His effective blending of academic life with his work in human and civil rights led to his 1965 appointment as dean of academic affairs. Dr. Hubbard became vice president of the university in 1972, a position in which he gave distinguished service until his retirement in 1991.

Dr. Hubbard's quarter century at the center of university administration was a period of dramatic social change in the university, in the State of Iowa, and in the larger world. The theme that runs through his career as an administrator is his steadfast commitment to expanding human rights on and off campus. Working with university presidents Howard Bowen, Willard ''Sandy'' Boyd, James O. Freedman, and Hunter Rawlings III over more than twenty-five years, Dr. Hubbard succeeded in fully opening the resources of the University of Iowa to students from all ethnic backgrounds and to both genders. He accorded new respect for the opinions of students, creatively developed educational opportunity programs and scholarships for low-income and minority students, and helped to institute affirmative action at all levels of the university.

The University of Iowa's reputation as a welcoming place where all people may secure a quality education is in large part a result of the vision and hard work of Philip G. Hubbard. Dr. Hubbard's place in Iowa history books is ensured by his service as the University of Iowa's first African American professor, dean and vice president. His real place in Iowa history, however, is guaranteed by two far more significant things: his role in opening the university to the kind of board diversity that reflects the best in American values and deeply enriches the educational experience, and the powerful effect he has had on the hearts of those given the privilege of crossing his path.

The university, the State of Iowa and the world are better for the contributions of this truly exemplary American.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE LOCK-BOX ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the principles underlying H.R. 2—that Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds should not be used for any purpose other than funding the retirement or health care needs of our seniors. This bill takes a large step towards maintaining fiscal discipline by recognizing that Social Security and Medicare trust funds should be off the table when Congress considers tax and spending legislation.

This effort is particularly courageous since the administration opposes efforts to preserve Medicare trust funds for the health security needs of our seniors. During his confirmation hearing, OMB Director, Mitch Daniels, stated that he ''would be very hesitant to see us treat [Medicare] funds the same way we do Social Security.'' I applaud the majority's recognition of the fact that both programs face a demographic crisis as the baby boomers get older, and that both programs deserve to be protected to fund our commitments to them in the future.

Medicare's financial condition is actually more serious than that of Social Security. The Medicare trust fund is projected to become insolvent in 2025, whereas the Social Security Trust fund will remain solvent until 2037. This highlights the importance of preventing Medicare surpluses from being used for any other purpose than protecting Medicare; this includes financing a prescription drug benefit or any revenue reducing policy with trust fund reserves—whether they come from Social Security or Medicare. This means that every member who votes for this bill today is serving notice that they will not use Social Security or Medicare trust funds for any purpose other than funding or reforming these programs.

Mr. Speaker, while I applaud the majority's commitment to this cause, I am concerned that the bill before us today contains a large loophole that would allow the Medicare and Social Security surpluses to be spent for any purpose so long as it is labeled ''reform.'' For the record, I want to be clear that the term ''reform'' does not and should not include new programs such as, providing a prescription drug benefit under Medicare or dismantling the Social Security safety net with private accounts. I also want to be clear that if Members vote for this bill, they are voting to prevent new programs labeled reform from crowding out Social Security and Medicare surpluses to make room for other revenue-reducing initiatives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while I am encouraged with the majority's commitment to this cause, I am disappointed in the manner in which this bill is being considered today. The future of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses is a complicated and serious matter that deserves a full, free and honest discussion of the issue and alternative ways to solve the problem. Rather than allowing this exchange of ideas, the majority circumvented committee consideration of this issue, instead rushing the bill to the floor under expedited rules that allow only an hour of debate and no opportunity for amendment.

Allowing members to have a voice in this process could have corrected the loophole in the present bill. To be sure, Representative ROSS and I have recently introduced legislation that would correct this problem by entirely preventing the use of Social Security and Medicare trust funds—except for their intended purpose.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 13, 2001

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, today we're focusing on the right to vote.

This is certainly an appropriate theme for this year's observance of Black History Month—coming, as it does, in the aftermath of a national election which may have been decided by breakdowns in voting machines and procedures, by faulty ballots, by voting place errors and abuses that effectively denied this most fundamental right to many citizens.

Complaints of irregularities have been widespread in a number of states. Moreover, many of the absentee ballots cast by our military personnel—the men and women defending our freedom away from home, often in harm's way—were thrown out because of technicalities.

I believe we can do better.

In our country, the freest and most advanced in the world, there should be no excuse for not having a non-partisan, modern, well-managed system that ensures to the highest degree possible that qualified voters will have access to the polls and their votes will be fairly counted.

If we could not do better, our form of representative government—with its guarantee of freedom of speech and religion, from unjust fear, and from the denial of opportunity—would be on very shaky ground.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let this Special Order serve as a reminder that it is the responsibility of each of us, as members of ''The People's House,'' to determine to the best of our ability exactly what went wrong in this last national election and to consider what should properly be done at the federal level to help ensure that it doesn't happen again.

When I think of the voting franchise in the context of Black History Month, I first think of Selma.

In the mid-1960's, this was the scene of a series of campaigns to secure the right to vote, which had been routinely denied to black citizens. People had lost their lives just for trying to get people registered. Black citizens who came to register were harassed and sometimes arrested on charges of unlawful assembly. Beatings had become commonplace. Many black people lost their jobs just for attempting to register and vote, suffering severe economic consequences. Today, this community presents keys to the city to those who fought for civil rights. But, back then, attempting to register and vote could be a perilous thing to do.

These efforts culminated in ''Bloody Sunday,'' when our friend and colleague from Georgia, John Lewis, led demonstrators across the Pettus Bridge into the ranks of armed troops, rallying much of the country around the enactment of the Voting Rights Act—the crowning achievement of the Civil Rights Movement.

That was a high point in a struggle that had been going on for nearly two centuries.

In our country's formative years, it was thought by many that only people who owned property should be permitted to vote and participate in the political process. Free blacks were effectively excluded until after the implementation of the Voting Rights Act, even after the adoption of the 13th Amendment that granted the voting franchise to black males in 1866. This exclusion also extended to all women, who did not gain the right to vote until the ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920.

In fact, not one country granted its citizens universal suffrage prior to the 20th century—not Greece in the 5th Century B.C., England with the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215, or the United States with the adoption of the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

I'm told that Finland, in 1906, was the first country to elect its government on the principle of universal suffrage in competitive, multi-party elections. But perhaps no one inspired the world more than those who valiantly carried the torch of freedom here in the United States, providing a beacon of light for the whole world to follow.