

service and commitment to our community won her a place in all of our hearts. She will be sorely missed.

TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR EDWARD
ZIGLER

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 2003

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend and colleague, Dr. Edward Zigler, who has recently retired after over 40 years as a distinguished professor of psychology at Yale University. Dr. Zigler has been a tireless and effective advocate for children for four decades. I, and many others in this Congress, have counted on his impeccable knowledge of children's development, his wisdom about its application to the Nation's most significant issues facing children and families, and his unassailable honesty and integrity.

Edward Zigler is a Sterling Professor of Psychology, Emeritus, Head of the psychology section of Yale's Child Study Center at the School of Medicine, and Director of Yale's Center in Child Development and Social Policy. He is the author, co-author, and editor of hundreds of scholarly publications and has conducted extensive investigations on topics related to normal child development, child psychopathology and mental retardation. He is the founder of the School of the 21st Century, which has been adopted by more than 1300 schools nationwide.

Because of Dr. Zigler's expertise and his commitment to our Nation's children, he has been asked to assist every Administration, both Republican and Democratic, since the term of President Lyndon B. Johnson. He was one of the planners of Project Head Start during the Johnson Administration. From 1970 to 1972, Dr. Zigler was the first director of the U.S. Office of Child Development (now the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families) and Chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau. President Ford then asked him to consult on the resettling of Vietnamese children following the "Baby Lift". President Carter asked him to write the 15-year report on Head Start.

In his ongoing role as an advisor on the Head Start program, he has worked with several Secretaries of Education, Health and Human Services, Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW); and Labor, including Secretary Bennett in the Reagan Administration and Secretary Riley in the Clinton Administration. Currently, he is on Secretary Tommy Thompson's Head Start Research Committee.

His work extends well beyond the Federal level to his own State of Connecticut, where he has played an instrumental role in establishing high quality school readiness programs for low-income children, and the city of New Haven, where he enlisted the police department in child abuse prevention efforts. The fact that his counsel has been sought consistently by both parties, and by decision-makers at all levels of government through the years is a testament to his nonpartisan focus on what research indicates is best for children.

Even a brief review of Zigler's research and writing makes it abundantly clear why his advice has been sought by so many for so long.

Starting with an interest in mental retardation, Zigler's theory that children who experience an inordinate amount of failure would do better in school if they believed they had a chance to succeed, captured the imagination of the Planning Committee for Head Start in 1965. It was not long before Zigler was asked to head the agency responsible for Head Start. Thus began his sojourn into public policy. Since then, in addition to his sustained commitment to ensuring that Head Start offers young children living in poverty the comprehensive services they require to enter school ready to learn, Zigler has worked on issues ranging from child abuse to child care to children exposed to the trauma of war. He and his students have surveyed child care standards in the States as well as their preschool programs to raise awareness of the importance of quality and to guide policy makers in mandating better programs. He has been a pioneer in the development of effective family support programs. His work on child abuse and neglect has guided significant Federal and State legislation aimed at preventing this tragic social problem. During the Vietnam era, he worked relentlessly to assist with the resettlement of Vietnamese children. He was a member of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion and of the planning committee for the Early Head Start program for families and children ages zero to three. Recently, Zigler completed work on a revision of the Head Start Program Performance Standards, and is currently serving as the Honorary Chair of the National Advisory Panel for the Head Start 2010 Project. Children always come first for Edward Zigler.

If children come first to this distinguished academician, Zigler's students follow as a close second. He has played a more central role than any other developmental psychologist in creating the field of child development and social policy. He was the major figure behind the creation of the Bush Centers in Child Development and Social Policy, which stimulated the development of several cross-disciplinary doctoral and post-doctoral training programs. He was also a key player in the establishment of the Congressional Science Fellows programs of the Society for Research in Child Development, from which many in the House and Senate have benefited through placement in our offices of outstanding post-doctoral experts in child policy. All told, he has mentored over 70 graduate and postdoctoral students and countless hundreds of undergraduates who are now following in his large footsteps to ensure that our public policies for children and families are guided by the best available science.

Dr. Zigler's many honors include awards from the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Society for Research in Child Development, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the American Academy on Mental Retardation, the American Orthopsychiatric Association, the National Head Start Association, the Heinz Foundation, and Teachers College, Columbia University. He has also received honorary degrees from Park University in Missouri and McGill University in Canada.

Throughout his career, Dr. Zigler has exemplified the socially responsible scientist. He is honest even when it angers the advocates; he is outraged when outrage is called for; and he never gives up on even the most stubborn

problems. He is rare in his dual commitment to scholarly research and to public service. The Nation's children have benefited vastly.

I am pleased to honor him and to express my gratitude for all he has done and continues to do to ensure both happy childhoods and promising futures for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

FUND PORT SECURITY NOW

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 2003

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President requested \$74.7 billion for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003. Although \$1.5 billion is requested for the Department of Homeland Security's Counterterrorism Fund, the Administration's proposal fails to address one of the major weaknesses in our national security strategy—port and maritime security. The Administration continues its abysmal track record of short-changing our Nation's port security needs. The Supplemental Appropriations request includes no specific funding for assessing the security vulnerabilities of vessels and facilities along the navigable waterways of the United States. At current funding levels, the Coast Guard will not complete vulnerability assessments at the Nation's 55 largest ports until 2009. The Administration's request also includes no specific funding for port security grants.

On November 25, 2002, President Bush signed into law the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (MTSA). This landmark legislation is designed to improve security in our seaports, on vessels operating on our navigable waters, and in the entire maritime transportation system to protect our Nation from a security incident resulting in significant loss of life or economic disruption. Under MTSA, the Federal government is required to conduct a vulnerability assessment of each vessel, port, and facility to assess any security weaknesses. Moreover, by July 1, 2004, the Coast Guard must review and approve a security plan for each port, facility, and vessel. If a port or vessel does not have an approved security plan by this date, it cannot operate.

I am extremely concerned that this Administration is not taking the potential threat to port security or this responsibility seriously. Pursuant to MTSA, on December 30, 2002, the Coast Guard published a Federal Register notice that detailed its cost estimates for ports and vessel owners to comply with security standards that the Coast Guard will prescribe under the Maritime Transportation Security Act. The Coast Guard estimates that it will cost approximately \$1.4 billion to comply with the Act in the first year and \$6 billion over the next 10 years, including:

Facility security: \$4.4 billion;
Vessel security: \$1.1 billion; and
Port security plans: \$477 million.

The Administration has proposed nothing to address these enormous security needs. The Administration has neither requested nor provided adequate resources to conduct the Coast Guard vulnerability assessments quickly and secure our ports, facilities, and vessels. To date, the Administration has requested only \$11 million for vulnerability assessments and

not one dime for port security grants. Despite the Administration's unwillingness to provide any substantial resources for port security, Congress has appropriated almost \$350 million for port security grants. Nevertheless, Congress has provided only six percent of the necessary funding and the Administration has awarded only \$92 million, less than one-third, of the available funds.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go to secure our maritime system. To date, the Coast Guard has completed vulnerability assessments at only eight of our Nation's 350 ports. Moreover, the Coast Guard has conducted vulnerability assessments at only three of the top 25 ports. It has not conducted vulnerability assessments at any of our largest ports, including Los Angeles/Long Beach, New Orleans, Houston, New York, San Francisco, Philadelphia, or Seattle/Tacoma. At current funding levels, the Coast Guard will not complete assessments at the 55 largest ports until 2009. In addition, the Administration proposes to transfer the responsibility for conducting vulnerability assessments from the Coast Guard to the new Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IAIP) Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). I am concerned about transferring these responsibilities for vital security plans to a DHS agency that has been in operation for just three weeks and has few staff members. The Administration must dedicate the personnel and financial resources to get these vulnerability assessments done quickly and efficiently.

Moreover, the Administration must support funding to secure our ports and facilities. The Coast Guard has estimated that facility security will cost \$4.4 billion over the next 10 years. To date, the Administration has only awarded \$92.3 million of the available port security grant funds. When the Maritime Administration solicited requests for these grants, it received requests totaling seven times the available amount. Although Congress has provided an additional \$254 million for port security, no further grants have been awarded.

Last week, the U.S. House of Representatives considered H. Con. Res. 95, the FY2004 Budget Resolution. Cong. Spratt, Ranking Democratic Member of the Committee on Budget, offered a substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 95 that included \$1.5 billion specifically for port security grants. Regrettably, the Republicans defeated this amendment. However, in the Senate, Senator HOLLINGS offered an amendment to its FY2004 Budget Resolution that would provide \$2 billion (\$1 billion in FY2004 and \$1 billion in FY2005) to fund the security requirements of the Maritime Transportation Security Act. It passed by voice vote. As the Budget Resolution goes to Page 4 conference, I urge this Administration and this Congress to strongly support Senator HOLLINGS' amendment and ensure that we begin to provide the necessary resources to secure our national maritime system.

