

THE "UNITED STATES BOXING
COMMISSION ACT"**HON. CLIFF STEARNS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to help protect professional boxers throughout our country. I am introducing the "United States Boxing Commission Act" to create a Federal entity responsible for coordinating, implementing, and enforcing uniform standards for the sport of boxing. Currently, the states and tribal organizations regulate professional boxing. Although they have taken great effort to require minimum standards for the sport, uniform enforcement has been a problem.

Congress has enacted legislation to address the sport of boxing twice in the past decade. In 1996, we enacted the Professional Boxing Safety Act. In 2000, we again addressed boxing reform and passed the Muhammad Ali Act. The idea of a Federal Boxing Commission was raised in previous Congresses and it was deemed unnecessary at that time. However, after carefully reviewing the effectiveness of the laws we passed, I am convinced it is now time for a Federal Commission for professional boxing. Despite our previous efforts, enforcement of the law remains an issue and the sport continues to face problems that cannot be addressed by the states. In fact, at a hearing I held in my subcommittee, a current state boxing commissioner testified that the states need the Federal government to be directly involved.

I do not think lightly of creating a new Federal commission. I would typically be reluctant to introduce such a bill because I believe strongly in states' rights, and most of them do an excellent job in regulating boxing. However, the history and nature of the sport provide overwhelming evidence that it only takes one state to lower its standards—usually in the name of money—and undermine the integrity of the sport. More importantly, the safety of a boxer is supposed to be paramount and protected by the state authority. When a state lowers its standards or fails to follow the law, it jeopardizes every boxer's safety.

This legislation is intended to implement changes that are within the Energy and Commerce Committee's jurisdiction and is therefore narrower than what is required to fully address the issues boxers face. It creates the United States Boxing Commission which will have the power and authority to set minimum standards for the states to follow. It will not replace the state regulation, but will work with the states to develop appropriate minimum standards and to ensure their rules and standards are enforced.

As I indicated, I support additional reforms that are necessary to fully address the problems of the sport and protect boxers. While it is my preference to do more, because those reforms are not within the Committee's jurisdiction, I am committed to work with my House colleagues and the Senate to address those concerns and ensure they become Federal law as well.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MACOMB
COMMUNITY COLLEGE ON ITS
50TH ANNIVERSARY**HON. SANDER M. LEVIN**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate an excellent educational institution in Michigan, Macomb Community College, as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. "Community" is central to the vision of Macomb Community College (MCC), and over its fifty years of service I am confident it has touched nearly every home in Macomb County in one way or another.

MCC was founded as part of a K-14 system and was known as "South Macomb Community." Approximately 84 students attended classes, \$2.00 per credit hour, in seventeen basic course areas at night in space borrowed at Lincoln High School. Today its reach extends to six campus sites and outreach centers and it enjoys an annual enrollment of 44,000 students with 1100 courses offered in the day, night, and online.

Every decade has seen expansion and distinction at MCC. In the 1960s their service area was expanded to include the entire county, and its two main campuses, South and Central, became realities so it could serve both, urban and rural areas.

Enrollment continued to climb in the 1970s and, at one point in the 1980s, MCC was the third largest college in the state behind the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. They also added a world-class facility, the Macomb Center for Performing Arts, which now holds nearly 700 events annually, enjoyed by some 260,000 individuals. It was also in the 1980s that a third campus site was added to house police and fire academies, workforce development and training, and continuing education programs.

In the 1990s, the College partnered with nine universities and upper division public and private colleges to launch the University Center where approximately 2500 students could pursue bachelors and masters degrees closer to home. Also in this decade, its fourth campus, the Emergency Services Training Center was constructed as a state-of-the-art training facility for police, fire, first responder, emergency medical and municipal services.

In 2002, MCC partnered with the State of Michigan on the site of the former Army Tank Plant, after the property was transferred from military to public use, to build its most recent addition, "The Michigan Technical Education Center" (M-TEC) to house the College's comprehensive Workforce Development Institute.

Mr. Speaker, one might say that fifty years ago South Community College planted seeds in borrowed space. Today, those seeds have sprouted throughout the entire County. The residents of Macomb County have indeed been fortunate to have such a progressive institution committed to the educational needs of everyone in the area. The College has been forward-thinking in their approach to the needs of the County and they have been committed to the vision of a "better future for those growing up in the community as well as the community itself."

