No discussion of the judiciary should close without reference to the shambles that the Senate confirmation process has become. It does no good to speculate about how or when the disintegration began, which political interest has been the most culpable, or the point at which the appointment of judges became completely dysfunctional. That sort of debate is both endless and futile. The only hope for an end to the downward spiral is for the combatants to lay down their arms; stop using judicial appointments to excite special interest constituencies and political fundraising; move forward with votes on qualified, responsible and respected nominees so that those who have the support of a majority of the Senate can be confirmed, as contemplated by the Constitution; and remove the rancor and gamesmanship from the judicial selection process.

We expect dignity, wisdom, decency, civility, integrity and restraint from our judges. It is time to exercise those same characteristics in our dealings with, and commentary on, those same judges—from their appointment and confirmation, to their decision-making once they take office.

INTRODUCTION OF SHAREHOLDER DESCENDENTS VOTING STANDARD AMENDMENT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 2005

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA), as originally enacted, limited Alaska Native Regional Corporations from enrolling Natives born after December 18, 1971, as shareholders in their respective corporations. Subsequent amendments to ANCSA have allowed Regional Corporations to include Natives born after December 18, 1971 (often referred to as "New Natives" or "Shareholder Descendents"), if existing shareholders of the Corporation adopt a resolution at an annual meeting. Thus far, very few Native Corporations have adopted resolutions to include Shareholder Descendents, in part because the standard for adopting a resolution is too high.

Existing law provides that a resolution is considered approved by the shareholders of a Native Corporation if it receives an affirmative vote from a "majority of the total voting power of the corporation". At any given annual meeting; however, the total voting power of the corporation is not exercised.

Accordingly, it is possible that eighty-five to ninety percent of the voting proxies at an annual meeting would be required to vote in favor of a Shareholder Descendents resolution. This is an extremely difficult threshold to meet. Accordingly, the attached proposed amendment would allow a Shareholder Descendents resolution to be approved by a majority of the shares present or represented by proxy at an annual meeting. If a change is not made to the existing voting standard for adoption of a Shareholder Descendents resolution, the promises of ANCSA are potentially left unfulfilled, at present, two generations of Shareholder Descendents.

ENGINEERING A SOLUTION; BRING WOMEN INTO THE FOLD

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 2005

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, amidst the controversy surrounding recent disparaging remarks regarding women in science, I was encouraged to read an editorial from a shining star in Silicon Valley, Carol Bartz, the President and CEO of Autodesk and a member of the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology. Ms. Bartz is right, while the controversy of women in science rages on, "unless we bring the other half of our population [women] into the engineering ranks, that [U.S.] leadership [in engineering] inevitably will evaporate."

I would like to include Ms. Bartz' editorial, printed in the San Jose Mercury News on March 24, 2005, in the RECORD.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Mar. 24, 2005]

ENGINEERING A SOLUTION: BRING WOMEN INTO THE FOLD

(By Carol Bartz)

Last week, Harvard University President Lawrence Summers suffered the sting of a faculty no-confidence vote, stemming from his remarks in January about women in science.

But every day, U.S. companies and the U.S. economy suffer the far more significant sting of girls avoiding science and engineering career paths in droves.

Despite interesting work and excellent pay—an average of $81,000 a year, almost twice U.S. median household income—employers are begging people to fill positions. Yet just one in 10 engineers is a woman, a far worse track record than science or math.

Why are girls who are fully capable of planning cities, designing jet engines or creating the next iPod avoiding engineering? Is it some biological difference in the female brain, the premise that cost Summers so dearly? Or is it simply a lack of encouragement during those crucial teen years when career paths are forged?

Does it matter?

Even with top salaries, the free-market supply of electrical and mechanical engineers is well below U.S. demand. Something is clearly wrong. The answer is obvious: We are relying on archaic, boys' club traditions to supply an industry that instead should serve as a role model for pure efficiency and reason. And we risk global competitiveness as a result.

No responsible CEO would try to build a business by ignoring the value of half her available capital. That would abrogate her responsibility to shareholders, employees and customers. Yet the engineering world is engaged in precisely this irresponsible corporate behavior by failing to take advantage of one-half of the available human "capital."

And in America we do so at our peril, because a perfect storm is brewing.

On one side of our nation looms international competition in engineering-dependent industries we once dominated. The only answer to maintaining our competitive edge is to use our engineering expertise to create innovation.

Looming on the other side is an immense gap between the demand for innovative young engineers and the number of students awarded degrees in mechanical and electrical engineering. Every day the gap grows, as an aging national workforce of some 2 million engineers gradually retires without nearly enough graduates to take their place.

With our national competitiveness for the 21st century at stake, we have no choice. We must work to change the status quo and ensure that the female half of our population makes its proportional contribution to the ranks of engineering.

As a software engineer by training, and the CEO of a company whose products are used by millions of engineers globally, I have seen the current system firsthand.

Even at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's School of Engineering, the No. 1-ranked school in the country, U.S. News & World Report found women made up only 25 percent of graduate enrollment last year.

The private sector must shoulder much of the burden of attracting women to the field. Offering competitive salaries is not enough. It is incumbent on companies to make an engineering career compelling in all of its aspects to young women—to re-energize the field and reintroduce the "cool" factor that engineering once possessed.

There is some hope. Already, the National Science Foundation, the Business-Higher Education Forum and other organizations are working hard to encourage women to join the ranks of American engineers. As for the "cool," this weekend, San Jose State University will host the regional round of the FIRST Robotics competition, offering high school students (girls included!) the opportunity to solve engineering design problems using robotics.

For more than a century, America's global economic leadership has rested on innovation by our engineers, the best in the world. Through them, we have been able to meet tremendous challenges, building the world's most complex infrastructure, some of the world's largest and most important cities, and products that have changed the lives of people everywhere. Unless we bring the other half of our population into the engineering ranks, that leadership inevitably will evaporate.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 2005

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children who lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide.

April 24th marks the anniversary of one of the darkest tragedies in human history—one that must be properly commemorated as the first genocide of the 20th century. On this day ninety years ago, the Ottoman Turk regime began rounding up hundreds of Armenian intellectuals and political leaders to be deported or executed. Thousands more Armenians were killed in their homes or on the streets. For five years, the brutal regime carried out the systematic destruction of the Armenian people through forced labor, concentration camps, and death marches, until millions were dead or exiled.

As we look back on the bloodshed and atrocities committed against the Armenian people, we must publicly acknowledge the weight of this human tragedy. I am disappointed that President Bush failed to characterize the brutal massacre of the Armenian people as a genocide in his annual commemoration address. To deny this truth is to