decision without being able to thoroughly review and doublecheck data.

We had one breast cancer drug, and the FDA got the information one and a half weeks before the PDUFA deadline would run.

My final concern today is that of subpoena power.

The FDA is one of the only health and safety regulatory agencies that does not have subpoena power.

Subpoena power would give FDA the authority it needs to inspect manufacturers' documents.

This is an issue we need to explore, but we couldn't because we weren't allowed to.

And last but not least, safety, adequate labeling, and compliance with federal regulations always seem to fall by the wayside when we rush through PDUFA or whatever it might be.

We did pediatric exclusivity here recently, and we are still waiting for studies.

I recently wrote a letter to Bristol-Myers Squibb in February about a drug called Serzone.

Sixteen other members joined me.

That was a drug that the FDA did a pediatric exclusivity study request in 1994. We are still waiting for the results of that study.

We have young people who have suffered liver damage from this drug, and we can't even get anyone to tell us what the results of that study were, eight years ago. That's ridiculous, and it has to stop.

We want to make sure that drugs are safe, and we want to make sure that we have adequate labeling, and we want to make sure that the FDA has adequate information.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, from subpoena power to enforcement power, the pediatric labeling under the pediatric exclusivity issue—all these issues we were not allowed to bring up before the House.

I will continue to work to make safety, accuracy, honesty, and labeling is put back in the Food and Drug Administration.

I voted for the bioterrorism conference report because it is too important to not implement.

But what about the terror facing people everyday when they take medications that are not established to be safe?

Mr. Speaker I hope issues as important as this one will be debated fully in the future and not subject to such underhanded tactics in the future.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO THE MEDICARE WAGE ADJUSTMENT PROVISION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 2002

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Medicare Wage Adjustment Provision. The pure thought of allowing selected hospitals in two states to receive preferential treatment over the hospitals in the other 48 states is simply absurd. Similar to the hospitals in my Colleagues' districts, the 23 hospitals in my district are faced with extreme cuts in funding on the state and federal level and cuts in Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements. By granting the selected hospitals in Pennsylvania and New York a wage adjustment, we are taking more money away from the hospitals in other districts.

We do not need unnecessary funding to this already expensive bill. We do not need to give special treatment to a few hospitals and the members which represent them, who did not seek help or adjustment based on procedure by going to CMS or allowing the policy to be considered or reported by the Ways and Means Committee. Instead, the Members of these hospitals were looking for a political shortcut and are attempting to use this legislation.

Every week, Mr. Speaker, I meet with my hospital constituents to discuss the alarming issues the hospital industry is facing, such as the nursing shortage, the cuts in reimbursements to the hospitals and physicians, the cuts in Medicare Indirect Medical Education Payments and the list sadly continues. This provision will only add to the current feeling of distress among our country's hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I stand side by side with my Republican Colleagues and my Democrat Colleagues in support of our troops and homeland security. However, this provision is one which I cannot stand behind knowing the amount of damage that will arise. This is not about the War on Terrorism. This is not a fair provision intended to help all Americans.

LIBERTY MEMORIAL WORLD WAR I MONUMENT REDEDICATION

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 2002

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that on May 25, 2002 the citizens of Kansas City and dignitaries from around the world will come together for the rededication of the Liberty Memorial, our nation's only recognized World War I Monument. This monument, originally dedicated on November 11, 1926, serves as a lasting beacon to our men and women of the armed services. I am proud that this distinguished historic landmark is located in the district that I represent.

Following the Armistice on November 11, 1918, the citizens of the heartland rallied to build a memorial in honor of the 116,516 Americans who died in the war. The Liberty Memorial Association made up of greater Kansas City's business and political leaders organized a fundraising campaign with the slogan ''Lest the Ages Forget.'' The goal of $2.5 million, $2 million designated to build the monument and museum and $500,000 for Allied charities, was reached in ten days.

On November 1, 1921, more that a hundred thousand people witnessed the site dedication, an event that hosted the five great Allied Commanders of World War I: General John J. Pershing of the United States; Admiral Lord Earl Beatty of Great Britain; General Armando Diaz of Italy; Marshal Ferdinand Foch of France; and Lieutenant General Baron Jacques of Belgium. General Pershing, a native Missourian, noted on the occasion that ''The people of Kansas City, Missouri are deeply proud of the beautiful memorial, erected in tribute to the patriotism, the gallant achievements, and the heroic sacrifices of their sons and daughters who served in our country's armed forces during the World War. It symbolizes their grateful appreciation of duty well done, an appreciation which I share, because I know so well how richly it is merited.'' During the parade that followed the ceremony, the American Legion Vice Chairman of Decoration Committee, Honorable Harry S. Truman, presented their country's flags to the Allied Commanders.

