

The Advanced Technology Program is not public financing of established technologies. It should not be seen as speculative investment nor should its success be measured in the same economic terms as private investment. Framing the debate in these terms is fundamentally wrong and misses the point of the program. The ATP is a research and development program, not an exercise in government venture capital.

The program seeks to provide a critical bridge for the "funding gap" from innovation to the marketplace of pre-competitive, emerging technologies. ATP seeks to smooth the transition from invention to commercialization, the so-called "valley of death" or "Darwinian Sea." The United States has the greatest research effort in the world. Our universities and industries develop more ideas and discover more innovations than everywhere else combined. We also understand capital markets and have used our knowledge to produce the world's most vibrant and robust economy. Yet we are still not very good at turning raw ideas into commercial products. While it is tempting to believe that this process is straightforward and should be understandable from basic social and economic principles, it is not and cannot. The relationship between the private sector and this intermediate stage between research and venture capital investment is poorly understood and the subject of intense scrutiny. It would be wrong to treat it as a mature, fully-formed, capital arena.

As such, there is a role for government to play. What's more, the ATP has been largely successful in carrying out that role. The purpose of the ATP is to develop and disseminate high-risk technologies with the potential for broad-based economic benefits. It is devoted to technical research; research that is more directed than basic proof-of-principle work, but not to product development. And more often than not, it involves matching funds from industry. This process has worked. In a recent review of the first 50 ATP awards, 32 projects have been successful in bringing 61 products or processes to market.

Despite this success, H.R. 2500, the Fiscal Year 2002 Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill, only provides enough funds to fulfill existing commitments and halts new awards. While I understand the rationale to suspend new ATP grants is due to the on-going program re-evaluation efforts conducted by the Secretary of Commerce, I am concerned that this may ultimately lead to a zeroing out of the program. The ATP is one of the most closely reviewed government programs of all time. In addition, the National Research Council has just completed the most comprehensive review of ATP to date and the review is extremely positive. The report calls ATP an "effective federal partnership program" and claims that it "appears to have been successful in achieving its core objective." It also cites its "exceptional assessment effort" and compliments its review and awards process. These are extremely strong statements for a non-partisan group that tries to avoid making policy judgments.

The Academy report, however, does not say the program is perfect and does take issue with certain aspects of the ATP. It also makes recommendations for changes and improvements. These concerns should be taken seriously, but the report is still a strong endorsement for continuing the program. Effective pro-

grams that produce measurable long-term economic benefits should not be sacrificed on the altar of short-term budget constraints. The success of the ATP speaks for itself and the program should be continued. At the very least, I hope that when this legislation is considered in conference, there will be adequate funding to continue the program pending the Secretary's reevaluation.

TRIBUTE TO THE HORNETTES OF
NASHVILLE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2001

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Hornets of Nashville High School on their recent state softball championship. The Hornets defeated the Stanford Olympia Spartans 3-0 to win their first ever Class A State Softball Championship.

In addition to being crowned state champs, the Nashville Hornets tied the state record for most wins in a season with 41 victories and only 2 losses. The team gave Nashville softball fans a thrill throughout their historic season.

I would like to personally commend the team members and coaches for a job well done. They are: Cara Pries, Lindsay Henry, Tessa Schmale, Amy Harre, Amber Fark, Linda Maschhoff, Amy Rybacki, Ashley Schaeffer, Mallory Ruggles, Krystal Stein, Kristen Klingler, Danielle Kaufman, Chelsi Boatright, Nicole Richard, Danielle Chambers, Heather Guest, Sara Skibinski, Nicole Asberry, and Stephanie Niedbalski. Their coaches are: Neil Hamon, Wayne Harre, Charlie Heck, and Head Coach Chad Malawy. I am very proud of you all.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE POLICE
CHIEF CECIL GURR

HON. CHRIS CANNON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2001

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a fallen police chief from Roosevelt, Utah. Police Chief Cecil Gurr was "off duty" in his car en route to the grocery store to run family errands when he heard a police dispatch about a domestic dispute at a nearby convenience store. As he had countless other times, he responded to the call. Drawing attention away from his officers, Chief Gurr deliberately placed himself in the line of fire to protect his men. Caught in the exchange of gunfire, Gurr died Friday, July 6th, 2001 in the line of duty for the Duchesne County community. I send my prayers and condolences to his family, neighbors, and the community as a whole.

Cecil Gurr had been Roosevelt's police chief since 1978. He grew up in Roosevelt and joined its police force in 1974 after a tour of duty in Vietnam and a short stint with the FBI. Nearly 30 years of his life was devoted to protecting his hometown of 4,000 residents. He is survived by his wife, Lynnette, his three children, and four grandchildren. Left behind are

neighbors and a community that will greatly miss his unconditional self sacrifice, kindness, generosity, and quiet demeanor. And, now those left behind must unite to support and strengthen one another during the coming months and years as they heal.