It has been my pleasure to work closely with MCC in so many important areas, like school-

to-work and re-training programs, and to spend time with the students there. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking all those who have helped build this remarkable institution, and to extend our best wishes for their important endeavors in the future.

SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS
LEGAL PROTECTIONS ACT OF 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 6, 2004

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues for acting to protect the benefits of a vulnerable class of America's brave veterans.

Over 100,000 of America's military veterans or their dependents are not able to manage their own finances because of physical or mental disabilities. In these cases, the Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA) appoints a family member, a guardian, or another person to act as a "fiduciary" to protect and manage their monetary payments and VA benefits.

Caring for a dependent veteran involves using the payments the VA sends each month to pay utility bills, buy food, and to meet the other needs on behalf of the veteran. It is a tremendous responsibility.

Last year, during an oversight hearing into the VA's fiduciary program, I learned that some of these veterans are not always cared for by the appointed fiduciary.

In fact, the Inspector General has found cases in which a fiduciary has withheld payments completely for several years—defrauding the veteran out of several thousand dollars.

In my District Office in San Diego, my staff has tried to assist veterans who lost out on their payments only to learn that under current law, the VA does not have the authority to replace the benefits when misuse has occurred.

Because it was our veterans suffering from the lack of oversight, I introduced the Veterans Fiduciary Act of 2004 or H.R. 4023 to provide veterans with protections similar to those recently enacted to protect Social Security beneficiaries. Surely our Nation's veterans also deserve the same protections as Social Security beneficiaries.

H.R. 4032 gives veterans new avenues to recoup their losses if they fall victim to fraud. In addition, the VA will conduct more thorough background checks and will have new authority to take action against fiduciaries who are not fulfilling their obligations.

I am pleased provisions of H.R. 4032 have been included in the servicemembers Legal Protection Act of 2004 or H.R. 4568. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION
AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM DELAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I know some wanted to pick a fight here today, trying to get

us to talk about homosexuality and all those kinds of things. We did not talk about them because that is not what this is about. What this is about is marriage and the definition of marriage. Marriage is the most enduring institution in human history—the unique, spiritual bond between one man and one woman. Marriage is a man and woman that can create children. It is the architecture of family and the most successful arrangement ever conceived for the protection and raising of children.

A man provides something that a woman cannot provide, just as a woman provides something that a man cannot provide. Women can be great mothers, but they cannot be fathers. Men can be great fathers, but they cannot be mothers. The reason that one man and one woman are necessary to rear children is so that the children can receive the benefits that a man can give them and that a woman can give them. Boys and girls need men and women, moms and dads bringing into their homes every day the complementary and unique characteristics of their genders.

Marriage is the basic unit of society, the very DNA of civilization, and if that civilization is to endure, marriage must be protected. Societies transmit their values through marriages and the families they create. A man and a woman come together in marriage to create children and rear them and hand down their values to them. Families come together to create communities. And these communities come together to create our nation. The preservation of our values as a nation starts with one man and one woman having children.

If you destroy marriage and people do not get married, several things happen.

First of all, you destroy the responsibility that comes with creating children. If you destroy marriage, men are let off the hook. Men can have the sex without consequences, without commitment, without the responsibility of raising the children. That has happened in our society and societies in Europe and other places. On the other hand, if a man has a commitment to a woman, the mother of his child, then he realizes the responsibility of trying to raise that child. So when you ask the question, what is the harm in destroying marriage, the answer is the harm done to children. Children born out of wedlock are more likely to suffer from a variety of social ills, from dependence on drugs to dropping out of school.

The recent history of our inner cities shows what can happen when fathers don't marry the mothers of their children. We have seen fathers just having many children by many mothers, and leaving these children to mothers and grandmothers and aunts to raise. And then we see the deterioration of their lives because they are raising themselves because their mothers and aunts and grandmothers have to work in order to raise them to pay for the family. These kids, who are often essentially raising themselves, grow up without the values that would be handed down to them if they lived in a stable family of father, mother, and children.

Gang violence can be traced to the pressures that have been put upon marriage and the family. Kids need a mother and father and stable family life, and when they lack these, they look for their identity elsewhere. Gangs can become the substitute for families.