Vice President Calvin Coolidge participated as an honored guest during the site dedication and returned as President five years later as honored speaker for the official Liberty Memorial dedication on November 11, 1926, attended by one hundred and fifty thousand people. In his address at the Liberty Memorial dedication, President Calvin Coolidge noted that, ''We are attempting to restore the world to a state of better understanding and amity. It is enough for us to know that the side on which we fought was victorious. But we should never forget that we were asserting our rights and maintaining our ideals.'' His words are especially true today as we rededicate our efforts to fight for our ideals of peace and liberty against those who threaten us through acts of global terrorism.

Forty years later, Kansas City Mayor H. Roe Bartle proclaimed that a rededication of the Liberty Memorial would take place the week of November 10, 1961 to promote international understanding. Mayor Bartle gave purpose to the rededication with the following statement, ''This monument encompasses all the individual efforts of the people of the world to live in friendship and fraternity so that all can assist one another in eliminating hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy so that the world can set aside the hatred, fears, prejudices, and inequities that exist.'' The ceremonies featured former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman along with 57 foreign representatives to emphasize international relations and the establishment of People to People headquarters in Kansas City. On Veterans Day, November 11, 1961, President Truman said, ''Those who fought in the war thought it was the war to end all wars. It would have been if we had done our duty as a nation. Our failure to participate in the League of Nations was a factor in World War II . . . I was here in 1921, at the original dedication. It is a wonderful thing when people take on themselves a job that ought to be done . . . I hope this day will be a preliminary to continuing world peace.'' Today we continue to strive for world peace as we continue the job of what ought to be done.

In 1994 the deterioration of the Liberty Memorial had reached a critical stage and had to be closed. Once again the citizens, corporations and government responded. The State of Missouri appropriated the amount of $15,000,000. The United States Congress approved my request for $5,000,000. Foundations, corporations, private citizens and a Kansas City sales tax have resulted in an additional $55,000,000. The culmination of the restoration project will be at the rededication ceremony this Saturday on May 25, 2002, when the Liberty Memorial will once again be opened to the public. The Liberty Memorial has renewed life from the work of artisan craftsmen, priceless oil paintings restored, bronze light fixtures refurbished, sky light in place, and the monument made structurally sound. This Saturday, May 25, 2002 the flame will once again grace the skyline of Kansas

City. Allied leaders, diplomats, international dignitaries and Ambassadors from Italy, France, Belgium and the United Kingdom have been invited to participate in the rededication of this very special monument, which represents the appreciation of those who gave their lives to preserve our freedom, ''Less the Ages Forget.''

On the base of the Liberty Memorial is an inscription which reads, ''In Honor of Those Who Served in the World War in Defense of Liberty and Our Country.'' The top of the Memorial has four Guardian Spirits: Honor, Sacrifice, Patriotism and Courage. This Memorial Day weekend our prayers should include the brave men and women who serve in defense of Liberty and our Country with honor, sacrifice, patriotism and courage.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in commemorating one of our Nation's most cherished reminder of liberty and freedom, the restored World War I Liberty Memorial in Kansas City Missouri.

HONORING ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 2002

Mr. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to stand before my colleagues and celebrate Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month. Asian and Pacific Americans have been a part of this country for over 200 years, with one of the first Asian American communities, the Filipino community, being established in the Louisiana Bayou in 1763. Asian and Pacific Americans have quickly established themselves as a strong and thriving community in this country, positively contributing to its industrial, educational and social successes. I am also proud to see the growing number of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans involved in the American political system at the local, state and national levels.

As this community continues to grow, it is important for all of us to continue to learn from each other. In the 9th Congressional District, I am very fortunate to represent a vibrant, productive, and diverse Asian-Pacific American community that totals over 70,000 people. The community is diverse, ranging from Chinese to Indian to Korean to Filipino to Samoan. Each subset of the Asian-Pacific American community has brought a rich culture and strong work ethic to my district. From restaurants to service stations to software companies, the Asian-Pacific American community has provided the services needed to keep the 9th Congressional district an enjoyable, safe and culturally rich place to live.

