

## H. RES. 455

Whereas for nearly 50 years, John Francis "Jack" Buck was known as the "Voice of the St. Louis Cardinals" to generations of baseball fans, one of the most respected sports broadcasters in the industry, and a beloved institution to all St. Louis Cardinals fans;

Whereas Jack Buck's distinctive voice and his signature exclamation "That's a winner" following each Cardinals victory were familiar to baseball fans across the United States;

Whereas Jack Buck was born in Holyoke, Massachusetts, in 1924 and was a decorated veteran of World War II;

Whereas Jack Buck began his broadcasting career in 1948 while attending Ohio State University, where he was the play-by-play announcer for football, basketball, and baseball;

Whereas in 1954, Jack Buck was hired by the St. Louis Cardinals, joined Harry Caray in the booth at Sportsman's Park, and began his 48 years of broadcasting Cardinals baseball on KMOX radio;

Whereas in 1970, Jack Buck was made the lead play-by-play announcer for the St. Louis Cardinals and he brought baseball to life for millions of fans throughout the Midwest;

Whereas Jack Buck covered some of the greatest moments in baseball history, including Lou Brock's record-setting 118th stolen base, Bob Gibson's incredible 1968 season, and Mark McGwire's record-breaking 70th home run in 1998;

Whereas in 1960, Jack Buck was the play-by-play announcer for the first televised American Football League game and worked AFL broadcasts for three years;

Whereas Jack Buck was the announcer for one of professional football's most famous games, the 1967 NFL Championship game, dubbed the "Ice Bowl", between the Green Bay Packers and the Dallas Cowboys;

Whereas Jack Buck was the radio voice of Monday Night Football from 1978 to 1996;

Whereas Jack Buck was the lead announcer for 8 World Series, 17 Super Bowls, numerous baseball All-Star and National League playoff games, and other major sporting events, including professional bowling;

Whereas Jack Buck has been inducted into 11 different Halls of Fame, including the Baseball Hall of Fame (1987), the Pro Football Hall of Fame (1996), the American Sportscasters Association Hall of Fame (1990), the Radio Hall of Fame (1995), and the St. Louis Walk of Fame (1991), and has been the recipient of numerous lifetime achievement broadcasting awards;

Whereas for more than 30 years Jack Buck was the campaign chairman for the St. Louis chapter of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, for which he helped raise more than \$30,000,000 for research to find a cure for the disease; and

Whereas on June 18, 2002, Jack Buck passed away after a long and distinguished career in broadcasting in which he touched the lives of millions of sports fans across the United States; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives honors the life of John Francis "Jack" Buck.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 445, just adopted, and on H.R. 5018, passed earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1800

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## CONCERN OVER POSSIBLE SHUTDOWN OF AMTRAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong concerns over the possible shutdown of Amtrak.

Amtrak's new president has said that Amtrak needs a \$200 million loan guarantee by June 30 or the company will have to begin a shutdown of all services. This would have a serious impact on commuters and travelers across this country, and I speak for those who would be strongly affected in California. For that reason, Congress and the administration must avert a shutdown.

We cannot allow Amtrak to go bankrupt. Amtrak is a critical component of our national transportation network, providing safe, efficient and affordable transportation for millions of Americans each year. Amtrak serves over 500 cities and communities across this country, many of which rely on trains as a crucial transportation option.

Since 1996, ridership on Amtrak trains has increased by 19 percent. Last year, Amtrak had 23 million riders. Including commuter services, Amtrak's total ridership exceeds 60 million passengers a year.

Amtrak also plays a significant role in my State. California hosts three of the top six most heavily traveled services in the country. The Pacific Surfliner, which serves my congressional district in southern and central California, carries more than 1½ million passengers annually. The Surfliner is California's most highly developed service, and it is second only to Amtrak's northeast corridor in ridership. It connects two of the most congested regions in the country, Los Angeles and San Diego. Maintaining mobility in this busy economic corridor is essential.

