

Winning the 2007 USBC Bowling National Championship Tournament and winning their eighth national title has revealed its excellent athletic program at Wichita State University to the Nation. I know the fans, students, and alumni of the university will remember this moment for many years to come.

Madam Speaker, once again I congratulate Wichita State University for their success.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 472, congratulating and commending the Wichita State University's bowling team for winning the 2007 United States Bowling Congress Intercollegiate Bowling National Championship. On April 21, 2007, the Wichita State University Shockers, as they are called, women's bowling team defeated McKendree College two games to none to claim their eighth national championship.

In game one, both teams went head-to-head in a low-scoring match. However, the Shockers were able to capitalize on a McKendree split and pull out a win 138–128. Close match. In the second match, the Shockers completely outplayed McKendree as senior Felicia Wong and junior Emily Maier doubled in the third and fourth frame and again in the eighth and the ninth to close out the match and claim the title.

This year's title is the team's first since 2005 and the eighth overall, which is the most in all of college bowling history. This title also adds to the amazing legacy of Wichita State bowling, as it is the 15th in school history, eight women's titles, seven men's titles.

Founded in 1895, Wichita State University offers more than 60 undergraduate degree programs in more than 200 areas of study in six undergraduate colleges. The graduate school offers an extensive program, including 44 master's degrees in more than 100 areas and a specialist in education degree. It offers doctoral degrees in applied mathematics and chemistry, communicative disorders and sciences, psychology, educational administration and aerospace, and electrical, industrial and mechanical engineering.

Together with the City of Wichita, Wichita State University has built one of the most unique partnerships in Kansas, one that over the years has propelled each to new heights.

I extend my congratulations to head coach Gordon Vadakin, women's coach Mark Lewis, assistant women's coach Kristal Scott and President Donald Beggs, all of the hard-working players, certainly the fans and to Wichita State University. I am happy to join my colleague, Representative TODD TIAHRT, in honoring an exceptional team in all its accomplishments and wish all involved continued success. I ask my colleagues certainly to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Does my colleague from New York have any more speakers?

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Yes, Madam Speaker, I have one, and if it would be appropriate, I yield 5 minutes at this time to my colleague Mr. TIAHRT from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. I am pleased today to have the privilege of honoring the 2007 National Championship Wichita State University women's bowling team. House Resolution 472 congratulates and commends the Wichita State University's bowling team for winning the 2007 United States Bowling Congress Intercollegiate Bowling National Championship.

Though known for its baseball and lately its basketball teams, the Shockers have had a long tradition of championship bowlers, and last year's team again made the region proud. The Wichita State University's women's bowling team has won eight intercollegiate bowling national championships, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1986, 1990, 1994, 2005, and now 2007, and has advanced to the national tournament a record 31 times.

On April 21, 2007, the Wichita State University's women's bowling team won the 2007 United States Bowling Congress Intercollegiate Bowling National Championship Tournament in Wichita by defeating Central Florida University four games to one in the semi-finals and McKendree College of Illinois two games to zero in the finals.

Wichita State University earned the second seed on the day after completing 32 baker games. On day two, the team defeated Ohio State University four games to one in the best of seven series, Purdue University four to one and Newman University four games to two to advance to the semi-finals.

On the final day of the tournament, the Wichita State University women defeated Central Florida University four games to one in the semi-finals and McKendree College two games to zero in the finals to win the national championship at home at Northrock Lanes.

Despite having a top caliber team, the championship was not assured going into the season because the Shockers had lost seven players from their top-ranked team from the 2006 season. The 2007 additions included six new members and three international players, Wichita local freshman Ricki Williams and two transfers. None of the bowlers had been in a championship game before nor a televised game. Yet they did not let the hype overpower them and instead let their talent shine through.

I want to congratulate WSU President Don Beggs and athletic director Jim Schaus for their leadership by creating a great university and an excellent athletic program. Wichita State is blessed to have two coaches, Gordon

Vadakin and Mark Lewis, who are themselves members of USBC Hall of Fame. Head coach Gordon Vadakin has coached the team since 1978, leading it to the Intercollegiate Bowling National Championship Tournament 29 times and has coached the team to six national titles. Women's coach Mark Lewis and assistant women's coach Kristal Scott directly coached the 2007 WSU women's team to the national championship in Wichita, Kansas.

The 2007 national championship team is comprised of the following members: Daniela Alvarado, Ashley Cox, Elysia Current, Sandra Gongora, Melissa Hurst, Samantha Linder, Emily Maier, Rocio Restrepo, Ricki Williams and Felicia Wong. WSU juniors, Elysia Current and Emily Maier, were named the First Team All-Americans, and Maier was named as the member of the All-Tournament team of the Intercollegiate Bowling Championship Tournament. I also want to thank Amy Skeen of my staff who worked on this resolution and getting it to the floor.

Once again, I am very pleased that today the United States House of Representatives will congratulate and commend the Wichita State University's women's bowling team for winning the 2007 Intercollegiate Bowling National Championship Tournament. Go Shox.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 472. Team athletic competition teaches student athletes teamwork, cooperation, and leadership. These skills will translate into the classroom for each student as well as into their professional lives. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H. Res. 472, celebrating the success of the Wichita State University Shockers.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 472.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

Mrs. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3564) to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States through fiscal year 2011, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Improvement Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 596 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 596. Authorization of appropriations

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subchapter not more than \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, \$3,300,000 for fiscal year 2009, \$3,400,000 for fiscal year 2010, and \$3,500,000 for fiscal year 2011. Of any amounts appropriated under this section, not more than \$2,500 may be made available in each fiscal year for official representation and entertainment expenses for foreign dignitaries."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Federal regulation process is among the most important ways by which our Nation implements public policy. Each year, agencies issue thousands of regulations to ensure that the food we eat, the air we breathe, and the cars we drive are safe. Surprisingly, however, there is little empirical analysis of whether these regulations work as intended.

Until 1995, the last year it received federal funding, the Administrative Conference of the United States was a nonpartisan, public-private think tank that provided invaluable guidance to Congress about how to improve the administrative and regulatory process. First established on a temporary basis, the conference, over the course of its nearly 30-year existence, made numerous recommendations, many of which were enacted into law. H.R. 3564, the Regulatory Improvement Act of 2007, would simply reauthorize the conference for an additional 4 years.

Madam Speaker, some might ask why we should reauthorize an entity that has not been in existence for nearly a dozen years. Let me just mention three reasons. First, the conference saved taxpayers many millions of dollars. It helped agencies implement cost-saving procedures and made recommendations that work to eliminate excessive litigation costs and long delays. Just one agency alone, the So-

cial Security Administration, estimated that the conference's recommendation to change its appeals process yielded approximately \$85 million in savings.

Indeed, Justice Stephen Breyer testified before the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law about the "huge" savings to the public resulting from the conference's recommendations. Justice Antonin Scalia likewise agreed that it was an "enormous bargain."

Second, the Administrative Conference promoted innovation among agencies. For example, it convinced 24 agencies to use alternative dispute resolution for issues concerning the private sector. The conference also spearheaded the implementation of the Negotiated Rulemaking Act, the Equal Access to Justice Act, and the Magnusson-Moss Warranty Act, governing consumer product warranties.

Madam Speaker, the conference played a major role in encouraging agencies to promulgate smarter regulations. It did this by improving participation in the rulemaking process, promoting judicial review of agency regulations, and reducing regulatory burdens on the private sector.

Third, and perhaps more importantly, Congress needs the conference. Experience with the Congressional Review Act demonstrates that we simply lack the resources and, sometimes, the political will to conduct aggressive oversight of regulations. Congressional recognition of the conference's significant contributions to the regulatory process is probably best evidenced by the fact that in nearly every Congress since its demise in 1995, legislation has been introduced assigning responsibilities to the conference. The Congressional Research Service advises that reactivation of the conference comes at an opportune time, especially in light of efforts by the executive branch to augment its role in the regulatory process.

Madam Speaker, there are few entities that enjoyed more bipartisan support than the Administrative Conference. I commend my colleague, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, Mr. CANNON of Utah, for his continued leadership in pursuing the reauthorization of the conference. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3564.

Madam Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD two letters from Supreme Court Justices Breyer and Scalia written in 1995 that describe the importance of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 21, 1995.

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight, and the Courts, U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY, thank you for the invitation to submit a few comments about the Administrative Conference of the

United States. As a "liaison" to the Administrative Conference (from the Judicial Conference), I have participated in its activities from 1981 to 1994. I believe that the Conference is a unique organization, carrying out work that is important and beneficial to the average American, at rather low cost.

