

these discussions, or distortions, are manifold; and collectively, they constitute nothing less than a coordinated attack on virtually every stage and every aspect of the science/policy interaction.

Evidence of this attack comes from many sources, including a GAO study which I am holding up here, which I requested along with my ranking member on the Committee on Science, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON). Interestingly and perhaps tellingly, we had asked that a full committee hearing be conducted to study this matter; but we were denied that privilege, leaving us to hold a somewhat symbolic hearing of our own.

Nevertheless, based on testimony from that hearing and numerous other sources, it is apparent to me and others that the assaults on scientific independence and integrity includes all of the following: limitations of the questions that are allowed to be asked; constraints on the methods that are used to seek answers to questions; limits or elimination of funding and resources to pursue certain questions that are not politically correct; biased selections of people who will be allowed to ask questions or serve on scientific panels; active and intentional suppression of findings that are not to official liking; unjustified claims and inflation of studies or results that are approved of by the administration; punishment or ridicule of scientists who disagree with official administration dogma; retribution for political involvement on the part of scientists; disregard of discomfiting scientific evidence; placement of nongovernmental ideologues in charge of international missions to supervise U.S. positions, vis-a-vis, scientific discussion; and creation of a climate in which scientists and policymakers have begun actually to self-censor or self-select and actually leave government service.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to his nephew: "Question with boldness even the existence of a God because, if there be one, He must more approve the homage of reason, than that of blindfolded fear." Clearly, at least in his private letters, Jefferson was not one to believe in limiting questions, and indeed, if one visits Monticello and sees his love for science, one realizes how important that was to him.

When one considers that Benjamin Franklin was considered one of the greatest scientists of his age and that Madison, Jefferson, and Washington and many of the Founders had a profound interest in science, we realize the importance of that principle to the founding principles of this Nation.

But we must contrast that attitude of the Framers with an administration that removes from a National Cancer Institute Web site fact sheets showing there is no empirical evidence linking abortion to breast cancer. Contrast that attitude of scientific inquiry with suppressing analyses of clean air legislation that will save lives and cut pol-

lution at negligible cost. Contrast the Framers' attitude with initiatives in Congress to cut funding for research relating to sexually transmitted disease prevention. Contrast that attitude with limits to stem cell research. Contrast that attitude of the Framers with the selective appointment or withdrawal of experts on scientific advisory panels. Contrast that attitude with the willful stacking of advisory committees and removal of any voices deemed unfriendly to a predetermined outcome.

Within the scientific community, the effect of the administration's and congressional actions have been chilling and demoralizing. Researchers are practicing self-censorship or leaving government careers entirely.

Let me conclude, if I may, with one final comment of Richard Feynman. He said, "It is our responsibility as scientists, knowing the great process which comes from a satisfactory philosophy of ignorance, knowing of the great progress which is the fruit of freedom of thought, to proclaim the value of this freedom; to teach how doubt is not to be feared but welcomed and discussed; and to demand this freedom as our duty to all coming generations."

We must do that not only as scientists but as Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TORT REFORM

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about tort reform, but before I do that I would like to use some of the comments of my colleague and friend who has just spoken about scientific integrity and maybe the creation of a climate that self-selects facts but disregards the scientific evidence, the active suppression of that evidence and questioning and removal of voices that are contrary to predetermined outcomes.

I was certain that he was going to bring in CBS news and Dan Rather into the thing, but he stopped one step short. So I would like to add CBS news and Dan Rather to the list of people who preselect their facts, who preselect and predetermine the outcomes, and then compliment CBS news and Dan Rather for their pursuit of truth in front of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we continue to talk about on this House floor is the way that businesses are driven off the shores of America into other countries. Very often we

seem to simply omit the discussion of tort reform and the need for tort reform and the cost to not only businesses but to individuals in this country for lawsuits, for frivolous lawsuits, litigation.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Chamber ran an ad 2 years ago which described the cost of every car to include \$500 for the cost of legal protection. That means that every consumer who buys a new car contributes \$500 to the trial lawyers in this Nation. Is it any surprise then, Mr. Speaker, that this year the trial lawyers have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars into the 527s in order to buy influence and to influence the outcome of the elections?

It is no surprise to me, Mr. Speaker, because we find that the trial lawyers right now are pulling somewhere between 2.5 to 3 percent of the Nation's economy. Keep in mind that we are trying at this moment to get a 4 percent rate of growth year after year, and we are doing that; but at the same time, the trial lawyers are pulling 2.5 to 3 percent of the economy out the bottom.

Now, if that money were going to productivity and the hiring of people, that would be one thing; but what we find is that trial lawyers are escalating into the category of the world's richest people, not based on productivity, not based on what they add to the economy, but based on what they take out of the economy.

This affects every single one of us when they go to get a job. We find that the companies pay less because of the threat of lawsuits.

American Express told us in New York last year, a group of business leaders who were in the Congress, at that point that if we do not limit the frivolous lawsuits, if we do not limit class action lawsuits in this Nation, that we are going to drive out every single major corporation; that, in fact, within 20 years there would not be a single major corporation left in America.

We have to wonder then where are we going to get our pension plans funded. Where are we going to have the taxes that are paid to the Federal Government to support our retirees? It is a huge problem, and yet the trial lawyers continue to buy influence at an amazing rate, and they buy influence in this institution.

Here in the House, we have passed multiple forms of lawsuit abuse protection; but somehow, once they leave the doors of this institution, they simply are bottled up and kept dormant.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the partisan politics that limit the debate and that limit the actions to stop the frivolous lawsuits. It is time for the partisan politics to stop and for us to protect the American consumer, for us to protect American businesses.

At one point last year, the insurance agents' representative for the Nation came into my office and gave me a list of maybe 30 or 40 new businesses, new

activities that will not be covered under insurance this coming year. That means that every company that does those activities will not function because you cannot function without liability insurance in this country.

So what we are doing is we are continuing to limit the number of activities that we can have, jobs produced for Americans, all at the benefit of the trial lawyers of America.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOE KARY WESTMORELAND

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand to pay tribute to an outstanding and distinguished human being, Joe Kary Westmoreland, from my district who died just recently.

Joe began his musical career by singing and playing the piano at a very early age in New Morning Star Baptist Church. After graduating from Booker T. Washington High School, he moved to Los Angeles to continue his education. He attended Los Angeles City College and the University of California at Los Angeles where he earned a bachelor's degree in 1981.

□ 1415

In 2000, Joe received a doctoral degree from the Pentecostal Bible College, West Coast Campus.

Joe taught choral music at Duarte High School, Occidental College, and UCLA. For over a quarter of a century, he served the First African Methodist Episcopal Church of Los Angeles, many of these years as Minister of Music. Since 1976, his gospel music compositions have been presented in over 100 concerts by major orchestras and two films, *Music in Time* and *Zubin Rocks Gospel*, and are in public libraries around the country. One aired on three segments of CBS' 60 Minutes.

The North Carolina Symphony and Interdenominational Choir performed seven of Joe's compositions at the Shaw University Heritage Festival, from 1977 through 1980. He conceived and helped produce the noted, *Hallelujah Concert: A Tribute to Gospel Music*, held at the Great Western Forum in Inglewood, California. Joe was the first composer of gospel music to have his works performed by Zubin Mehta and the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra as well as the New York Philharmonic Orchestra.

In 1982, Joe was commissioned by the Albany Symphony to write a gospel mass. This music was also performed by the Utah Symphony Orchestra in 1983. And in 1987, together with Charles May, he wrote the gospel opera, *Job*, which starred Reverend Daryl Coley and the First AME Freedom Choir. It was performed again in 1988 for the Los Angeles Festival and for the AME General Conference in Fort Worth, Texas.

His credits go on and on in the area of music and gospel and bringing the

two together. He wrote the gospel opera, *Jezebel*, which was performed in the Vision Theater in Los Angeles for a full month. His musical talents have not been unrewarded, and he has received every single award across the board.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of citizen that we need more of. He leaves a tremendous legacy in music and song but, most of all, in spirituality. And I want to extend my sympathy to his wife who stood by him all of those years, through an automobile accident, through several strokes and heart attacks, but he was still able to write and perform. He had been married to his wife for 39 years.

We pay tribute to his spirit, to his life, and we wish him a rest that is well-deserved in the hands of our Lord.

SCIENCE POLICY/STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have already spoken on, I think, a very important initiative or series of initiatives that require, unfortunately, the attention of this Congress and certainly the attention of many of our committees and particularly the one I serve on, the House Committee on Science.

I believe that the administration's science policy is adrift. We have not focused on the important needs of this Nation as relate to issues dealing with nanotechnology and basic research, environmental issues, and, of course, stem cell research, space exploration, and the International Space Station.

I rise in the backdrop of some 2 years since the tragedy of Columbia VII with so many of our brilliant scientists that flew into space with great hopes and aspirations to be able to press for space exploration, to be able to enhance a better quality of life for those of us who live on earth.

Space exploration has found, in many instances, ways to create a better life for human beings. It was the beginning of the understanding of the human genome. It certainly has been at the backbone of research dealing with cancer, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, heart conditions, stroke and aging. So we know there is value in exploring space. Other technological advances have been the beneficiary of that, yet I do not think we have done enough on Admiral Gehman's report on the issue of safety. I do not believe we have yet to complete, legislatively, the instructions that Admiral Gehman gave to us. The administration has been slow in acting.

I, for many months now, have been asking for a full and complete hearing on the questions of safety on the International Space Station. Just recently, we determined there was a leakage

that had to be fixed by the only two remaining astronauts on the International Space Station. We have yet to create a vehicle that can allow additional travel for additional astronauts to go back and forth to enhance the safety of the International Space Station by repairing some of the problems with that space station.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues on the House Committee on Science to move forward on a hearing now on the safety questions of the International Space Station and begin again hearings to hear from NASA as to its implementation or its proposals for ensuring that human space shuttles fly again. These matters have not been attended to, and it puts us very far behind the work we should be doing in science.

I also note for those who have been following the discussion dealing with the stem cell research that, in the United States, millions of people are suffering needlessly. They are suffering because the administration is putting aside a century-long commitment to investing in and making use of good science in order to better the lives of the American people.

Furthermore, I am sorry to say that this Congress has been derelict in its duty to critically oversee the administration and to push creative and thoughtful legislation that will keep this Nation moving forward.

We discovered a few weeks ago articles reporting on the decrease, the dumping down of dollars going into our research laboratories and our other research facilities such that professors and those who are graduating this year with the expertise of research, who can be part of new discoveries for the 21st century, are wondering whether they will have positions in research institutions around the Nation, whether or not there are enough Federal dollars to create opportunities for research. We would be certainly remiss if we did not fight for and seek to increase those dollars to keep from losing that talent.

We are finding now that international students, likewise, are finding their way to research labs elsewhere rather than coming to the United States and providing us the opportunity of being first in line with outstanding research that will again increase our quality of life. It was at the beginning of the new computer age, the Internet, the Web, all of that created by new bright minds, some of those in military research facilities, with dollars that were provided from our Federal Government.

As of this week, more than 5,000 scientists have signed on to a statement produced by the Union of Concerned Scientists accusing the administration of misusing and fully abusing scientific methodology. Signers include 48 Nobel laureates, 62 National Medal of Science recipients, and 127 members of the National Academy of Sciences. A number of these scientists have served in multiple administrations, both Democratic