In addition, if funds are not provided to Amtrak, regional contract partners, like commuter rail system Metrolink, are at risk. Metrolink contracts with Amtrak to provide service throughout southern California, including Ventura

County. Shutting down Metrolink service will not only impact ridership, 34,000 riders a day, but contribute to increased congestion on the region's highways.

In my district, Amtrak serves Santa Barbara, Goleta, Lompoc, Guadeloupe, San Luis Obispo and Paso Robles. These communities rely on Amtrak as a very important, vital transportation link.

At a time when more and more communities are looking to rail passenger service to increase transportation options, create economic development and reduce congestion, we must avoid an unnecessary disruption of service that America depends on.

Mr. Speaker, there are three things Congress and the administration can do. First, we must support an appropriation of \$200 million for Amtrak in the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. A number of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the conferees urging them to do so yesterday. I urge the administration to join in this effort.

Second, we must substantially increase funding for Amtrak above current levels. As my colleagues know, the President has requested in his budget only half of what Amtrak says it needs to survive. If we do not address this shortfall, the railroad has publicly stated that it may be forced to eliminate the entire long distance train network.

Third, we must adopt a long-term strategy to reform and to improve Amtrak.

We need to address the real problem with passenger rail travel in this country: lack of funding, new missions and undercapitalization. As we begin a new era, our Nation needs a viable passenger rail system to supplement our network of highways and airports. It is time we recognize such a system requires more financial support.

The Department of Transportation's Inspector General has stated that Amtrak has never received sufficient funding to invest in capital projects that would create opportunities for greater efficiency and revenue production. Yet, despite the inadequate support, Amtrak has been able to increase ridership and revenue. I commend Amtrak for doing so much with so little.

In conclusion, I would like to urge the administration to take action to prevent a shutdown of Amtrak. Immediate Federal investment in our national passenger rail system is vital. If we are unable to avoid a shutdown, thousands of Amtrak workers could lose their jobs, and millions of passengers face the loss of vital train service in communities nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we can make a commitment to provide stable and adequate funding for the national Amtrak passenger rail network.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

DEMOCRATIC PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug bill we are introducing today is straightforward. It is easily distinguishable from the Republican bill introduced last week. There is no fine print in our bill. There are no holes in our prescription drug coverage. There are no question marks where the premium and cost-sharing requirements should be. The availability of coverage does not hinge on the Federal Government, unlike the Republican plan, showering the insurance industry with tax dollars so they will offer stand-alone drug plans.

One of the strongest points of the Democratic plan is that it is not endorsed by the drug industry. That is because we hold down drug costs by bringing down drug prices, not by shortchanging seniors on coverage. Our bill creates a drug coverage option for Medicare beneficiaries that is affordable, it is reliable, and I emphasize is at least as generous as the coverage available to Members of Congress.

Our bill strengthens Medicare, rather than snubbing it. It minimizes the hassle involved in getting drug benefits.

We add the drug coverage option to the Medicare benefits package. Seniors are not forced to go outside of Medicare and enroll in an insurance company HMO to get their drug benefits as they are required to do under the Republican plan.

Our bill takes action against inflated drug prices on behalf of every senior and every American consumer. The brand name drug industry has taken to exploiting loopholes in the FDA drug approval process to block generic competition and keep drug prices high. So not only the drug companies charge Americans the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, while those drugs are still under patent, these companies, these drug companies continue to charge Americans ridiculously high prices even after the drugs have gone off patent, even after the patents expire, because they block generics, block competition from entering the market.

This gaming of the patent system is not theoretical. It happened with Paxil; it happened with BusPar; it happened with Prilosec; it happened with Neurontin; it happened with Wellbutrin. These are top-selling drugs. Seniors and other consumers who need these drugs have paid twice, three times, four times more than necessary for these products for months and sometimes for years because brand-name drug companies block legitimate generic competitors from the market.

These big-name drug companies supported by Republicans over and over game the patent system.

While the Congressional Budget Office has not formally scored these provisions, their estimate suggests Medicare alone could save tens of billions of dollars if we make drug companies play fair. Needless to say, these provisions to bring drug prices down are not in the Republican bill. The drug industry, in fact, has ponied up \$3 million, \$3 million to back an ad campaign touting the Republican's bill, which protects the drug companies.

If drugmakers thought there was any chance the Republican's bill would reduce drug prices for Medicare enrollees, do my colleagues think they would endorse it? Of course not. The Republican bill has the drug industry's fingerprints all over it.

Our bill is admittedly more expensive than the Republican bill. It should be more expensive because our coverage is better. The Republican bill is dirt cheap for a reason. Their bill is most notable for the coverage it does not provide. It is basically one big disclaimer.

The last thing we want to do is to reduce the number of uninsured in this country simply to increase the number of underinsured. If we can afford \$4 trillion in tax cuts, we can afford to create a real drug coverage option in Medicare for retirees and disabled Americans. It is a matter of priorities.

This Congress made a choice between tax cuts for the richest one-half percent of people, the most privileged people in this country, a choice between giving them tax cuts and providing inadequate prescription drug benefits for seniors. Republicans chose the tax cuts for the most privileged. Democrats are choosing a prescription drug benefit for 38 million Medicare beneficiaries.

It is a question of priorities. Let us do the right thing and pass the Democratic substitute.

---

THINNING AMERICA'S FOREST LAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here today, my home State of Arizona is burning. We have lost now nearly 400,000 acres to fire. That is more than 500 square miles. Colorado is burning as well. We have lost a tremendous amount of forest just this year, and we have got to do something about it.

We should not be surprised at the losses so far to fire. Our forests have been choked with underbrush and excess trees for years now; and whenever we try to go in and thin and manage our forests, we are blocked by radical environmentalists who file lawsuits, who create such uncertainty with the Forest Service that nobody can go in and thin our forests like they should.

One of the groups that is blocking us from going into forests and thinning is

a group called Forest Guardians, one of these radical environmental groups. They were interviewed in the East Valley Tribune in Arizona yesterday, and in the paper it says, Forest Guardians oppose using any forest thinning that might benefit commercial logging companies. If one uses the words thinning and/or they use the word forest and commercial in the same sentence, it seems they sue before one can finish the sentence. They simply oppose anything that benefits commercial companies, which means that to go in and thin the forest it is all on the public treasury.

It is estimated that it would cost them \$35 billion to go in and thin our forest properly, to prepare them to make sure that we do not have the devastating crown fires that are killing trees and everything, wildlife, whatever stands in their way, but we can cannot do it with the public treasury. We have to allow people to go in, but of course they oppose that.

Going on, it says, and hear what the Forest Guardians are suggesting: Instead, small numbers of small trees should be removed by crews using solar-powered chain saws to ensure the work does not affect air quality in the forest. Solar-powered chain saws. I know my way around a hardware store pretty well, although I have never stumbled into the solar-powered chain saw aisle. It is simply laughable, if it were not so horrifying, that we are being held up by such groups that have such outlandish ideas.

I do not know what is next, trained beavers? Are we supposed to round up the animals of the forest, Mr. Deer and Mr. Bear, and convince them to get a forest council together to help us replant? We need to remind the radical environmentalists that Ferngully was a cartoon.

We have serious problems here in our forests. They demand serious solutions, serious debate, serious answers, and we are getting solar-powered chain saws? We have got to rethink what we are doing.

Our State is burning. Colorado is burning. There are some 3 million acres of Ponderosa pine forest in Arizona. We stand a chance of losing most of that over the next year or two. It is a tinderbox unless we get in, and we cannot afford to wait another 4 or 5 years until we wade through all the lawsuits to allow private interests in to thin forests. We have got to move ahead, and I plead with those serious environmentalists who want to protect habitat for endangered species, who want to have beautiful forest land, to join with us and create a balance as we are getting serious about the issue, instead of throwing up roadblocks and talking about solar-powered chain saws and the like.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.