"He was very fair and firm and always had the best interests of the community at hand . . . He'd do anything for you. He never asked for anything in return," stated Roosevelt Police Officer Brad Draper. The National Law Enforcement Officer Memorial says that "it is not how these officers died that made them heroes, it is how they lived."

We may never truly comprehend the latent danger associated with the daily routines of our law enforcement officers. They continually put themselves in danger as they stop a vehicle, respond to an incident or a suspicious circumstance. The dangers, risks, and violence they encounter each day are very real. Sorrowfully, at such times we pause to honor the brave law enforcement officers who serve and protect our communities. I hope they will routinely be given the honor, respect and thanks they deserve—not only when life's fragile nature is revealed.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask that you and our colleagues join me in remembering this fine man and the selfless life he lived. On behalf of the residents of the Third District of Utah, we extend our prayers and most heartfelt sympathy to his family and loved ones.

IN TRIBUTE TO KATHARINE
GRAHAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2001

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, our nation has lost one of the true giants of American journalism. Katharine Graham, 84, the former chairman and chief executive officer of The Post Co. and former publisher of The Washington Post, died on July 17 from head injuries she sustained in a fall while on a business trip in Idaho.

Mrs. Graham was a remarkable woman of courage, grace and integrity who lead the Post through what has been called two of the most celebrated episodes in American journalism: the publication in 1971 of the Pentagon Papers and the Watergate scandal. She is credited with transforming the Post into one of the nation's leading newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, to our colleagues who spend so much time in Washington, D.C., The Washington Post is required daily reading if we want to stay on top of the news of the nation and world. To the handful of us who are privileged to represent congressional districts in the Washington metropolitan region, The Washington Post is our hometown newspaper and we today share in the loss of its legendary leader.

I would like to share with our colleagues the July 18 editorial from The Washington Post in tribute to Katharine Graham.

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 2001]

KATHARINE GRAHAM 1917-2001

It's one of the wonderful mysteries of journalism that, though a thousand people's labor may be necessary to produce each day's issue, every newspaper takes on an

identity of its own. That character is shaped by people you may have heard of—the top editor, an advice columnist, a chief political correspondent, your county's school reporter—and by many whose names you probably don't know: the copy editors, the ad sellers, the press operators and distributors. Few of those who work here, though, would dispute that at The Post a single person is responsible first and foremost for making our newspaper what it is today. That person is Katharine Graham, who died yesterday at the age of 84.

Mrs. Graham's imprint was the product both of her values, which suffused the paper, and of the crucial decisions she made about its leadership and direction. At The Post and Newsweek, she chose great editors, such as The Post's Benjamin Bradlee, and then gave them the independence and resources they needed to produce strong journalism. She also supported them at crucial moments, when their work was doubted or under attack by powerful forces in and outside of government. Two of those cases helped define her career, and The Post: her refusal to bow to the government's efforts to block publication of the Pentagon Papers and her backing of the paper's coverage of the Watergate scandal.

Her decision in 1971 to publish the Pentagon's secret history of the Vietnam War, after a federal court already had blocked the New York Times from doing so, was even harder than it appears in retrospect. There was nothing harmful to national security in the papers, but the Nixon administration claimed otherwise, and its henchmen were not above threatening The Washington Post Co.'s television licenses. Mrs. Graham's lawyers advised against publication; they said the entire business could be ruined. But after listening to the arguments on both sides, Mrs. Graham said, "Let's go. Let's publish." In those circumstances, she didn't believe that the government ought to be telling a newspaper what it could not print.

She proved that again the following year, when The Post again came under enormous government pressure as it pursued, almost alone, the story behind the Watergate break-in. The White House insisted that The Post's reporting was false, and launched a series of public and private attacks against the newspaper—and, on occasion, against Mrs. Graham. Such pressure would have caused many publishers to rein in their newsrooms, but Mrs. Graham did not; instead, she strongly backed Mr. Bradlee and his team. Some two years later, partly because of the paper's persistence, Mr. Nixon was forced to resign.

No less important to the paper's success was the fact that Mrs. Graham was a tough-minded businesswoman who never lost sight of the fact that high-quality journalism depended on running a newspaper that turned a profit. She concentrated on the business success of the newspaper, leading it through a difficult strike by pressmen in the mid-'70s, even as she oversaw the diversification and expansion of The Post Co., which added new broadcast television stations and cable networks under her leadership.