We recognize and cherish the contributions of the Asian-Pacific American community to our country. The Asian-Pacific American community has come so far in such a short period of time, and I am confident that it will only continue to grow and thrive while maintaining its many cultures and values.

ON WELFARE REFORM AND TANF REAUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 2002

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this bill.

In 1996, Congress passed a largely successful welfare reform bill that gave states much more flexibility to manage their own welfare assistance programs as they saw fit. This approach has significantly reduced the number of people who need welfare and put many impoverished people into jobs that have brought their standard of living above the poverty level.

Still, there is more that needs to be done. The 1996 law has helped move people from welfare to work. But it has not had similar success in helping people escape poverty—and there is no reason anyone should live in poverty in the most prosperous country in the world.

And some important things have changed since 1996—right now, our economy is struggling to recover, many businesses have had to lay people off, and other firms even have had to shut down.

So, as we consider whether to renew or revise the 1996 law, we have both important opportunities and serious challenges. But this Republican Welfare reform bill does not rise to the occasion.

Their bill would penalize—not assist—people who are trying to escape poverty. Their bill takes away the flexibility states have had to develop their own programs. It discriminates against legal immigrants. It doesn't provide enough funding for childcare. It doubles the number of work hours required for mothers with children under the age of six and provides a new ''superwaiver'' authority to the President to waiver almost any Federal requirement in food stamps and housing.

In short, its most important effect would be to make things worse, not better for millions of people—something I cannot support.

And that's not all—the Republican bill would make it harder for the States as well. It has been estimated that this bill dictates up to $11 billion in unfunded mandates. In fact, I have seen estimates that my own state of Colorado might have to pony up an extra $84 million to pay for Federal mandates.

I very much regret that the Republican leadership has insisted on depriving the House of the opportunity to pass a better bill. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cardin, contained many provisions focused on moving welfare recipients into real, wage-paying jobs. It would have provided the states with the discretion to determine the best mix of activities needed to move recipients toward selfsufficiency. It would have restored the option of states to provide assistance to legal immigrant families with Federal Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) funds and eliminated the current ban on providing Medicaid to legal immigrant pregnant women and children. It would have provided an additional $11 billion for mandatory child care funding over the next five years and would have increased access to education and training for welfare recipients.

And, that substitute did not include the new ''superwaiver'' authority that the Republican bill gives to the President—a nearly unbounded authority that I think is excessive.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped it would be possible for me to support balanced, bipartisan legislation to build on and broaden the success of the 1996 welfare reform law. In particular, I had hoped that the House would have the Opportunity to shape a new law that would do more than just get people off welfare roles, but instead would make it more likely that we could achieve the goal of ending poverty. Unfortunately, this bill does not come near to that, and I cannot support it.

CITIZEN SERVICE ACT OF 2002

HON. PETER HOEKSTRA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 2002

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Citizen Service Act of 2002 to reauthorize programs under the Corporation for National and Community Service. I would like to thank the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Select Education, Mr. ROEMER, for working with me to put together a bipartisan bill to reauthorize and reform the national service laws.

On April 9, 2002, President Bush unveiled his ''Principles and Reforms for a Citizen Service Act'' to guide the reauthorization of the Corporation for National and Community Service and its programs, which include AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and Learn and Serve America. Since then, the Subcommittee on Select Education has worked in a bipartisan manner with the Administration to craft legislation to reform and enhance national service.

The major federally funded community service and volunteer programs in this country are authorized under two statutes: the National and Community Service Act and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act. The bill I am introducing today provides reforms and improvements to these national service laws. The improvements in the Citizen Service Act of 2002 will allow organizations and volunteers assisted under these acts to maximize their efforts and will greatly benefit those assisted through volunteer efforts.

The Citizen Service Act of 2002 focuses on four major objectives for reauthorization. This legislation will: (1) support and encourage greater engagement of citizens in volunteering; (2) make federal funds more responsive to State and local needs; (3) make federal support more accountable and effective; and (4) provide greater assistance to community-based organizations (which include religious organizations). This legislation also addresses several specific issues that will help to improve national service provisions found in current law.

Prohibition on Grants to Federal Agencies—Prohibits the Corporation from making grants to Federal agencies.

Literacy Programs—Requires literacy programs to be based on scientifically based reading research and ensures that programs provide instruction based on the essential components of reading instruction as defined in P.L. 107–110, the No Child Left Behind Act.

Funding Allocations—Allocates funding for AmeriCorps programs as follows: up to 20