And preferences for socioeconomic disadvantage will not help very much. Although minorities are more likely than whites to come from low-income backgrounds, the vast majority of low-income people are still white.

Finally, there is little if any evidence that percent plans provide an effective substitute for traditional affirmative action at our leading private institutions. Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, virtually every private institution in the country is subject to the same legal standards regarding traditional affirmative action as public institutions. Any Supreme Court decision finding traditional affirmative action unconstitutional at public universities would likely end affirmative action at private universities as well—with very troubling results.

It is one thing for Florida to guarantee top 20 percenters admission to one of the state's 11 public universities, or for the University of California to guarantee top 4 percenters admission to one of 10 campuses. But what about schools like Harvard or Stanford or Columbia? Given how small and selective these schools are, even a plan guaranteeing admission to the top half of one percent of high school graduates would not work, nor would it necessarily make good sense.

While some may think it odd to worry about racial diversity at private schools, since our public university systems serve far more students, these schools have long been regarded by the American public—indeed, the world—as the very best of what higher education can offer. And those schools generate a disproportionate number of our nation's leaders in government, business, and academia. As Justice Lewis Powell said 25 years ago in the Bakke case, which featured Harvard's affirmative action policy as the gold standard for selective admissions: ''It is not too much to say that the Nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to the ideas and mores of students as diverse as this Nation of many peoples.''

The bottom line, then, is that although percent plans and other approaches may hold promise for some institutions, they are not effective substitutes for traditional affirmative action at all institutions. There is no ''one-size-fits-all'' alternative to traditional affirmative action that works at every school, in every system, in every state. I agree with you, Mr. President, that we need to take a closer look at ways to achieve diversity besides traditional affirmative action. But I do not agree that we should foreclose traditional affirmative action as an option for pursuing diversity where the alternatives do not work.

Finally, let me mention two additional concerns. First, no one doubts that the percent plans in Texas, Florida, and California were designed to achieve exactly what traditional affirmative action was designed to achieve, namely, increased opportunity for qualified minority students. And the barometer of success has been whether these plans are keeping minority enrollments at levels achieved under traditional affirmative action. Where percent plans have been judged successful-at UT-Austin, for example-they have lowered, not raised, average SAT scores among former beneficiaries of traditional affirmative action. The fact is that percent plans, in their motivation, design, and effect, look a lot like traditional affirmative action. If the Court agrees with your Administration that traditional affirmative action is unconstitutional, aren't percent plans simply the next shoe to drop? If we accept the constitutionality, and sometimes the wisdom, of percent plans, then logic and law dictate that we also accept the constitutionality and wisdom of affirmative action

This is especially true for public universities like Michigan that strive to serve a student body representative of the taxpayers who support the system. As you said yesterday, ''America is a diverse country, racially, economically, and ethnically. And our institutions of higher education should reflect our diversity.'' I see nothing wrong with a public university doing directly what Texas, California, and Florida have been forced to do indirectly, indeed what we have applauded them for doing.

Second, I am very concerned about the unintended consequences of making a constitutional distinction between percent plans and traditional affirmative action. If admissions policies must be scrubbed clean of race, then shouldn't they also be scrubbed clean of gender? Women have made great strides in higher education, but they continue to lag behind men in areas like engineering and computer science. In fact, women are awarded 25 percent of doctoral degrees in math and the physical sciences, and only 15 percent of doctorates in engineering. Percent plans cannot solve these problems of gender inequality, just as they cannot solve every problem of racial inequality. But percent plans teach us what supporters of traditional affirmative action have long known: that there are considerations important to the distribution of educational opportunity in America other than a standardized test score.

Traditional affirmative action, whether based on race or gender, stands or falls on similar logic. And if traditional affirmative action falls, I worry it is only a small step to rolling back our most basic antidiscrimination laws, like Title VII and Title IX. Given unconscious stereotypes and structural inequalities that persist in our society, there is a very fine line between taking deliberate steps to ensure access to higher education for minorities and women, and protecting them from unlawful discrimination.

Mr. President, I urge you to carefully consider the implications of eliminating traditional affirmative action in the absence of alternatives that effectively promote, and do not work against, diversity and integration in all of our public high schools, colleges, and graduate programs. And I urge you to consider the consequences your Administration's position may have for the vigorous enforcement of our nation's anti-discrimination laws.

Sincerely yours,

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON.

21st CENTURY NANOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research & Development Act. I want to thank my colleague from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, for his leadership on this important issue. I have enjoyed working with Senator WYDEN on nanotechnology for the past several years. I would also like to thank the other cosponsors on this legislation, the Senior Senator from Virginia—Mr. WARNER, Senators LIEBERMAN, MIKULSKI, HOLLINGS, LANDRIEU, CLINTON, LEVIN, and BAYH.

