

avoiding health care altogether, because of medical privacy concerns.

The medical privacy rule issued by the Clinton Administration in December 2000 established a sound foundation for addressing the complex issues relating to medical records privacy. Unfortunately, the Bush Administration's changes to the rule opened up significant loopholes in medical privacy protection. The Bush Administration eliminated the rule's requirement that individuals must provide consent before their personal health information can be used for treatment, payment, and a broad category of activities called "health care operations."

The Bush Administration also decreased privacy protections relating to marketing activities by removing privacy protections for activities that most consumers consider to be marketing. In addition, it changed the rule to allow disclosures of health information without patient consent to drug companies and other entities regulated by the FDA for a wide range of purposes. The December 2000 rule, in contrast, allowed such disclosures only for a narrowly defined list of health-related activities such as reporting adverse events associated with drugs.

That is why I am joining my colleagues Reps. MARKEY, DINGELL, and ROHRBACHER today in introducing the Stop Taking Our Health Privacy Act of 2003. The STOHP Act would: (1) reinstate the December 2000 rule's patient consent requirement for treatment, payment, and health care operations while ensuring that this requirement does not undermine essential health care activities such as filling prescriptions and making referrals; (2) strike the Bush Administration's definition of "marketing," thereby ensuring that the rule's privacy protections apply to activities consumers consider marketing; and (3) eliminate the broad exemption the Bush Administration created that would have allowed disclosure without consent to drug companies, while ensuring that disclosures essential for public health purposes are allowed.

I am pleased that this bill has bipartisan support. Medical privacy should not be a partisan issue. I hope to continue to work with both Democratic and Republican colleagues to remedy the harm done by the changes to the rule and to promote vigilant enforcement by the Administration of the privacy protections that remain. I will also continue to press for additional protections to ensure appropriate disclosure and use of individuals' health information.

TRIBUTE TO THE ASSISTANT CITY  
MANAGER BOB WALES, CITY OF  
RIVERSIDE, CA

**HON. KEN CALVERT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 10, 2003*

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Riverside, California are exceptional. The community of Riverside has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Bob Wales is one

of these individuals. On Thursday, April 10, 2003, Bob will be honored at a retirement reception in recognition of his contributions as the Riverside Assistant City Manager.

Bob received his Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1962. Upon graduation, Bob was commissioned in the U.S. Army and served honorably as a First Lieutenant in Orleans, France until joining the California Division of Highways in 1964. Bob obtained his license as a Professional Engineer from the State of California in 1969. Bob's accomplishments include the design of the 2/210 freeway interchange as well as the design of numerous bridges throughout California.

Bob began his career with the City of Riverside as an Associate Engineer in the Public Works Department in August of 1969. Over the following eight years Bob served as a Senior Engineer and a Principal Engineer.

In 1977, Bob was named Public Works Director and continued in that position for ten years until he was later appointed Assistant City Manager of Development. His duties included the oversight of the Public Works, Planning, Airport and Development Departments, as well as negotiating agreements with private developers and ensuring expeditious processing of key economic development projects.

In 1986, Bob was appointed Executive Director of the Riverside Redevelopment Agency in addition to his other duties. In that position he has contributed to all facets of redevelopment in the City's six project areas. Under his exemplary leadership, the Agency has been involved in hundreds of projects worth millions of dollars including the reopening of the historic Mission Inn, the construction of a California State office building, the redevelopment of a major portion of the east side of Riverside with two large scale retail/entertainment projects and the creation of a Justice Center in the downtown area which brought in a State Court of Appeals, a U.S. Bankruptcy Court, a U.S. Federal District Court and a County Family Law Court.

Bob's tireless passion for community service has contributed immensely to the betterment of the community of Riverside, California. He has been the heart and soul of many of the redevelopment projects and the vision of the future for Riverside and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I know that many community members are grateful for his service and salute him as he retires.

INTRODUCING THE AIR TRAFFIC  
CONTROL SYSTEM INTEGRITY ACT

**HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 10, 2003*

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with Congressmen LOBIONDO, DEFAZIO, and QUINN to introduce the Air Traffic Control System Integrity Act of 2003, a bill to ensure that functions relating to the air traffic control system continue to be carried out by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the Bush Administration's recent attempts to inch its way towards privatization or corporatization

of our air traffic control system. First, on June 4, 2002, the President signed Executive Order 13264 to delete a phrase in Executive Order 13180 stating that air traffic control is an "inherently-governmental function."

More recently, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) placed air traffic controllers on its 2002 Commercial Activities list, which is an inventory of activities performed by government personnel that should be subject to the forces of competition. Although FAA Administrator Marion Blakey testified before the House Aviation Subcommittee that ATC is in a protected class of the OMB Commercial Activities list, there is nothing that prohibits the Administration from re-categorizing ATC in the future.

The National Air Space system is not one well-defined piece of equipment. It is a complex, integrated arrangement of thousands of distinct systems, as well as regulations, procedures, and people, all interfacing with one another to accomplish one of the most intricate missions in the world—ensuring our country's ability to safely and efficiently move over 600 million passenger a year.

On September 11th, we learned just how efficiently our 15,000 air traffic controllers and 6,000 technicians do their jobs. On that fateful day, at 9:45 a.m., the Department of Transportation gave the order to ground all aircraft in U.S. airspace immediately—an operation that controllers and technicians had neither been trained nor tested to accomplish. Within the space of two hours, the FAA's air traffic controllers safely landed 4,482 aircraft; 3,195 commercial, 1,122 general aviation, and 165 military—without one operational error.

Following September 11th, our FAA technicians worked with the Department of Defense to staff Long Range Radar sites throughout the country as well as to provide additional radar surveillance data and voice communication capability to the military in support of "Homeland Defense." The dedication and professionalism of all of our highly skilled government employees is unparalleled.

Operation of ATC requires the cooperative, coordinated efforts of many divisions in FAA including those responsible for ATC services, facilities and equipment, safety certification and regulation, airport development, research and development and law. All of these divisions are required by law to have safety as their highest priority.

Any plan to privatize or corporatize the ATC system contemplates that system users, principally the airlines, will be saddled with a fee structure to pay for the corporation. This means that the ATC system will be an expense for airlines, affecting their profit and loss. At the same time, airlines will play a role in setting policies for the new corporation and deciding how much the corporation will spend, and, very likely, deciding who will be winners, and who will be losers.

Do we really want to have a relationship between airline profitability and ATC spending and other decisions affecting safety or security? To be blunt, when airline profit margins start to influence ATC practices, the safety margin may be eroded, and that would not serve the public interest.

One of the main justifications advanced in support of an ATC corporation is that it would produce a system that is more responsive to airline concerns and would reduce airline costs. However, two of the most prominent