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that is necessary in order for us to re-
store our Nation’s most cherished wa-
terway, the Chesapeake Bay, which not
only has significant environmental im-
portance for Virginia and many other
States, but also contributes enor-
mously to our recreational activities
and to our economy. I, therefore,
Madam Speaker, urge my colleagues to
support this legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I
yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from
Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I
thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr.
UNDERWOOD), my friend, for yielding
this time to me and for his leadership in
moving this legislation, and also the
gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), my colleague, in working
together to forge forward this very im-
portant reauthorization legislation that
will help continue the Federal
partnership in restoring the Chesae-
peake Bay, the largest estuary in our
Nation.

In 1990, original authorizations for
NOAA’s participation was passed by
this Congress, and since that time,
NOAA has been an instrumental part-
ner in our efforts that involve not only
the State of Maryland, but our sur-
rounding States: not just State govern-
ment, but local governments; not just
government, but the private sector. We
have worked together in partnership
and have made tremendous progress in
restoring the Chesapeake Bay.

This legislation not only reauthor-
zates NOAA’s participation, but estab-
lishes small grant programs to local
governments, community organiza-
tions, educational institutions to re-
store fish and habitats.

Madam Speaker, I say personally I
know the groups that qualify for these
funds. They are out there every day
helping us restoring the waters and
stirring the sediment and helping us
in a major way. This legislation will mean that there will be
additional resources available to these
local groups to help them.

The legislation also provides for a 5
year study, which I think is extremely
important on the multispecies manage-
ment plan. For too long, we have been
looking at individual species. This leg-
islation will allow us to look at all the
species within the bay as to how they
interact with each other.

We increase the authorization to $6
million through fiscal year 2006; and in
combination, this legislation will in-
crease NOAA’s participation in part-
nership to restore the bay.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate all
for moving this legislation so early. It
will help us in our efforts not only in
Maryland, not only in the communities
that surround the Chesapeake Bay, but
as a model for our Nation as to the
right way to clean up a major body, a
multijurisdictional body of water.

Madam Speaker, I urge my col-
leagues to support the legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I
yield myself such time as I may con-
sume to urge everyone to vote aye on
this question and to congratulate the gen-
tleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST)
for this very fine piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the bal-
ance of my time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I
yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gen-
tleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD)
once again, and certainly the gen-
tleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN)
for helping us with this legislation.

One last very brief comment on the
Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Chesa-
peake Bay itself, about 100 years ago,
at the turn of the century, we took out
of the bay on an annual basis up to 15
million bushels of oysters, 15 million.
It was the engine that drove the econ-
omy of the State of Maryland and Vir-
ginia and, to some extent, Pennsyl-
vania, for the commercial harvest, for
the recreational activities, for all the
spill-over economic resources that de-
pended on the Chesapeake Bay, 15 mil-
lion bushels of oysters. We are, in a
good year now, in a very good year,
down to 300,000 bushels of oysters.

With this legislation, we can under-
stand the nature of the mechanics of
the ecosystem, how the food web works.

Human activity degraded the bay; human ingenuity will restore it.

I urge an aye vote on H.R. 642.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs.
EMERSON). The question is on the
motion offered by the gentleman from
Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) that the
House suspend the rules and pass the
bill, H.R. 642, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, on
that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the
opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of
those present have voted in the affirm-
ative.

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, on
that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to clause 8 of rule XX and the
Chair’s prior announcement, further
proceedings on this motion will be
postponed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL
FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 2001, TO FILE
LEGISLATIVE REPORTS ON H.R.
392, H.R. 503, H.R. 863, H.R. 1209,
AND H.J. RES. 41

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam
Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that
all Members may have 5 legislative
hours within which to revise and extend
their remarks and to include extra-
enous material on H.R. 768, the bill
under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam
Speaker, I move to suspend the rules
and pass the bill (H.R. 768) to amend
the Improving America’s Schools Act
of 1994 to make permanent the favor-
able treatment of need-based edu-
cational aid under the antitrust laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Represen-
tatives of the United States of America in Congress
assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Section 568(d) of the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is re-
pealed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam
Speaker, today the House
considers H.R. 768, theNeed-Based Edu-
cational Aid Act of 2001. This bill was
introduced by the gentleman from
Texas (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman
from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK). It
makes permanent an antitrust exemp-
tion that allows universities to agree
on common standards of need when
awarding financial aid.

This exemption has been passed on a
permanent basis several times without
controversy, and the current version is
set to expire at the end of September.

It appears to be working well, and I am
hopeful that it now can be made per-
mansent.
In a moment the sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), will seek time for a further explanation. I appreciate their work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I wanted to thank the author of the bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), who was last seen leaving the floor, and I want to yield him some time because I do not think this is going to take long.

What we were doing for many years on need-based educational aid assistance was passing temporary exemptions to the antitrust act. It worked fine. And now we have decided to permanentize it. It be that the effort of the gentleman from Massachusetts and as well as the gentleman from Texas.

It is a great piece of legislation, and it represented probably the most vigorous high point of antitrust enforcement during the past few years.

I rise in support of H.R. 768, the "Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001." This bipartisan bill would make permanent an exemption to the antitrust laws that permits schools to agree to award financial aid on a need-blind basis and to use common principles of need-based aid analysis in making their determinations.

The exemption also allows for agreement on the use of a common aid application form and the exchange of the student's financial information through a third party.

In 1992, Congress passed a similar temporary exemption, which was extended in 1994, and again extended in 1997. The exemption expired last year.

During the almost ten years of its operation, we have been able to witness and evaluate the exemption, and we have found it has worked well. The need-based financial aid system serves important social goals that the antitrust laws do not adequately address—such as making financial aid available to the broadest number of students solely on the basis of demonstrated need. Without it, the schools would be required to compete, through financial aid awards, for the very top students.

The result would be that the very top students would get all of the aid available, which would be more than they need. The rest of the applicant pool would get less or none at all. Ultimately, such a system would undermine the principles of need-based aid and need-blind admissions, which are so important to achieving educational equality.

No student who is otherwise qualified ought to be denied the opportunity to go to one of the nation's most prestigious schools because of the financial situation of his or her family. H.R. 768 will help protect need-based aid and need-blind admissions and preserve that opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for any comments he would like to make. I yield back to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for further explanation. I appreciate their work on this bill.

Mr. FRANK. It was MIT that was the real hero of this, and to whom I think credit should be given.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. It was MIT that was the real hero of this, and to whom I think credit should be given.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.
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