Today, our scientists and visionaries are quickly learning that there is a whole New Frontier of promise and human endeavor literally right under our eyes, at the nanoscale, when magnified for us to see.

The potential for nanotechnologies and the exciting work taking place in the nanoscience field are by all accounts revolutionary. Nanotechnology is still very much in its infancy, but as the technology matures it will undoubtedly have a tremendous impact on our daily lives.

Nanoscience is quickly transforming almost every aspect of our modern world and is already significantly improving our quality of life. From computer and electronic devices, to health care and pharmaceuticals, to agriculture, energy and our national defense, nanoscience will be the foundation of many of the revolutionary advances and discoveries in the decades to come and will soon occupy a major portion of the technology economy.

Through nanoscience, researchers and scientists are already beginning to develop technologies that years ago were thought to be impossible. Memory and processing chips the size of a sugar cube have the ability to store all the information in our Nation's National Archives and the Library of Congress combined. Nanoscientists are also exploring ways nanomaterials can travel through the human body to detect and cure diseases, such as target cell therapy where limited amounts of chemotherapy drugs can, cell by cell, attack individual cancer cells and leave healthy cells intact.

As production and innovation of nanotechnologies becomes easier, faster, more efficient and less costly, every market sector in the economy will begin to feel its impact. The NanoBusiness Alliance estimates that the global market for nanotechnology related products and services will reach more than $225 billion by 2005. The National Science Foundation conservatively predicts a $1 trillion global market in a little over a decade.

While nanotechnology is typically defined by size—that is 1 nanometer equaling 1 billionth of a meter—the science of nanotechnology is really the ability to pick and place or manipulate atoms 1/100,000 the width of a human hair, and eventually generate materials with properties that are fundamentally new and superior to the bulk form of the same materials.

It is the promise and potential that impels the Congress to act and introduce legislation that assures this Nation remains at the forefront of the nanoscience revolution. The United States has been the leader of virtually every important and transformative technology since the Industrial Revolution, and this legislation ensures we will continue to lead the world in this new frontier.

The 21st Century Nanotechnology Research & Development Act authorizes appropriations for the coordination of an interagency and interdisciplinary program to support long-term nanoscale research in the fields of nanoscience, nanotechnology and nanoengineering as part of the National Nanotechnology Research Program. The legislation authorizes $676 million for fiscal year 2004—a 15 percent increase from the President's budget request for fiscal year 2003—in

all nine civilian Federal agencies currently conducing nanotechnology research.

The goal of the legislation is to provide an organized, structured and collaborative approach to nanotechnology research that will ensure America's leadership and economic competitiveness internationally. This legislation provides grants to support nanoscience research centers that will bring together experts from various disciplines, agencies, industries and universities.

I have wanted the Commonwealth of Virginia to recognize nanotechnology as a key element in the future of high technology and economic development and commend the establishment of the Initiative for Nanotechnology in Virginia to serve as a facilitator in the nanoscience community. This legislation takes the work being done at the State level and encourages increased collaboration with State-led initiatives like the one in Virginia as well as universities and industry led projects.

As our scientist and researchers adventure boldly into this New Frontier of nanoscience and chart new waters in lands not yet discovered, this legislation will serve as a guide and hopefully a catalyst to the nanotechnology community. The work being done in the nanoscience field is invigorating; it's exciting, and it's important for our future health, the economy and millions of jobs.

I hope my colleagues will work with Senator WYDEN and me to pass this important legislation in a nanosecond, but recognizing the deliberative process of the Senate, passage in a nanoyear will suffice.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BETTY HAGEL BREEDING

• Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, on Monday, a colleague of ours lost his mother and, as always, when tragedy hits one member of our Senate family, we all feel like we have lost a member of our extended family.

Not every American is recognized for the way they lived their lives. Most Americans pass through time making contact with those around them, leading good and decent lives, praying to God for forgiveness and salvation, and leaving behind a modest legacy.

Betty Hagel Breeding was just like each one of us. She strived to live her life well; she endured life's unexpected twists and survived its tragedies for 79 years. She passed away this week, a true Nebraskan and a beloved matriarch, grandmother and mother of our colleague and friend Senator CHUCK HAGEL.

Life doesn't prepare you for much, especially the loss of your parents. It's especially difficult to lose someone who has played such an instrumental role in shaping your life, like most parents do.

According to her sons, Betty Hagel Breeding was ''the glue'' in the Hagel family, even more so after the death of her husband in 1962 and later her youngest son, Jim. From that point on, she alone faced the realities of life, the uncertainty of the future, and the wonder of fate as she guided her boys as they became young men.