I continue to believe that securing our Nation's ports and the cargo that moves through them is a Federal responsibility. All Americans, whether you live in a port city or whether you live in Boise, Idaho will benefit from that security. The impact on our economy and on all Americans if our Nation's ports are closed down for a few weeks because of a terrorist attack is simply too great. Factory lines will close down. Refineries will run out of oil. Stores will run out of goods.

I urge this Administration and this Congress to act now to ensure that we provide the necessary resources to secure our ports, facilities, and vessels.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, men and women in our armed forces are engaged in battle in Iraq. These volunteers pledged their lives to protect and defend the United States of America.

No words can express the gratitude that I have for their willingness to sacrifice and to risk their lives in a foreign land, far from home. No words can express the compassion and empathy I have for their families and friends, who must carry on with their lives while worrying about their loved ones. Our country must always recognize and honor the loyalty, courage, and commitment of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. I do so today and every day that they are in harm's way.

It is not only our regular military forces who are engaged in this war. National Guard and Reserve units from every state in the union have been called to active duty to serve our country. They have left their jobs and their homes, their husbands and wives, their daughters and sons. They join a long American tradition of citizen soldiers. From the Revolutionary War's Minute Men to the Doughboy's of World War I, from Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders to Vietnam's Green Berets, Americans have answered the call to serve. I am thankful for their courage and sacrifice.

Honoring our men and women in uniform is absolutely the right thing to do. This Congress must recognize and praise our fellow citizens who are placing their lives on the line. It is for this reason that I voted in favor of H. Con. Res. 104. I completely agree with the main message of the resolution: "unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation . . . to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery; and to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq."

I do have significant reservations about other language contained in the resolution, particularly language in the preamble. I strongly disagree with the section of the resolution that notes the President's notice to Congress that "reliance by the United States on further diplomatic and other peaceful means alone will neither adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq nor likely lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq." In the absence of an imminent threat to the United States, working with our allies and other nations to address this threat is the ap-

propriate way to proceed. While the Administration made efforts to engage the world in support of weapons inspections, they did not exhaust means short of war, prior to commencing military action.

I do not support the concept of preemptive military action, without an imminent threat to our national security and American lives. The Administration's preemption doctrine sets a dangerous precedent, and dramatically lowers the threshold for the use of military force. Is a first strike how we will approach the nearly 30 other countries that possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them? And how will we speak with any moral authority to other sovereign nations who seek to take things into their own hands against other states?

I also disagree with the President's linkage of war in Iraq to the September 11 terrorist attacks. The Administration has failed to establish this linkage with any convincing evidence. It is wrong to continue to cloud this critical distinction in the minds of the American people. It also undermines our nation's credibility in the world. I reject the assertion in the resolution's preamble that the "use of military force against Iraq is consistent with necessary ongoing efforts by the United States and other countries against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001."

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Majority chose to politicize this resolution in support of the troops. This should have been a clean resolution that focused solely on our deep appreciation for our men and women in uniform and their families. Such a resolution would have commanded a unanimous vote of this House, showing our national unity, and conveyed to our troops our unequivocal support for them.

I voted in favor of the resolution, despite my fundamental disagreement with these extraneous provisions, because I felt it was more important to stand in solidarity with our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. My vote is not an endorsement of any other sentiments contained within the resolution, nor should it be construed that way.

I continue to believe that war is not the answer to the threat of Saddam Hussein. I have taken an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. I cannot, and will not, simply delegate the responsibility to the President of the United States. As a Member of Congress, I have a responsibility to review the conduct of the war, engage in the policy debate, and cast my vote in the best interests of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, some will say that questioning the Administration in a time of war is unpatriotic and dangerous to the war effort. My oath compels me to disagree. A democratic country must always have a debate, must always have questions raised, and Congress must never become a rubber stamp.

I am not the first patriotic American to believe this, and I will not be the last. I would like to quote a man known as "Mr. Republican" when he served honorably in the U.S. Senate for many, many years. Senator Robert Taft of Ohio understood that maintaining democracy in time of war requires debate. Two weeks after the attack on Pearl Harbor, on December 19, 1941, he said: