

Human Services. To reverse current trends in medical education and lower the rate of inflation on health care costs, I have introduced the Primary Health Care Education Act.

In the past year, two separate Government-funded studies have produced substantial evidence that medical schools must respond now to compensate for our primary care needs of the 21st century. The Primary Health Care Education Act is based on the findings and recommendations to the Congress found in both reports. These reports include: first, the General Accounting Office's [GAO] October 1994 report to congressional requesters entitled, "Medical Education: Curriculum and Financing Strategies, Need to Encourage Primary Care," and second, the Council on Graduate Medical Education's [COGME] eighth report to Congress and the Department of Health and Human Services called Patient Care Physician Supply and Requirements: Testing COGME Recommendations.

I would like to briefly summarize the GAO's findings. Medical career decisions are usually made at three specific times during a student's education: first, at the end of college when students typically apply to medical school, second, during the fourth year of medical school when students choose the area of medicine to pursue and enter residency training, and third, at the end of residency training when residents decide to enter practice or to train further for a subspecialty. The Primary Health Care Education Act attempts to encourage primary care as a career choice at all points in a student's academic career.

The choice of career paths in medicine is found to be significantly influenced by the curriculum and training opportunities students receive during their medical education. Foremost among these factors was whether the medical school had a family practice department. Students attending schools with family practice departments were 57 percent more likely to pursue primary care than those attending schools without family practice departments. Second, the higher the ratio of funding of a family practice department in relation to the number of students, the higher the percentage of students choosing to enter primary care. Students attending medical schools with highly funded departments were 18 percent more likely to pursue primary care than students attending schools with lower funding. A third factor was whether a family practice clerkship was required before career decisions were made in the fourth year. Students attending schools which required a third-year clerkship were 18 percent more likely to pursue primary care. Fourth, a significant correlation was found between residents who were exposed to primary care faculty, exposed to hospital rounds taught by primary care faculty, and exposed to rotations which required training in primary care—and residents who were not—in choosing to enter general practice.

Given the health care needs of the 21st century, COGME recommends we attain the following physician work force goals by the year 2000. First year residency positions should be limited to the number of 1993 U.S. medical school graduates, plus 10 percent. At least 50 percent of residency graduates should enter practice as primary care physicians. By comparison, current projections show that America will have a mix of 31 percent generalists and 69 percent specialists by 2000—under the status quo.

To reverse the current trends toward specialization, the Traficant Primary Care Education Act directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to give preference to medical schools which have established programs that: first, emphasize training in primary care, and second, encourage students to choose primary care. Under the act, the Secretary must consider the GAO's findings when establishing the conditions a medical school must meet to receive preference.

The Secretary, however, is by no means limited to the GAO's findings. The Primary Health Care Education Act was designed to give the Department of Health and Human Services the authority to shift the current trends in medical education to meet existing and future needs. It does this by giving preference, or awarding grants and contracts to schools which have designed curriculum that has been proven to increase primary care. The Traficant bill, however, by no means dictates, to the administering agency or medical schools, the best way to achieve the desired results. The Traficant bill, in fact, follows the intent of language of the Public Health Service amendments of 1992, which was passed only by this body. It is my hope that HHS, as the expert agency on this issue, in consultation with medical schools, GAO, and COGME, will attain the health care and physician work force needs of the 21st century.

The Primary Health Care Education Act has been endorsed by the American Osteopathic Association and the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine. If you support improved access to services and lower health care costs, I urge you to cosponsor the Primary Care Education Act.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH TRIBUTE TO REV. LEON H. SULLIVAN

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today we take the time to observe Black History Month and pay tribute to those individuals who have made significant contributions to history and to our society. One such individual is Rev. Leon Howard Sullivan, a clergyman and civil rights activist, from Charleston, WV.

Leon H. Sullivan was born on October 16, 1922. Growing up, he lived in an environment that was severely limited both economically and socially. In spite of his circumstances, Sullivan focused his after school energies on religion and sports. At the remarkably early age of 17, he was ordained a Baptist minister, and soon thereafter, he entered West Virginia State College, a historically black college, on an athletic scholarship. His contribution to society and to West Virginia State College led to the construction of Sullivan Hall in 1970. Sullivan Hall houses the women students at West Virginia State College and the West Virginia Graduate Studies Administrative and College Offices.

In 1942, Sullivan met former U.S. Representative, Adam Clayton-Powell who was visiting West Virginia. Sullivan so deeply impressed Powell that at Powell's suggestion, Sullivan moved to New York City to study theology at the Union Theological Seminary and sociology at Columbia University.

After completing his studies, Sullivan became the pastor of the Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia from 1950 to 1988. In the 38 years he served at the Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia, the congregation increased from 600 to 6,000 members. Sullivan expanded the church's activities to include a daycare center, a credit union, an employment agency, a community center for youth and adults, adult education reading classes, athletic teams, choral groups, and family counseling services.

In an effort to provide opportunities for African-American business ventures, in 1962 Sullivan established the Zion Investment Association in Philadelphia. He has constantly fought the war against racist hiring practices and organized protests and economic boycotts. In 1964, he demonstrated another act of courage on behalf of justice and equality when he established the Opportunities Industrialization Center [OICA], the first organization of its kind in the United States dedicated to providing comprehensive employment training and placement for disadvantaged, unemployed, and unskilled Americans of all races. Today, there are more than 70 OIC centers across the United States and 28 centers in countries such as Africa, Poland, Central America, England, and the Philippines.

Reverend Sullivan's concerns regarding housing for the poor and the elderly resulted in the construction of more than 1,000 housing units in major cities including Philadelphia, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, and Indianapolis. His OIC training programs have trained more than 2 million people for better job opportunities in America and Africa.

He is the recipient of more than 100 national and international awards, and in 1992, President George Bush presented Reverend Sullivan with The Presidential Medal of Freedom. He serves on the board of directors of numerous companies such as Mellon Bank and is the director emeritus of General Motors Corp. where he was the first African-American to sit on the GM board.

This is but a thumbnail sketch of the many achievements of Rev. Leon H. Sullivan. With a mind full of ideas and the motto "We help ourselves," Rev. Leon H. Sullivan has contributed immensely to the advancement of African-Americans and to society as a whole. He is a man of great wisdom with many hopes and dreams for his fellow Americans and is an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS MARCHESE

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 9, 1997, Mr. Louis Marchese, 65, died at his home in Arlington Heights, IL. I rise today to pay tribute to this fine man.

A prominent lawyer in Illinois, with an extensive background in contract and distribution law, Mr. Marchese was a senior partner with the Chicago law firm of Halfpenny, Hahn, Roche & Marchese. He was nationally recognized for his expertise in association law, anti-trust law, contract law, trade regulation, employment law, product liability, interstate taxation, and government regulatory law. In addition to his significant legal contributions, Mr.

Marchese also lectured at the Executive Development Centers of both the University of Illinois at Chicago and Northwestern University. He also is credited with writing several books and articles related to his legal work and experience.

Mr. Marchese was a member of the Chicago Bar Association, the American Trial Lawyers Association, and the legal section of the American Society of Association Executives. He received his law degree from the DePaul University School of Law in Chicago and was an Army veteran of the Korean war.

His son, Steven, is my talented and effective legislative assistant.

Besides Steven, Mr. Marchese is survived by his wife, Margaret; son, John; daughters, Mary Ellen Baker, Ann Griffin, and Meg Marchese; his mother, Anna; brother, Jerry; and five grandchildren.

A TRIBUTE TO GWENDOLYN BROOKS, A LEADING VOICE IN AMERICA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Gwendolyn Brooks, who is being honored for her distinguished career on February 14, 1997, by the Department of English and the Moorland Spingarn Research Center of Howard University. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a special person who has touched millions of people throughout the world with her words.

Gwendolyn Brooks was born in Topeka, KS, in 1917 and then moved to Chicago early in her life. She has long been recognized as a leading voice in modern American letters. For more than 50 years, she has undertaken as her life's work a composite portrait of African-Americans acknowledging within the universe of her poems their nobility and enduring spirit. For five decades, she has interpreted their stories within the context of America, commemorating in works such as "A Street in Bronzeville," "Annie Allen," "The Bean Eaters," "In the Mecca," "Family Pictures," "Riot," "Aloneness," "Beckonings," "To Disembark," "Maud Martha," and "Blacks," those of us adjudged the leastwise of the land. With prophetic insight, eloquence, and passion she has written of her people's joys; their triumphs, their follies, and their despair. But through the sustaining power of her love and the depth of her commitment, her people live and may yet prevail.

Gwendolyn Brooks, distinguished poet of our time, distinguished poet laureate of Illinois, distinguished consultant-in-poetry to the Library of Congress, distinguished Pulitzer Prize winner, teacher, mentor, true lover of the poor, poet of the people, we honor and salute you.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS ALVA EDISON

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Thomas

Alva Edison, the greatest inventor, whose 150th birthday was February 11. He was a man whose vision transformed America from an agrarian nation into an urban-industrial power. He almost single-handedly ushered the world from the age of steam into the age of electricity. Thomas Edison embodies everything noble about our great country.