When you lose someone like that, there is a bottomless hole in your life. When you reflect on the influence of your parents it crystallizes the role they played in the development of who you are and what you believe.

Our parents are the people who teach us how to be, how to treat others and how to live our lives. Betty Hagel Breeding passed away on Monday, but the lessons she taught her children and her children's children will live on through her sons. Her legacy lives today in Nebraska in those who have survived her and the lives of the Nebraskans touched by each one of them.

Senator HAGEL is in Nebraska today with his friends and family. They are reliving the memories they share of Betty Hagel Breeding and celebrating her life and how she led it. I know many Nebraskans and many in the Senate community join me in sending heartfelt condolences to the Hagel family.

In times like these, when Nebraskans reach out to support fellow Nebraskans, it reminds me of why our State motto is ''the good life;'' because neighbor to neighbor, town to town, city to city, Nebraska is home to great men and women, like Betty Hagel Breeding.•

GRAND VALLEY UNIVERSITY WINS NATIONAL FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent accomplishments achieved by Grand Valley State University's, GVSU, football team who on December 14, 2002, became the 2002 National Collegiate Athletic Association, NCAA, Division II Football Champions. This championship was the first in Grand Valley's history, and completes a perfect season in which the GVSU Lakers went 14–0 maintaining their position atop the Division II football rankings for the entire season. Even more impressive is the fact that the Lakers are 33–1 in their last 34 games with their only loss coming in the 2001 title game.

Preceding their National Championship, the GVSU Lakers won the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, GLIAC, Football Championship with a perfect record in league play. The Laker's depth was evidenced by their placing 18 players on the All-GLIAC team. Quarterback Curt Anes was named the GLIAC Player of the Year for the second straight season, and received the Harlon Hill Trophy as NCAA Division II's most outstanding player. In addition, head coach Brian Kelly was recently named the American Football Coaches Association Division II Coach of the Year. Coach Kelly has led the GVSU Lakers to a 104–34–2 record during his 12 years as head coach, and includes five GLIAC titles and five NCAA Division II playoff appearances.

The championship game, which I was lucky enough to see on television, was a true nail-biter. The game matched the top ranked Grand Valley State Lakers against the second ranked Valdosta State University Blazers. After marching through the playoffs with relative ease, the Lakers found a formidable opponent in Valdosta State, and the game was appropriately close to the very end. GVSU sealed the game when All-American quarterback Curt Anes tossed a 10-yard pass to fellow All-American wide receiver and his primary target David Kircus with 1 minute and 4 seconds remaining securing a 31–24 victory.

Over the last 2 years, the GVSU Lakers have demonstrated great strength, skill, unity, and perseverance. Their ability to regroup after last season's loss and maintain their top ranking all season bears witness to the focus and common purpose shared by the entire team. I commend them for their hard work and dedication. I know that my colleagues will join me in congratulating the GVSU Lakers on winning the 2002 NCAA Division II Football Championship.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the players and coaches be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Players:
Curt Anes, Kentwood, MI
Ryan Balcom, Allendale, MI
Joe Ballard, Chesaning, MI
Mike Banaszak, Detroit, MI
Terrance Banks, Gary, IN
Matt Beaty, Detroit, MI
DeJuane Boone, Detroit, MI
Josh Bourke, Tecumseh, Ontario, Canada
Kevin Boyd, Highland, IN
Ryan Brady, Chesaning, MI
Marvis Bryant, Miami, FL
Brent Burleson, Carmel, IN
Kirk Carruth, Saginaw, MI
Roberto Cepero, Miami, FL
Justin Cessante, Dearborn Heights, MI
Dion Charity, Kentwood, MI
Michael Christmon, Pontiac, MI
Jeremy Cochrane, Montrose, MI
Dustin Cole, Mattawan, MI
Phil Condon, Fraser, MI
Kyle Daisy, Stevensville, MI
Louis Dauser, Grand Rapids, MI
Chad Day, Lake Orion, MI
Todd DeVree, Hudsonville, MI
Orlando Dickerson, Allen, TX
Jamel Dillard, Saginaw, MI
Marcel Dillard, Saginaw, MI
Jeff Dock, Stevensville, MI
Melvin Estes, Chicago, IL
Sean Ferguson, Wyoming, MI
Cullen Finnerty, Brighton, MI
Eric Fowler, New Haven, MI
William Gray, Kalamazoo, MI
Scott Greene, Hartland, MI
Lucius Hawkins, Inkster, MI
Aaron Hein, Hartland, MI
Antwaan Henderson, Stevensville, MI
David Hendrix, Stevensville, MI
Tyrone Hibbler, Flint, MI
Mike Hoad, Farmington, MI
Mike Holloway, Chelsea, MI