last 12 months, the United States textile industry has lost 60,000 jobs, roughly 10 percent of the domestic workforce. Textile states such as North Carolina and the communities that depend on textiles have been hit the hardest. For years, the closing of textile mills in my district has been a regular occurrence. Unfortunately, the long winter that this industry has endured shows no signs of thawing and bills such as the Andean Trade Preferences Act threaten to turn this winter into a permanent freeze.

The Andean Trade Promotion Act, by further opening the United States market to floods of cheap textile imports, adds insult to injury. The result, should the President sign the bill in its current form, will only mean more economic loss in the communities of the 1st District of North Carolina and additional hardship for many constituents.

Because of this, I vigorously oppose the bill in its current form.

I would also like to briefly comment on the timing of the bill. It is difficult for me to understand why the leadership brought the Andean Trade Preferences Act to the Floor only days before a scheduled vote on granting the President Trade Promotion Authority. If anything, by ignoring the needs of textile states and communities in the Andean Trade Preferences Act, the leadership sends those of us from textile states a strong signal that we should not support TPA for the President. After failing us on this much smaller bill, what confidence can we have that the leadership or the President will do anything differently with regard to textiles if granted TPA?

I take the damaging textile provisions included in the Andean Trade Preferences Act as further evidence of why Congress should oppose providing the President with Trade Promotion Authority. If there are reassurances that can be given that textiles will be given due consideration in later negotiations I would welcome them. But until that is done in a satisfactory manner I will remain skeptical about granting to the President Trade Promotion Authority.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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