Of course there are great parents raising great children in arrangements outside of marriage. There are wonderful children being

raised by gay people. There are wonderful children being raised by single moms. But these arrangements are not the ideal. The ideal remains marriage between one man and one woman.

To those who say that whatever trouble that ideal is in is due in large part to heterosexuals, I wholeheartedly agree. The last four decades, on the whole, have not been good for marriage in America. Take no-fault divorce. Divorce is a pressure against marriage. No-fault divorce undermines marriage.

But I would submit that the rise of no-fault divorce, welfare policies that reward abandonment, the breakdown of the family, and every other challenge to marriage are not reasons to abandon that ideal, but reasons to hold up that ideal higher than ever.

For as much as we may suggest that marriage needs us, in fact we need it!

Society needs children to be raised by their biological, married parents.

This isn't radical or even conservative: it's common sense, affirmed by a vast majority of our countrymen, who support the protection of marriage because they know from their own experiences that without this enduring and beautiful institution, they themselves would be lost.

That is why the cultivation of the ideal family of mother, father, and children—an ideal established by nature, sustained by human experience, and supported by decades of social science—remains a compelling government and societal interest.

Despite the challenges of recent decades, marriage remains absolutely fundamental to our society—too fundamental to allow a few judges to impose a radical redefinition of it over the will of the American people.

But that is exactly what is happening.

So when the Massachusetts Supreme Court redefines marriage out of thin air, we get a little concerned, because we have seen it before.

And we have seen what happens when we don't stand up to activist judges. We did not stand up on the question of abortion, and there have been 45 million children killed, unborn children killed, because we did not stand up to activist judges using the courts to legislate.

Every leader of the groups that are opposing this legislation to protect marriage has announced to the world that they are going to take this to the U.S. Supreme Court. They are already doing it. There are 11 court cases right now. Nebraska has been overturned, Washington state, Massachusetts. There is a huge, huge effort in every state in this union, even though 44 states in this union have laws protecting the definition of marriage.

The opponents of this amendment to protect marriage are after those state constitutions, and when they get at those, or using the full faith and credit clause, they can go to the federal courts, and then it begins. Then the Defense of Marriage Act comes down. Then the United States Supreme Court, who has already signaled that they are going to, through *Lawrence v. Texas*, redefine marriage in this country, will amend the Constitution and redefine marriage.

We have been left no recourse. Judicial activism does not understand the word "restraint," nor does it respect the consensus opinion of the American people. The courts

have forced on us this question of the future of marriage, and this amendment is our only hope of preserving it.

We are starting the effort today. Yes, it may not pass today. I wish it would, but it may not pass today. But this is only the beginning, because this nation will protect marriage. This nation knows the consequences of destroying the definition of marriage as one man and one woman. If we lose today, we will come back. We will take it from here, and we will be back. And we will be back. And we will be back. We will never give up. We will protect marriage in this country.

THE "FAIR ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS (FACT) ACT"

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 2004

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Fair Access to Clinical Trials (FACT) Act. This bill is designed to ensure that the public has complete and accurate information about the drugs and devices they use.

Recent revelations in the press and in the oversight hearings conducted by the Energy and Commerce Committee's Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee have raised serious concerns that some companies in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries have failed to properly disclosed important information from the public about the safety of certain drugs or medical devices. For example, there is now evidence that several pediatric anti-depressant trials that produced important new adverse information about the safety of certain drugs were not released to the public. The public is now demanding to know why these trials never saw the light of day. Although much attention has focused on disclosure problems involving the effects of certain anti-depressants on young people, the problem of selective disclosure and publication is not limited to a specific type of drug or scenario—the same concerns exist whether we are talking about drugs to treat depression, heart disease or arthritis, or even a medical device that would be implanted into the human body.

I am sure that some clinical trials do not become part of the medical literature for innocent reasons. But we cannot ignore the possibility that some studies were and continue to be intentionally buried by companies who are worried about the impact of a negative trial on their bottom line. Regardless of the motivation, however, the fact remains that we don't know what trials are currently being conducted, so it is impossible to determine whether the companies and researchers are actually telling us the whole truth about their drugs and devices or whether they are painting a distorted picture of their products by picking and choosing which trials they want to reveal.

This creates two huge problems.

The first is that in order for doctors to make good medical decisions and provide their patients with the best possible care, they need to have access to complete and sound scientific data.

The second is that when people enroll in clinical trials they give up a certain control of