The Conference primarily examines government agency procedures and practices, searching for ways to help agencies function more fairly and more efficiently. It normally focuses upon achieving "semi-technical" reform, that is to say, changes in practices that are general (involving more than a handful of cases and, often, more than one agency) but which are not so controversial or politically significant as to likely provoke a general debate, say, in Congress. Thus, it may study, and adopt recommendations concerning better rule-making procedures, or ways to avoid legal technicalities, controversies, and delays through agency use of negotiation, or ways of making judicial review of agency action less technical and easier for ordinary citizens to obtain. While these subjects themselves, and the recommendations about them, often sound technical, in practice they may make it easier for citizens to understand what government agencies are doing to prevent arbitrary government actions that may harm them.

The Administrative Conference is unique in that it develops its recommendations by bringing together at least four important groups of people: top-level agency administrators; professional agency staff; private (including "public interest") practitioners; and academicians. The Conference will typically commission a study by an academician, say, a law professor, who often has the time to conduct the study thoughtfully, but may lack first-hand practical experience. The professor will spend time with agency staff, which often has otherwise unavailable facts and experience, but may lack the time for general reflection and comparisons with other agencies. The professor's draft will be reviewed and discussed by private practitioners, who bring to it a critically important practical perspective, and by top-level administrators such as agency heads, who can make inter-agency comparisons and may add special public perspectives. The upshot is likely to be a work-product that draws upon many different points of view, that is practically helpful and that commands general acceptance.

In seeking to answer the question, "Who will control the regulators?" most governments have found it necessary to develop institutions that continuously review, and recommend changes in, technical agency practices. In some countries, ombudsmen, in dealing with citizen complaints, will also recommend changes in practices and procedures. Sometimes, as in France and Canada, expert tribunals will review decisions of other agencies and help them improve their procedures. Sometimes, as in Australia and the United Kingdom, special councils will advise ministries about needed procedural reforms. Our own Nation has developed this rather special approach (drawing together scholars, practitioners, and agency officials) to bringing about reform of a sort that is more general than the investigation of individual complaints yet less dramatic than that normally needed to invoke Congressional processes. Given the Conference's rather low cost (a small central staff, commissioning academic papers, endless amounts of volunteered private time, and two general meetings a year), it would be a pity to weaken or to lose our federal government's ability to respond effectively, in this general way, to the problems of its citizens.

I do not see any other institution readily available to perform this same task. Individual agencies, while trying to reform

themselves, sometimes lack the ability to make cross-agency comparisons. The American Bar Association's Administrative Law Section, while a fine institution, cannot call upon the time and resources of agency staff members and agency heads as readily as can the Administrative Conference. Congressional staffs cannot as easily conduct the technical research necessary to develop many of the Conference's more technical proposals. The Office of Management and Budget does not normally concern itself with general procedural proposals.

All this is to explain why I believe the Administrative Conference performs a necessary function, which, in light of the cost, is worth maintaining. I recognize that the Conference is not the most well known of government agencies; indeed, it is widely known only within a fairly small (administrative practice oriented) community. But, that, in my view, simply reflects the fact that it does its job, developing consensus about change in fairly technical areas. That is a job that the public, whether or not it knows the name "Administrative Conference," needs to have done. And, for the reasons I have given, I believe the Administrative Conference well suited to do it.

I hope these views will help you in your evaluation of the Conference.

Yours sincerely,

STEPHEN BREYER.

SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: Thank you for the invitation to appear at the hearing on "The Reauthorization of the Administrative Conference" scheduled for August 2. I will be unable to do so, but your staff has advised me that a letter would be appropriate.

I am not a good source of information concerning recent accomplishments of the Conference. I have not followed its activities closely since stepping down as its Chairman in 1974. I can testify, however, concerning the nature of the Conference, and its suitability for achieving its objectives.