All those decisions would have been lonely and frightening for any chief executive; given Mrs. Graham's unusual position, they were all the more so. It's hard now to recall how extraordinary it was for a woman to occupy her job, but for years she was the only female head of a Fortune 500 corporation. You get a sense of how anomalous this was when you realize that she was a brainy University of Chicago graduate with journalism experience, both at this paper and elsewhere; and yet when the time came for her father to bequeath The Post to the next generation, it was her husband, Philip Graham, who took

over. No one, least of all Katharine, found this strange. Only when her husband died did Mrs. Graham take over the paper; her insecurities in doing so are well documented in her Pulitzer Prize-winning autobiography, "Personal History."

One of Mrs. Graham's public faces over time became that of the society figure. Both in Georgetown and in her summer home in Martha's Vineyard, she hosted presidents (including the incumbent) and generals and secretaries of state. She liked doing these things—Mrs. Graham knew the pleasures of gossip, and she believed, among other things, that Washington should be fun—but there was a serious aspect to them too. Beneath the high-society veneer was an old-fashioned patriotism: a belief that liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, even politicians and journalists, shared a purpose higher than their differences and so ought to be able to break bread together. Her credentials for bringing people together were strengthened by her scrupulous refusal to use her position (not to mention this editorial page) to advance her personal or corporate financial interests. She was the same way about philanthropy; she gave generously to many institutions and causes in and outside of Washington, yet sought little credit for it.

In what she amusingly called retirement, Mrs. Graham seemed only to become more active. With the publication of her autobiography, so astonishingly honest and unsentimental about herself, the well-known publisher became an even better-known author. And yet, as public a figure as she was, we here at The Post flattered ourselves to think that we saw an essential side of her that others did not. We were the beneficiaries of her investment, year after year, in a superior product: in new sections, new local, domestic and foreign bureaus, new and diverse talent. We were the beneficiaries of her gradual and graceful passing of the baton to the next generation, a transition that she made seem easy but that—as the experience of other great newspaper families shows—can work only with the greatest of care. We got to hear her brutally frank assessments of puffed-up Washington celebrities, delivered in salty language that forever altered the pearls-and-Georgetown image for anyone who heard them. Most of all, we got to see the respect she brought, and the high expectations she held, day in and day out, for fair-minded journalism. The respect was more than reciprocated. We will miss her very much.

VETERANS HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2001

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, As the graduation season comes to a close, I would like to recognize a few special graduates from the state of Idaho. Local high school students presented about 50 World War II veterans with high school diplomas they never received due to the war. These men put their education on hold, joined arms, and fought valiantly for our beautiful country. The high school diplomas are well deserved and long overdue.

Retired servicemen appreciate the homage that high school students are giving, and I am pleased to see the youth in Idaho recognizing the great deeds of past generations. The Greek historian Herodotus once wrote, "Great

deeds are usually wrought at great risks." When faced with the dangers of war, our American soldiers proved their valor and accomplished the greatest deed of all: heroism. How can we allow Americans to forget the heroic efforts of veterans more than 50 years ago?

As Memorial Day passes and Veterans' Day quickly approaches, we as a country cannot escape our obligation toward our American heroes. World War II veterans have never asked for a monument and were content without it, but it is time for us to say thank you for their courage and sacrifice through gestures such as a memorial. I am grateful that Americans have finally pulled together to honor these brave men and women of World War II with a national memorial.

High school students throughout Idaho have discovered a way to say thank you to the saviors of our country. As young Idahoans helped veterans to don the traditional cap and gown this year, it reminded me that throughout these 50 years we have not forgotten these men or their important role in our American history. Through the ongoing construction of the World War II Memorial, high school diplomas, and many other events, we are demonstrating our deep reverence to the heroes of our nation and keeping their memories alive.

DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 2001

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the long-term care debate continues to grow as a key health care issue and it will continue to grow more in the coming decade as Americans live longer.

Fortunately, more attention is starting to be focused on long-term care; the bad news is that there is a tremendous gap in ideas and solutions to make sure every family has access to affordable, quality long-term care when it is needed. In Pennsylvania already 1.9 million seniors and nearly 220,000 individuals with disabilities rely on Medicare to meet long-term costs, and 84,743 Pennsylvanians are in nursing homes.

In the next decade, the first of the "baby boomers" will reach 65 sending the need for long-term care much higher very quickly.

While long-term care is usually thought of in terms of the elderly, two of every five Americans will need long-term care at some point in their lives, often because of an injury or disability as well as advanced age. It is therefore, essential that the health care system provide families with affordable, available options for long-term care—options that provide the kind of quality everyone wants to see for a family member or friend.

A major trend in long-term care is away from nursing homes, to keep people in their homes or with family as long as possible, to look at alternative living arrangements and to stress community support and involvement. As we sort through this issue, it is imperative that long-term care promote individual dignity, maximize independence and self-sufficiency and be provided in the least restrictive setting—that includes providing home and community based, flexible, benefits and services.

The trend in long-term care is moving away from institutions like nursing homes. This is