He was born to Canadian immigrants Samuel and Nancy Edison in Milan, OH, on February 11, 1847. As a young, inquisitive boy he was actually expelled from elementary school for asking too many questions. Instead, he was taught at home by his mother and by his own intellect and curiosity. Despite these difficulties, he became one of the most prolific inventors in history.

There are few Americans who can claim that their vision, their creativity, their hard work and their entrepreneurial imagination have positively benefited the lives of virtually every human being on the planet for the last century.

Thomas Edison is one such person. He received a record 1,093 patents. These were for inventions such as the electric light bulb, the phonograph, and the motion picture camera. He also revolutionized the electric power generation and distribution systems, marking the true beginnings of the world's electric utility industry.

California has particularly benefited from this great man's genius. He created our film and recording industries which now employ over half-a-million people and exceed more than \$40 billion in annual worldwide revenues. Even today, one of the world's largest energy companies based in California, still bears his name: Edison International.

Perhaps Edison's greatest contribution to the science community was establishing the world's first research laboratory. His lab in West Orange, NJ, is now designated as the Edison National Historic Site.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Thomas Alva Edison for his contributions to all mankind. He is an American we can proudly point to as a role model for our youth and as an inspiration to our future.

REGARDING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS NATIONWIDE PERMIT PROGRAM REVISIONS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 12, 1997

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to an issue which has recently arisen regarding the implementation of the Congressional Review Act [CRA], Public Law No. 104-121, subtitle E, title II, 110 Stat. 847, 868-74 (1996). I particularly want to thank the Honorable H. Martin Lancaster, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, and Maj. Gen. Russell Fuhrman, Director of Civil Works, for the spirit of bipartisan cooperation with which they and their staff worked with the Transportation and Infrastructure Reform and Oversight Committee. Because, however, the issue is one which is likely to recur, I bring it to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration.

As many of you are aware, in December 1996, the Army Corps of Engineers issued its "Final Notice of Issuance, Reissuance and Modification of Nationwide Permits," (61 Fed. Reg. 65874 (Dec. 13, 1996)), which will significantly alter wetlands permitting in the United States. That regulation took effect yesterday, February 11, 1997.

Initially, the corps refused to submit the nationwide permit final rule to Congress because the agency maintained that the CRA did not apply. The corps argued that the nationwide permit regulations were not a rule within the meaning of the act for various reasons relating to, among other things, the permit-like nature of the regulations and their optional—rather than mandatory—use by permittees.

I disagree with that view. In my judgment, the corps' nationwide permit regulation was a rule within the meaning of the CRA and section 551 of the Administrative Procedure Act. My view was supported by an earlier opinion of the general counsel of the General Accounting Office who reached a similar conclusion on analogous facts last year. The general counsel considered the Secretary of Agriculture's issuance of an agency memorandum concerning the implementation of the Emergency Salvage Timer Sale Program. See B-274505, Letter from Robert Murphy, General Counsel, to Senator Larry E. Craig (Sept. 16, 1996). Even though that implementing memorandum was not a formal notice and comment rule, GAO nonetheless concluded that the memorandum met the much broader definition of a "rule" used in the CRA and was required by that act to be submitted to Congress for review. Given the nature of the Corps' Nationwide Permit Program proposal, I concluded that failure to submit the proposal to Congress would also violate the CRA, in light of the analysis and criteria used by GAO.

I was even more concerned with the potential that failure to submit the nationwide permit proposal for review could have rendered the entire, reissued program invalid based solely on procedural grounds. The CRA, 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1), provides that before a rule may become effective, the agency promulgating the rule must submit it to each House of Congress for review. The corps' initial inclination not to submit the nationwide permit final notice to Congress ran the risk that a Federal court might subsequently determine that the failure to do so violated the requirements of §801(a)(1). Were that determination to be made, the nationwide permit rule might be deemed without effect and all permits issued thereunder subsequent to February 11, 1997, deemed null and void ab initio.

In light of this uncertainty, I urged the corps to rethink its position and accept the congressional review process adopted in the 104th Congress. To its credit, the corps did so—although with reluctance. Though the corps continues to believe that submission of the nationwide permit rule was unnecessary, the corps agreed to submit the rule for review under the congressional review process and did so yesterday. We have both agreed that in doing so the corps remains free to argue its position both to Congress in connection with any further submissions under the CRA and in the Federal courts.

While the corps submitted the rule in the interest of comity, I remain concerned about the agency's determination that the rule is not a major rule triggering the special moratorium