The Conference seeks to combine the efforts of scholars, practitioners, and agency officials to improve the efficiency and fairness of the thousands of varieties of federal agency procedures. In my judgment, it is an effective mechanism for achieving that goal, which demands change and improvement in obscure areas where bureaucratic inertia and closed-mindedness often prevail. A few of the Conference's projects have had major, government-wide impact—for example, its recommendation leading to Congress's adoption of Public Law 94-574, which abolished the doctrine of sovereign immunity in suits seeking judicial review of agency action. For the most part, however, each of the Conference's projects is narrowly focused upon a particular agency program, and is unlikely to attract attention beyond the community affected by that program. This should be regarded, not as a sign of ineffectiveness, but evidence of solid hard work: for the most part, procedural regimes are unique and must be fixed one-by-one.

One way of judging the worth of the Conference without becoming expert in the complex and unexciting details of administrative procedure with which it deals, is to examine the roster of men and women who have thought it worthwhile to devote their time and talent to the enterprise. Over the years, the academics who have served as consultants to or members of the Conference have

been a virtual Who's Who of leading scholars in the field of administrative law; and the practitioners who have served as members have been, by and large, prominent and widely respected lawyers in the various areas of administrative practice.

I was the third Chairman of the Administrative Conference. Like the first two (Prof. Jerre Williams of the University of Texas Law School, and Prof. Roger Cramton of the University of Michigan Law School), and like my successor (Prof. Robert Anthony of Cornell Law School) I was an academic—on leave from the University of Virginia Law School. The Conference was then, and I believe remains, a unique combination of scholarship and practicality, of private-sector insights and career-government expertise.

I would not presume to provide the Subcommittee advice on the ultimate question of whether, in a time of budget constraints, the benefits provided by the Administrative Conference are within our Nation's means. But I can say that in my view those benefits are substantial: the Conference has been an effective means of opening up the process of government to needed improvement.

Sincerely,

ANTONIN SCALIA.

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3564. I would like to, first of all, thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this issue. I appreciate working with her.

I am delighted that H.R. 3564, which would reauthorize the Administrative Conference of the United States, is being considered on the floor today. I urge support of this measure. I also urge the Appropriations Committee to appropriate funds to ACUS so that this organization can once again become a living, breathing reality.

Madam Speaker, I am a believer in the adage that the government that governs best governs least; but when the government does govern, it must govern as its best. ACUS is just the organization to help us achieve that goal. Before its funding ceased some years ago, it laid down a decades-long track record of productive activity that was remarkable, unmistakable, and probably unparalleled.

Over the course of its 28-year existence, the conference issued more than 200 recommendations, some of which were governmentwide and others that were agency specific. It issued a series of recommendations eliminating a variety of technical impediments to the judicial review of agency action and encouraging less costly consensual alternatives to litigation.

The fruits of these efforts include the enactment of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1990, which established a framework for the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution. In addition to this legislation, ACUS served as the key implementing agency for the Negotiated Rulemaking Act, the Equal Access to Justice Act, the Congressional Accountability Act, and the Magnusson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act. The Conference also made rec-

ommendations regarding implementation of the Congressional Accountability Act and played a key role in the Clinton administration's National Performance Review with respect to improving regulatory systems.

Madam Speaker, time and again, ACUS took the small amount of taxpayer funds that we appropriated and produced enormous savings in the costs incurred and imposed by Federal regulatory agencies. That record is so clear that I can say with absolute confidence that, if we were not to authorize ACUS, we would effectively authorize waste in the rest of the Federal Government. I can say with equal confidence that if the Appropriations Committee were not to appropriate funds to ACUS after the Congress passes this bill, it would effectively appropriate waste by the Federal Government to the tune of millions upon millions of dollars.

Many of you may know my enthusiasm for ACUS, and it will not surprise you that hordes of experts, officials and stakeholders outside of these walls, share that same enthusiasm as well, including Justices Scalia and Breyer, both of whom worked with ACUS in an earlier part of their careers.

To quote just one legal luminary, "If the conference didn't exist, it would have to be invented." Thankfully, we don't need to invent it. We did that long ago. We know it was a great invention. All we need to do is to reauthorize it today and to appropriate funds for it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, regulations play a critical role in virtually every aspect of our daily lives, yet there is no independent, nonpartisan entity that Congress can utilize to scrutinize and approve the regulatory process. Accordingly, it is critical that we reauthorize the Administrative Conference of the United States as soon as possible so that it can fill this serious void.

I realize that this may not be the sexiest issue on the docket today, but I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3564.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MENDEZ V. WESTMINSTER DECISION

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend