The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, strong is Your justice, penetrating all human events and evaluating all human endeavors. Great is Your mercy for each of us as we stand before You today.

Grant the Members of the House of Representatives freedom of spirit; that each may act with a well-formulated conscience and discern the far-reaching consequences of every decision that is made.

While here, working in the public service of the Nation, everything that is done is viewed by all and open to review by others. But far greater is Your judgment, Lord.

Aware that all must appear before Your judgment seat and each will receive recompense according to what he or she did while in Your service, we ask You, O Lord, to grant the vision of faith and trust in Your great mercy now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minute speeches on each side.

URGING SUPPORT FOR THE THRIVE ACT OF 2005
(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, 45,000 adult Americans die every year from infectious diseases that could have been prevented by a simple vaccination. Tragically, 40 percent of adults in our country are underimmunized for preventable diseases such as influenza and hepatitis B. The consequences are unnecessary pain, suffering, and loss of life at a cost of more than $10 billion a year to society.

To address this tragedy, I am introducing the THRIVE Act of 2005 with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) as part of National Immunization Month. The THRIVE Act authorizes CDC to develop immunization guidelines and increase patient outreach and provider outreach. It directs the Secretary of HHS to launch a national media campaign about the value of adult immunizations, and it establishes a pilot project to distribute influenza vaccine for uninsured, at-risk adults.

The THRIVE Act of 2005 is a critical step towards reducing vaccine-preventable deaths in our country, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

MESSAGE ON MTBE: BAD LAW IS NOT CONGRESS’S FAULT
(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the energy bill later today, but I am amased that Democrats in this town have convinced the majority party that law-abiding citizens must clean up Congress's mess.

When Congress mandated use of cleaner-burning gas, MTBE was the
only way companies could obey its orders. Upon learning MTBE was linked to environmental concerns, Congress did not accept responsibility, change the policy, or invest in alternatives. Congress told the companies to clean up the mess themselves. Trial lawyers loved it. Congress’s inaction signaled that obeying law warrants a lawsuit. Now they sue anyone who might have even had a thought of using MTBE.

Mr. Speaker, these companies did not cover the costs. They did not set out to save money by cutting corners. They did not even choose to use MTBE over a cleaner alternative. Congress made them do it.

The Democrats’ own energy chairman in 1990 admits that. He says MTBE “was the only commercially viable alternative at the time.”

Democrats are quick to blame corporations, but slow to take responsibility for sufficient inducement. Maybe that is why they are still in the minority.

SUGGESTION FOR THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while I am not an expert in time management, I do have a suggestion that would allow the House to better use its time.

Last night we spent well over an hour here, a lot of very busy people, while the leadership variably cajoled, bribed, browbeat, et cetera, a few Republicans who wanted to have it both ways, who wanted to give people the impression they were opposed to CAPTA while they were ready to cave in for some inducement.

What we should have done, and I propose for the future, is the next time we have one of those tough votes where they are going to have to do that with their Members, let us schedule an evacuation drill from the House.

The fact is at the time the plane was flying over here and a roll call was open and we evacuated the House, it took about the same time as it took them to cajole and blackmail and browbeat their people last night.

So why not do two things at once? The next time they know there is a bill they are going to cram down people’s throats that they do not want to vote for and want to pretend to their voters they are against it, and it is going to take them an hour or 2 to find out ways to get them to help fool people, why not schedule in advance an evacuation drill, and that way we can kill two birds with one stone? And people might not know it is a drill, they can threaten people who do not vote with them: They can make them stay here in case there is a plane crash.

VIDEO CHOICE ACT OF 2005

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the laws governing delivery of television programming in this country are outdated, and we have not kept up with emerging technologies. I have introduced the Video Choice Act of 2005 to bring these laws into the 21st century.

Current law requires that all companies interested in offering cable service or video service, as it is called in the industry, now negotiate an individual agreement with a local franchising authority. This mandate serves as a barrier to competition, effectively preventing new technologies from entering the market. The Video Choice Act of 2005 will streamline the franchising process for new marketplace entrance and give American consumers choice over their video and cable service at a lower cost.

Our telecommunications services are rapidly changing and expanding. Congress must act to ensure our laws do not crush innovation and competition.

The bill is H.R. 3146. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Wynn) is the cosponsor on this legislation with me. I look forward to working with him for its passage here in the House of Representatives.

WE NEED A NEW ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. DeFazio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, we will adopt a so-called energy policy for the United States later today. We are in the beginnings of a 21st century energy crisis, skyrocketing prices at the pump, consumers are being gouged, growing dependence on foreign oil. And what is the answer of the Republican majority and this administration? Let us obligate the taxpayers of the United States to borrow $15.4 billion as a gift, a needed incentive to the oil industry to go out and produce more.

At 60 bucks a barrel and $2.40 a gallon, is it a needed incentive to the oil industry to go out and produce more? At 60 bucks a barrel and $2.40 a gallon and record profits and huge piles of cash they do not know what to do with, we need to subsidize the oil industry? I do not think so.

We need a new energy policy that will serve this country and the challenges of the 21st century with new technologies, new efficiency and break our dependence on foreign oil. Unfortunately, we are getting exactly the opposite here today.

RECOGNIZING DANIELLE SIMONETTA

(Mr. Wilson of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Wilson of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an individual without whom Members on this side of the aisle and indeed Members of the entire House would be lost.

Danielle Simonetta has been a public servant for the last 8 years, 5 of which have been spent with us here in the House. A New York native and a graduate of my alma mater, Washington Lee University in Virginia, Danielle began her Hill career with the legendary Gerry Solomon and then the gentleman from California (Mr. Dreier) as a Committee on Rules staff assistant to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Delay), majority leader.

In her time with leadership, she has worked tirelessly for the members of the Republican Conference. Those who know Danielle know she is a reliable source of information to us here on the House floor and a constant advocate for us in scheduling the floor. Whether it is adding a Member’s last-minute suspension to the House schedule, advising Members on the merits of a particular amendment, or just missing her beloved dog Otis, Danielle has always been here when we need her.

This fall Danielle will be leaving us to pursue an exciting new career opportunity. In addition, she is putting the finishing touches on her wedding. Congratulations to Danielle. We will miss her, and we wish her well.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE ANSWERS

(Ms. Lee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. Lee. Mr. Speaker, as the questions surrounding the Bush administration’s case for war continue to mount, and the administration continues to stonewall, the American people deserve answers.

I want to read from an editorial from yesterday’s Los Angeles Times. It says: “Scandals metastasize. That is the pattern since Watergate. What starts out looking like a small, isolated incident gradually reveals itself to be a part of a larger abuse of power. Meanwhile, an unraveling cover-up adds new elements. Is that happening now with the scandal over White House leaks of the identity of a CIA agent?”

As new elements of this unraveling cover-up are revealed, we should not lose sight of the larger abuse of power and the real scandal here.

As Chris Matthews said on Hardball on July 24: “The larger scandal in this White House/CIA leak story is not just who leaked the name of an undercover agent, but whether we were given a case for war, the deciding factor for many of us, knowing that it didn’t hold water. As we work to find our way out of this tragic stew, we should focus a bit . . . on how we got in.”

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve answers.
RECOGNIZING STEVE SAULS.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Steve Sauls, an extraordinary advocate for the students and the school of Florida International University in my hometown of Miami.

As an experienced member of the administration and leadership at the university, Steve has worked incredibly hard to promote the needs and the interests necessary to make FIU the fine institution that it is today.

Steve is retiring from his current position as vice president of government affairs for the university after 14 wonderful and productive years and has accepted a job as vice president of corporate relations in a private sector firm. I know that Steve will be immensely missed at the university, my alma mater, and will leave a void that will be difficult to fill. I have no doubt that Steve will continue to lead and excel in his new position, and I wish him all the best and FIU all the best in the years to come.

SOCIAL SECURITY CELEBRATES ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, we will be celebrating the 70th anniversary of Social Security, and that is 70 years of a guaranteed, promised benefit to all Americans of a certain age.

I have to say, I was interested to note that I looked on the Social Security Administration Web site, and I did not see any mention of the 70th anniversary, I think the reason is clear. This President, who basically is trying to dismantle Social Security, does not want the Social Security Administration to celebrate this landmark achievement.

Now, the President and House Republicans want Americans to forget how important Social Security has been for seniors and for the disabled for the last 70 years. It is a guaranteed benefit the Republicans want to turn into a risky privatization plan.

I know that the President continues to be on the road pushing his risky privatization plan as recently he was there with his mom, Mrs. Bush. And we are hearing that when we come back after the August break, we are going to see the Republican leadership in the House once again move forward with their privatization plan that is going to only aggravate Social Security’s insolvency.

Remember: 70 years of a guaranteed benefit.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2361, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 392

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H. R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

All points of order against the conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This resolution waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have before us the first appropriations conference report. The gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and those who have been working with him on the House side, as well as on the Senate side, should be applauded for taking this appropriation process and concept of prioritization and presenting the product that we have before us. The Interior conference has produced a conference report which is fiscally responsible and does live within strict budget discipline. It recommends for the fiscal year 2006 budget $36.2 billion, which is actually below last year’s enacted level of $37 billion.

Even though the total number is lower, it still takes into account significant and important high-priority items, such as wildland firefighting, $2.7 billion; a $61 million increase for our National Parks; a $31 million increase in our National Forest System; and a $28 million increase for the Indian Health Service.

Indian programs have been represented at a record $5.6 billion, which means the funding will provide for schools and hospitals, construction, education, human service needs, as well as law enforcement there.

With those increases there, it has to be significant, and there have to be offsets from somewhere else, and that is where the process of prioritization takes place. Once again, whether you like the total and the way it has been done, at least this committee has indeed done that process of prioritization.

I commend the Subcommittee chairman (Mr. TAYLOR); the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS); the ranking members who were involved in this, as well as all the conferees for shepherding this measure, this funding measure through the conference process in a timely and orderly fashion in the midst of a very lean budget climate.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is obviously not perfect; none of these ever are. We are not totally happy with all of the aspects of it. I, for example, still have a concern over our process that we are doing with Payment in Lieu of Taxes, or the PILT program. This House was wise enough to fund that program at $242 million; the conference funds it at $6 million less, at $236 million. That still is $30 million above what the Senate tried to accomplish.

This program, for example, is the best funding for our national monuments; it is rent that is due on the land that is government owned. If the Federal Government is going to own the land, they need to be able to fully support that.

Hope springs eternal. So let us, in the West, continue to work on this program in the future with the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR), the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), and others to make sure that these programs are adequately addressed in the future as well.

In closing, and notwithstanding these concerns, Mr. Speaker, the overall conference agreement is a good, bipartisan product. It has been done in a timely manner. It is the first one before us. It deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague from the majority mentioned, the rule is typical to that for all conference reports, and I will not oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not in opposition to the Interior and Environmental Appropriations conference report, but, rather, in disappointment that we have not done enough. Indeed, we live in trying times with enormous fiscal constraints, many of which we have brought upon ourselves. As the chairman and ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies will probably note today, they did the best that they could with what they were given.

Indeed, they did, Mr. Speaker. I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for their hard and, perhaps most important, their bipartisan work on this legislation. I do believe that they did the best with what the majority gave them.

The Interior conference report includes $84 million for Everglades restoration in my district and throughout.
south Florida. It increases funding for the National Endowment of the Arts and Humanities, as well as operations at our national parks and Indian health care.

The underlying report also includes a provision championed by my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Solis), that stops EPA from intentionally exposing pregnant women and children to pesticides and requires the agency to establish standards which will come down on the side of public health.

While I am pleased that the aforementioned is included in the conference report, I am greatly concerned about the report’s major cuts in clean drinking water and conservation programs. These programs are essential to protecting our environment and the health of our citizens. It is offensive that this Congress has found the money for tax cuts for the best-off of us in our society, but not enough for these critical programs.

Finally, this legislation includes $1.5 billion in emergency funding for veterans’ health care. Frankly, this money should have been appropriated before the July 4 recess. Instead, the majority played politics with the Senate, and our veterans were told no.

More than 1 year ago, Democrats came to this floor with the former Republican chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith), arguing that the majority was shortchanging veterans health care by more than $1 billion. Democrats were majority and had the votes to do whatever they wanted. Absolutely nothing. Democrats got stonewalled, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith) lost his job, and America’s veterans got shafted.

This spring, Mr. Speaker, our Democratic prophecies came true. The Bush administration finally admitted that it had pushed a budget which shortchanged veterans health care by some $1 billion. Democrats countered that $1 billion still was not enough, and the administration, oddly enough, then admitted that the actual shortfall was closer to $1.5 billion, the amount appropriated in this conference report.

How is it that this body can willingly authorize sending our troops into harm’s way, yet refuse to provide them with the health care benefits they were promised? I am pleased that the other body has the backbone to fix what is wrong, but I am not pleased by the efforts of the administration and House Republicans to cover up these shortcomings. Shame on all of us for letting this happen.

Mr. Speaker, individuals on their own are not going to conduct major environmental restoration, force power companies to reduce toxic emissions from their smokestacks, or clean up our Nation’s drinking water. But collectively, collectively, we can all make this happen.

Enforcement is not free, and neither is environmental restoration. Is there anybody in this body who is unwilling to pay just a little more to ensure that our children breathe clean air, and have clean and safe drinking water? If given the chance, who would not be willing to pool his or her resources with others in their neighborhood to collectively ensure that everyone has safe drinking water, no child would be forced to grow up playing in backyards polluted by dangerous levels of mercury and other toxins?

I will most likely support the underlying conference report, but I say to my colleagues, let us in the majority do more in this conference report. Our willingness to do so, however, was the missing ingredient.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I appreciate all of the hard work in crafting the Interior bill, the conference report; and I very much support it.

I really rise today, though, to talk about something a little bit different. Mr. Speaker, in a few hours, U.S. Army Sergeant Arthur Raymond McGill will be laid to rest. A third district native, Sergeant McGill gave his life serving his country in Iraq when his convoy detonated an improvised device. I rise today to mourn this tragic loss and honor his service.

Sergeant McGill grew up in the northwest Arkansas communities of Gentry, Decatur, and Gravette. At the age of 17, he joined the National Guard and later enlisted in the Army. He was on his second tour of duty in Iraq when he was killed.

Sergeant McGill valued family more than anything else and wanted to set a wonderful example for Kaylee and us all. Kaylee, who his aunt said was the love of his heart, having led the fight on the floor for a resolution honoring Sergeant McGill did set a wonderful example for Kaylee and us all through his selfless and noble service to his country.

Mr. Speaker, at the age of 26, Sergeant Arthur Raymond McGill made the ultimate sacrifice for his country. He is a true American hero, and I certainly ask my colleagues to remember his family, remember his friends in their thoughts and prayers during these very difficult times.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), my good friend that I serve with on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, when this House first considered the Department of Interior appropriations bill, I came to the floor to express my deep outrage that this legislation nearly eliminated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I join with my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. King) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt), in urging that the House and Senate conference committees restore some level of funding for this vital program. I am pleased that 119 Members shared our concerns about this funding cut and signed on to our bipartisan letter. Mr. Speaker, I will insert the letter for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been an enormous help to our local communities and the families who live in them. The Stateside grant program has helped to preserve open space, slow urban sprawl, and give our children safe places to play.

This partnership with Federal grants requiring a full match from States and local communities. In all, the stateside program has helped communities by funding 40,000 projects nationwide. Success stories can be found in every State and in 98 percent of U.S. counties.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is especially near and dear to my heart, having led the fight on the floor of the House back in 1992 to restore $30 million for the stateside grant program in the fiscal year 2000 Interior appropriations bill after it had been zeroed out in 1995.

In my district, the Land and Water Conservation Fund State assistance grants have provided much-needed funds to restore the historic Worchester Common in Worcester, Massachusetts, and renovate the Briggs Pool in Attleboro, Massachusetts. We have literally preserved dozens of acres of open space that otherwise would have been sold off for development that would not have been conducive to these communities. It has also helped to complete construction of this coming fall with the Princeton playing fields in Princeton, Massachusetts.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is based upon a simple concept. It
takes revenues from offshore oil and gas drilling and invests them in our Nation’s public land, letting States take the lead. For 40 years this program has a proven track record and benefited from strong bipartisan support.

It was the same bipartisan support that proved successful here today. Clearly the level of funding provided in this bill is far from what is required. In fact, the level of funding is at the same level we have legislated as program back in 1999. So I am disappointed with that. However, any amount appropriated to this program, no matter how small or large, serves a valuable purpose.

I commend my colleagues for their hard work. I thank those who helped reinsert funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund back into this bill. I hope that we can come to some sort of consensus that next year we will restore funding to a level that is adequate, and to a level that we all promised our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert for the RECORD the letter I referred to earlier.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

July 28, 2005

DEAR CONFEREE: We are writing to request that, as you move toward conference with the Senate on the FY 2006 Interior Appropriations Bill, you support the funding levels that were included for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) in the Senate passed version of the bill.

Since its creation in 1964, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) has been a critical source of funding for the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Forest Service. This funding is used to support the acquisition and maintenance of our national wildlife refuges, parks, forests, and public domain lands.

In addition, the LWCF also funds a matching grant program to assist states and localities in acquiring recreational lands and developing parks. An integral part of the LWCF, the state-side matching grant program has provided state and local parks and recreation projects, enabling millions of Americans to hike through magnificent scenery and view historic sites, bike along seashore and river trails, and picnic and play ball at local parks.

The Senate-passed FY 2006 Interior Appropriations Bill provides $192 million for LWCF. The House Appropriations Committee has allocated $30 million for the state-side grant program and $162 million for the federal program. This funding is absolutely essential for the proper stewardship of our nation’s magnificent natural heritage, and therefore, we strongly urge you to maintain the funding levels for LWCF state-side and federal grant programs provided for in the Senate bill. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,


Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the discussion that has gone through on this particular bill. We have had it on several different occasions. There are a lot of good things that are in this particular bill.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has mentioned the one portion of the $1.5 billion to solve the hole in the veterans funding area, that once the issue was validated could have been an easy chance for people to grandstand. But I am very proud of this entire Congress in a bipartisan way, who gave instructions in a bipartisan way, which came as clout, to a unanimous vote as I have seen here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is an appropriate step to do, to now take this and then review the process so that we can continue to go on. We have much to do in this particular area, but in each year that I have been here in this Congress, I have been very proud that we have tried to move forward in different areas and make progress to fully fund and fully maintain our commitments.

The same thing has gone on with all of the other programs in this particular budget and this particular conference report. This committee has once again done a great job in trying to come up with the principles that all appropriators ought to be doing a prioritizing program. They have prioritized the programs. Mr. Speaker, overall, we can be very positive of that.

Mr. DICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 394 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The question was taken; and the Yeas and Nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge the Members to support the rule that provides for consideration of this conference report to the accompanying H.R. 2361, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge the Members to support the rule that provides for consideration of this conference report to the accompanying H.R. 2361, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 394 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 394

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 394 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 394

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the
conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 394 waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The resolution also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, there are few matters that we will consider this year as important as this comprehensive energy plan. I know too well, our Nation badly needs an updated energy strategy. High oil and natural gas prices are causing stress on our economy by raising the price of energy on almost all consumer products, driving up costs for American families, and on job-creating businesses. Every industry from agriculture to tourism to manufacturing is negatively affected by high energy costs. We need to update our laws to reflect the changing global energy market, encourage conservation and energy efficiency, and to foster the advance of new technologies that make traditional fuels cleaner and make emerging energy sources more reliable and competitive.

The energy report will also show that this legislation reflects the fact that the energy challenges we face today are complex, that no single approach is going to solve all of the problems. This comprehensive energy strategy takes a balanced approach. It includes incentives related to oil, natural gas, and nuclear energy, but also emphasizes conservation, energy efficiency and renewables.

The energy plan updates and enhances the Energy Star Program, promotes the use of clean coal technology, clarifies the process for siting liquified natural gas terminals, encourages development of hydrogen-powered cars, and extends tax incentives for the production of renewable energy from wind, biomass and other resources.

With respect to electrical power issues, this legislation includes consensus language providing for mandatory reliability standards for electric transmission to help prevent blackouts like those experienced in the Northeast last December. It also encourages investment in transmission lines to eliminate bottlenecks in the electric grid. There are also important provisions providing for enhanced consumer protection against the kind of market manipulation we experienced in the west coast electric market 4 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a couple of areas that are particularly of interest to my constituents, the Pacific Northwest. We depend on clean, renewable hydropower for much of our electricity consumed in our region; however, the relicensing process that non-Federal dams must go through is too cumbersome to be reformed. It currently takes an average of 10 years to get through the relicensing, but often that can take longer. This energy bill provides for a much needed overhaul of this lengthy dam relicensing process, potentially saving ratepayers millions of dollars while ensuring protections for other river interests to remain in place.

License applicants will now have the ability to propose alternative license conditions to those made by Federal resource agencies. These more cost-effective alternatives will then be accepted, provided they are shown to provide the same level of environmental protection.

This conference report also preserves regional flexibility in achieving certain national electric marketing and transmission goals. This reflects the reality of what works in many areas of the country, but may not work in other areas that have a hydropower-based system.

This legislation strikes the proper balance on these and many other complex energy issues. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman Barton) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell), the ranking member, and the gentleman from California (Chairman Thomas) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel), the ranking member, for their perseverance and leadership in crafting this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take action to combat high energy costs and reduce America's dependence on foreign oil. Let us pass this balanced and bipartisan energy plan.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after passage of this rule, the conference report will come to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report for the energy bill. And before I explain why I strongly oppose this conference report, let me congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for his work on this conference committee. Last Congress Democrats were shut out of the conference committee. Republicans wrote that bill in the dark of night and behind closed doors. This time the chairman opened the process. He consulted frequently with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) and held public hearings.

The energy bill is an important piece of legislation that deserves to be debated out in the open, and while I do not support the final product, I want to commend the chairman for attempting to restore some bipartisanship to this Chamber, and I hope others will follow his example.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) deserves to be singled out as well. His long and distinguished career has produced some of the most important laws that govern our Nation. The gentleman from Texas (Chairman Barton) said it best last night in the Rules Committee when you talked about trying to discern the intent of one provision that would change current law. The chairman told the Rules Committee that as he was trying to explain the intent of the law, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) leaned across the table and talked about what he intended when he wrote that provision years ago.

I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) for his work on this conference committee.

With that being said, Mr. Speaker, let me comment on the substance of the energy bill. I must say that I agree with the editorial in this morning's Washington Post which says, and I quote, "The nicest thing we can say about the comprehensive energy bill is that it could have been a lot worse."

We all know that our Nation is facing a severe energy crisis. The President knows it, the House knows it, and, most importantly, our constituents know it. As we stand here today, the average retail price for gasoline is now $2.32, up 40 cents just this year. For a family of four this amounts to nearly $3,000 spent annually on gasoline. That is a tax increase courtesy of the Bush administration and the Republican-led Congress, and the oil companies that are reaping the rewards of record profits.

Yet the conference report that we have before us today does nothing, absolutely nothing, to lower energy prices for consumers. It fails to reduce America's dependency on foreign oil. It makes no real commitment to the development of renewable energy sources.

In all, the oil and gas industries will receive a multibillion-dollar package of tax breaks, and if that was not for the dedicated leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. Cappes), these same companies would have also been shielded from liability claims for their role in polluting our Nation's water supply with MTBE.

Though a few concessions have been made, this bill is nowhere near what it should be. In fact, this bill is chock-full of giveaways...
to the oil and gas industry at the expense of public health and environmental safety.

If enacted, nearly 30,000 new oil and gas projects developed each year will be exempted from clean water requirements. Control erosion and run-off into rivers and streams. These same companies, including the administration’s friends at Halliburton, would also be permitted to inject fluid laced with toxic chemicals into the ground. This proposal alone poses an enormous threat to the safety of our Nation’s drinking water sources, and if that was not bad enough, this bill extends the reach of the Federal Government into what should be local energy decisions.

Local communities like the City of Fall River, Massachusetts, in my district would have virtually no say in the construction, expansion and operation of liquid natural gas facilities. Permits for these projects would no longer be subject to review by State courts. Rather Federal appeals courts, which are far from experts on individual State laws, would have exclusive jurisdiction. This provision undermines the ability and local officials to protect their communities from dangers surrounding LNG.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we have before us today is not a comprehensive approach. It does not solve our Nation’s energy crisis. And I cannot say it any more simply than this: The Energy Policy Act will harm the environment, reward special interests at the expense of consumers and taxpayers, and limit State rights.

Mr. Speaker, I think we could have done much, much better, and I believe that it should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the conference report to which I have been linked.

Now, on the mobile source, which is primarily oil which we refine into gasoline, this is a good bill. But I cannot tell the American people that it is a good bill. We believe in private property. We believe in freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity. We believe in free enterprise. We believe in economic choices. So the bill before us does not dictate to the American people or to the corporations and to the interest groups that make up America exactly how we should develop our energy resources. It sets the ground rules.

I want to divide the energy sector into two components, stationary energy and mobile energy. On the stationary side, this is the best bill that has ever been before this Congress of the United States of America. It is going to fundamentally transform the way we develop our energy resources to generate electricity, whether it is in our coal area where there is great work on clean coal; or whether it is in the nuclear area where we really revitalize nuclear power; or whether it is in the way we do the transmission grids; whether it is the way we site new transmission lines; whether it is the way we develop the reliability of our system has to be, has to be maintained.

This is an excellent bill.

Now, on the mobile source, which is primarily oil which we refine into gasoline, this is a good bill. But I cannot tell the American people that it is a great bill in the sense that it is going to reduce your gasoline prices next week if the House passes it and the Senate passes it and the President signs it.

Here is the fundamental problem we face on our mobile energy sources. We consume 21 million barrels of oil every day in this country, and we only produce 8. You subtract the 8 out of 21 and you get 13. So we are importing about 11 million barrels of oil a day. On our best day, the United States of America did not produce more than 10 million barrels of oil a day, on our best day. There is nothing we can do that is going to generate another 13 million barrels of oil produced in the confines of the United States of America. It cannot be done.

Now, we can produce more and we have an inventory and the OCS has been under moratory that will at least allow us to see what might be out there. When we come back in September in reconciliation, we are going to pass a provision that allows us to drill up in ANWR and maybe produce as much as 2 million barrels of oil to help us, and we hope that this bill that will continue research on the hydrogen economy so that perhaps we can come up with an alternative to
Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENEAU).

Mr. BLUMENEAU. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy in permitting me to speak on the rule on the energy bill.

One is just struck by the rhetoric surrounding this because only people who are captive inside the beltway bubble would believe this without being a positive development for our country. People do not have to take the word of politicians for this. Any person can deal with reputable

The Energy Policy Act is good for West Virginia coal, West Virginia jobs, and great for our Nation’s economy and energy security. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member. They have worked in a bipartisan way in this conference committee to produce the best energy bill that we could.

Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial that appeared in The Washington Post today entitled “Energy Deficient” and the editorial that appeared in today’s New York Times entitled “Energy Shortage.”

The energy bill that has been six years in the making and is nearing the president’s desk is not the unrelied disaster some environmentalists believe. But others go so far as to say, President Bush undoubtedly will, that it will swiftly move this country to a cleaner, more secure energy future is nonsensical. The bill, House-Senate conference early Tuesday morning, does not take the bold steps necessary to reduce the nation’s dependence on foreign oil, and it also fails to address the looming problem of global warming.

These shortcomings are chiefly the fault of the White House and its retainers. To be sure, the Senate showed no more courage than the House in its refusal to increase fuel-economy standards for cars and trucks, even though higher standards, by far the most cost-effective, quickest and most technologically feasible way to reduce oil demand and cut foreign imports.

But the Senate did approve a renewable fuels provision requiring power plants to produce 10 percent of their electricity from nontraditional sources, like wind power, by 2010. It also approved a provision that would ask the president to reduce domestic oil consumption by one million barrels a day by whatever means he chose. The House conference report included none of these.

Meanwhile, both houses conspired in some spectacular giveaways. One would ease environmental restrictions on oil and gas compa¬nies. The other would by a bonanza. The other would shower billions in undeserved tax breaks on the same companies, even as they wallow in the windfall profits produced by $60-a-barrel oil.

The bill’s most useful provisions may take years to realize their promise. Again, thanks largely to the Senate’s tax provisions for more hospitable to energy efficiency and renewable fuels than earlier versions of the bill, and include substantial incentives for buyers of fuel-efficient cars.

More important in the long run, however, may be two provisions, buried deep in the bill, that are aimed at developing new energy technologies. One provision would encourage the development and commercial application of biofuels from agricultural products that, much like corn-based ethanol, might someday be used as a substitute for gasoline. The other provision is aimed at developing new clean-coal technologies to turn coal into a gas and, more important, capture emissions of carbon dioxide, a major contributor to global warming.

These could be powerful new tools in any future effort to reshape the way Americans use and produce energy. The success of both will depend on the willingness of the government to put money into them. That, in turn, will require a deeper commitment to a more adventurous energy policy than this administration has so far displayed.
independent analysis from academics, from scientists, even looking at conservativethink tanks to find out that the arguments are not sustainable.

This is, unfortunately, serious business. It is not just a list of special tax breaks and dodging hard issues. This is serious business for our economy because our addiction to huge amounts of foreign oil that come from unstable parts of the world dooms us to costly dependency and means that we will continue to finance both sides of what they call the "war on terrorism." This bill has no vision of a sustainable energy future for renewables and meaningful conservation, not window dressing but meaningful conservation. People are lining up in this country to buy energy-efficient vehicles that are only available by a handful of producers, and there is an opportunity lost to change that in terms of fuel efficiency. Ten percent of the world's supply of oil is dealt with in our addiction to inefficient energy transportation. We are even falling behind not just the developed countries like Germany and Japan who have much more efficient use of energy: we are falling behind emerging countries. People on the floor are appalled about China buying an oil company, Unocal. Well, China at least is getting its energy house in order. As an emerging country, it has officially committed to a much more dramatic and aggressive program for renewables than the United States.

This bill has no vision of an energy policy. It is a list of tax breaks and special interest favors that does not by any stretch of the imagination translate into a cohesive approach which global reality today demands for this country, demands for any country. It spends over $7 billion in subsidies to oil companies, the most profitable sector of our economy already flush with cash. I will not detail the harmful provisions that are going to come to forward that are unnecessary for the oil and gas industries for compliance with the Clean Air Act, the backdoor immunity to MTBE producers and distributors that unfairly and inappropriately denies injured parties.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his very diligent and hard work on the Rules Committee in terms of addressing the issues relating to this energy conference report.

Once again, and I want to talk a little bit about the substance, this administration and its lack of vision, I believe, quite frankly, have put the profits of their friends in the energy industry ahead of the needs of the American people, ahead of the needs of our economy and our environment. Instead of really trying to do something of lasting benefit, this bill would allow oil and gas companies to further pollute our skies, our water and our environment without paying for the consequences. The health of the American people, I believe, is quite at risk as a result of this bill.

We need a comprehensive energy bill with a vision for the future that embraces ingenuity, reduces our chronic addiction to oil, fights global warming, which we all recognize is a huge problem. Just look at the weather changes this year. Last year, we have got to address global warming. This bill could do that. It could help us adapt and adjust. It could help us protect our planet. But it puts our economy unfortunately on the wrong path rather than on the path to long-term sustainability.

While I want to commend our ranking member for at least making this bill much better than what it was, from what we remember when it left this body, it is still a bill that I believe forces us to rely on foreign energy sources rather than move toward energy independence. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time. Unfortunately, I am going to have to vote against this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to set the record straight about this bill and add some comments that I did not make in my previous statement.

The conferees on the bill, 8 Republicans and 6 Democrats. Thirteen of those conferees signed the conference report. We had all the Republicans in the Senate and five of the six Democrats sign this conference report. In the House, a majority of the House Democrats have signed the report, a majority. Of the Energy and Commerce Committee conferees that were general conferees, a majority of those conferees signed the conference report, including the distinguished former chairman of the committee, John Dingell of Michigan.

We have a bipartisan bill that has come before the House. As I announced earlier, if your vision of an energy policy is a policy where the government tells you what you can do and when you can do it and how you get your energy, this is not your bill. But if your vision of America is a vision of America that says it is okay to let the private sector, with the appropriate environmental guidelines and open markets, transparency rules and regulations, develop its resources for the good of all the people, this is your bill.

In terms of incentives for alternative energy, this bill has got more incentives at the individual level and at the general industrial level than any other energy bill that has ever been before this Congress. Whatever your energy source of choice is, there is something in this bill to help you decide if you want to maximize that choice. What this bill does not do is say every American has to drive a vehicle that gets 50 miles to the gallon whether they want to or not. Those vehicles are available right now in the marketplace, and Americans have the right to choose. This bill does not dictate that choice.

This bill also makes it possible, again without repealing or fundamentally changing any existing environmental law, to do some at least exploration and in some cases development of our onshore and offshore energy resources. As I said earlier, it fundamentally revitalizes the clean coal technology industry in this country and the nuclear power industry in this country.

This is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. A majority of the House Democrat conferees and every Republican conferee signed the conference report. Last night when we were before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Michigan and I were both unanimous in that this should come to the floor under a rule that both sides could support. I want to commend the distinguished Rules Committee, in the gentleman from Washington, for having the best rule that has ever been presented on the floor of the House of Representatives.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer).

Mr. Blumenauer. Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to belabor this. I have great respect for the skills, the great skills of the Energy and Commerce Committee. But it is just laughable to suggest that this is not your bill if you think you ought to dictate to the American public that you have to drive a car that gets 55 miles to the gallon. The idea that that were the only choice was a meaningful choice to raise CAFE standards the way other countries have done to their great advantage. That would have made more choices available to the American public and is something that is within our power, that we could do. It has nothing to do with forcing Americans to drive a car that gets 55 miles to the gallon. But the lack of a meaningful policy dealing with vehicle efficiency means that it is very difficult. There is a huge wait list. It took me 6 months to get a hybrid SUV.

We are dropping the ball here. As to the notion that this is the best opportunity in terms of renewable energy, talk to the people in the industry who are ready and able. Ask them if it is the best bill ever. That is not what I hear from people in this industry. I respectfully disagree.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let us put into conclusion that I have great respect for Chairman Barton and Ranking Member Dingell. They have worked very hard on this bill. I think it is a better bill than is before us than the one that we passed in the House. As Chairman Barton pointed out, Ranking Member Dingell supports this bill. There was virtually a love fest in the Rules Committee last night, in part a tribute to the process during these last several weeks.

Having said that, some of us obviously have some philosophical differences, and some of us feel compelled to vote against this bill. I have no doubt that this bill will pass with strong bipartisan support, but as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I feel compelled to oppose the bill as well. I am concerned about some of what I consider are giveaways in this bill that I think were unnecessary. One would ease the tax breaks on oil and gas companies drilling on public lands. The other would give billions of dollars in, I think, undeserved tax breaks to companies that, quite frankly, right now are gouging Americans. Oil companies right now, I think, are gouging Americans who are paying the highest gas prices in recent memory.

I think this bill could have been a better bill. Again, there are philosophical differences here. There will be a debate here. The conference report and against its consideration are port and against its consideration are

Mr. Speaker, 4½ years ago, President George W. Bush stood in this Chamber during his first State of the Union Address and said, “We have a serious energy problem that demands a national energy policy. Our energy demands will double in the lifetime of this Congress, while our oil production declines. So we need more energy at home while protecting our environment, and we must. We can produce more electricity to meet demand, and we must. We can promote alternative energy sources and conservation, and we must. America must become more energy independent, and we will.”

Today, Mr. Speaker, this rule brings before the House a comprehensive, bipartisan energy plan that will help us produce more energy at home while protecting the environment; produce more energy at home while protecting our environment, and we must. We can produce more electricity to meet demand, and we must. We can promote alternative energy sources and conservation. This energy plan will help America meet its demands of today while planning for the energy needs of future generations, and it will allow us to become more energy independent.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule, House Resolution 394, and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2985, THE CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT ACT, 2006

Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 396
Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2985) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Simpson). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Matsui), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 396 is a traditional, standard rule for consideration of the conference report for the fiscal year 2006 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The legislation before us appropriates $3.084 billion for operations of the legislative branch. The bill is fiscally sound. It includes a modest increase from the bill of fiscal year 2005.

In accordance with long practice, Mr. Speaker, each body determined its own fiscal requirements. As such, the conference report includes $3.1 billion in the House of Representatives originally appropriated for its operations earlier this year. It also includes the $759 million the Senate appropriated for its operations. The appropriations for both the House of Representatives and the Senate includes funds for Members’ representational allowances, leadership and committee offices. These funds will help Members fulfill their duties to legislate and to oversee.

These funds also help Congress complete the vitally important task, as I have just mentioned, which is the oversight of the executive branch. The Constitution grants Congress broad powers that include the extraordinarily important power of oversight. This includes obviously getting to know what the executive is doing, how programs are being administered, by whom and at what cost, and whether officials are complying with the law, with the intent of the law.

For the Capitol Police, who each and every day protect us, our staffs, and our constituents visiting the Capitol, the bill appropriates over $249 million. This level of funding will support the current staffing level of 1,592 officers, an additional 43 officers for the Library of Congress and 45 new officers for the Capitol Visitors Center. Also included is an inspector general for the Capitol Police to help the Capitol Police with administrative operations such as financial management and budgeting.

The bill also includes an important piece of legislation, the Continuity in Representation Act of 2005. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, flight 93 was headed toward us here. If it were not for the heroic acts of the passengers on flight 93, we could very well have faced a situation where Congress may not have been able to function. We cannot allow this to happen. We certainly have to do everything we can to not allow it to happen.
H.R. 941 would accelerate elections in case a terrorist attack leaves the House of Representatives with over 100 vacancies. It provides for the expedited special election of new Members to fill seats left vacant in “extraordinary circumstances.”

The House passed this bill earlier this year by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 329 to 68. In the 108th Congress, the House passed a similar bill by a vote of 306 to 97. Each time the Senate has failed to consider this vital legislation; so the Speaker wisely asked that this very important legislation be included in this process.

We must not ignore the threat to our constitutional duty. It is time that we have legislation such as this that can handle such an inconceivably horrible possibility and does not leave our duty to legislate and oversee in limbo.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, essential to our continued ability to legislate and oversee the government.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ONEIT), ranking member, for their leadership on this. And I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for her hard work and friendship.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule for the Fiscal Year 2006 Legislative Branch Appropriations conference report, and although I support this report, I would just like to express my general concerns over the exorbitant cost overruns of the Capitol Visitors Center. Funding contained in this report is based on the GAO’s assessment of needs, and I truly hope that this will be the last installment needed to get the center completed.

Through this measure, we will also fund the operations for our institution and the many supporting bodies that we rely upon daily, like the Library of Congress, the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Capitol Police.

I would just like to take this opportunity to draw attention to those who help keep Congress running. There is a tremendous operation that helps my colleagues and me do the business of the American people, from the personnel at the Congressional Research Service that aids our offices in keeping up with new laws, to the Speaker’s staff that records every word we speak, tracks each bill introduced, and, no matter the hour, is here to support us as we debate the priorities of the Nation. It is also the curators who impart the history of this great Capitol Building to visitors every single day, and painters and archivists that maintain the historical integrity of the buildings. It is not without the maintenance crews, for so many that I cannot even begin to name that keep the trains running smoothly on the Capitol complex. I thank them all for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing one of the first appropriations conference reports move forward today.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 394, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 394, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 2005 at page H 6691.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say at the beginning we currently do not have on the House floor the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), one of the opponents of the bill, but when he arrives, I want to assure those who are in opposition to the bill that we will yield time so that they have an opportunity to participate in the debate.

With that I want to say that this is a great bill. The House is poised to pass the most comprehensive energy policy that we have ever had before this body, at least in the time that I have been in the House of Representatives, which encompasses the last 21 years.

In the last Congress, the House was able to adopt a conference report, but the other body was never able to invoke cloture and bring that bill to the floor.

This bill builds on last year’s bill. It is full of superb legislation. It is a very balanced bill both for conservation and for production. There is a strong title on energy efficiency there is a strong title on renewable energy and clean energy. On a bipartisan basis, we have even adjusted daylight savings time to help save energy.

The bill before us today is going to promote a new generation of clean coal technology. It is going to promote the use of our Nation’s greatest domestic resource, which is coal. It is going to do it in a clean, environmentally safe fashion. We are going to introduce a new generation for nuclear power in this country. There are innovations that should make it possible the next 3 to 4 years to begin to construct a new nuclear power plant.

With the help of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and Senator Cooper in the other chamber, there is a reform in our relicensing process for hydroelectric plants, which, as we all know, have zero emissions. We also have parts of the bill that are going to vigorously pursue the Hydrogen Fuel Initiative, which has the potential to help relieve some of the dependency on the internal combustion engine which we have developed in this country. We want to give American drivers the opportunity to drive safe, affordable, and reliable, clean hydrogen cars as soon as the year 2020. That is not as far off as it seems, Mr. Speaker.

In the short term, we have provisions in the bill to make it more efficient to use our boutique fuels. These are fuels that are a blend of fuels between gasoline and different types of ethanol. Under current rules there are as many as 19 different blends, many of them manufactured or refined in only one refinery. The bill before us reduces that number so that we have greater transportability of our boutique fuels between those regions of the country that need those fuel sources.

We have a brand new title on siting new liquefied natural gas terminals. We are dependent on about 10 percent of imports for natural gas right now, yet we have not sited a new LNG facility in this Nation in over 30 years.

The bill before us will look at the permitting process. It will respect the States’ rights and local community rights, but it will also open a process where they get a decision, and hopefully some of those sites will be permitted in the next 3 to 4 years, and we will be able to import liquefied natural gas for our Nation’s economic future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The State of Texas by and through the Governor and that came over from the other body on a comprehensive inventory in the oil and gas reserves in the Outer Continental Shelf.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. After several years of trying, the time to pass this vital legislation is now. The President has waited patiently since his first week in office. We need to pass it now.

Blackouts have affected our country, gas prices are crippling family budgets, and foreign energy resources have our Nation beholden to overseas interests. We have not built a new nuclear power plant in a generation. Additionally, we must begin to harness new energy sources for new potential. This bill wisely addresses all of these things.

Taken together, the provisions in this legislation will diversify and increase our energy supply in a careful and measured way. It deserves passage. Now, it does not have everything in it that every Member wanted. This has been a long fight, and we all owe a great deal of gratitude to the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) for his patience over the last 5 years as he has tried to guide us to an energy policy for this Nation that we have not had certainly since I have been in Congress. It is time now to do that.

I want to thank personally this gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) for his fair and evenhanded way, as he has been just now, giving time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who obviously opposes the bill. But the rest of us in here need to pass this legislation today. I urge us all to vote “aye.”

Mr. BARTON, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTON), one of the conferees on the energy conference.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Boucher) for yielding me this time. Let me then proceed to thank our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell), for his strong leadership on this matter, and also our chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON), for his leadership. They have done a Herculean job in bringing us this energy bill to a comprehensive and bipartisan energy policy for the future, a very forward-looking bill.
Let me begin by applauding what is not in this bill. First of all, I think it is very significant that in this bill there will be no drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve. Our Arctic and sub-Arctic ecosystems will continue to be protected from just an environmental standpoint, but also from the perspective that we are out here to make our energy security greater and our energy independence greater. Please adopt the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

This bill also does not shield manufacturers of the fuel additive MTBE from lawsuits. This means that States and localities and municipalities will be able to hold these manufacturers liable for the presence of toxic pollutants in underground water supplies. These are two major environmental victories of which we should be very proud.

But let us look at the positive things that are in fact in this bill. We have here we see an energy policy emerging that will help America attain security and independence.

First of all, we put in this bill mandatory reliability standards. Now, there are, you see, folks, cells, by Noren et al., that sat in the dark and suffered through scorching heat in a power outage some years ago, so this is very important. These mandatory standards will help us avoid the problems that we encountered when whole States began to go dark and air conditioners went off. This is very meaningful. We have never had mandatory electricity reliability standards for performance, for training of personnel, and for maintenance of the system.

Let me look at another area, the area of hydrogen. We have almost $3 billion in incentives for hydrogen fuel development. Now, why is that important? Because in fact, in the future, we have a past which reflects a dependence on fossil fuels, oil, gas, and cars that emit huge amounts of pollution. We are looking at a future when cars and buildings will run electricity generated by hydrogen, that is, energy generated through solar, through wind, and through nuclear energy. This is very important. We will see cars that only emit water. We think this is a good thing.

Now, will that solve the problem of the $2.50 gas we have today? No. But this energy policy is looking toward the future, and I think it is important to understand that we are undertaking a task much like putting a man on the Moon in which we are saying, down the road, we will accomplish great things, innovative things because we are making those investments today, and those investments are, in fact, in this energy bill.

We should also be pleased that other sources of energy are being enhanced in this bill. Solar energy, wind energy, biomass, all receive incentives for development of critical alternatives.

We are at a situation in which we can tell our children and our grandchildren that we did something today to make their energy security greater and their energy independence greater. Please adopt the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for yielding me this time.

With great respect to our leaders, the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Ranking Member DINGELL), Mr. Speaker, I do rise in opposition to the bill.

This bill is a missed opportunity to provide a secure energy future for America. It is a bill filled with taxpayer-subsidized goodies for energy companies. It is a bill that will not reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased about one part of the bill: it no longer contains the liability waiver to the MTBE industry. Now, perhaps, communities with MTBE-polluted groundwater will have a fighting chance to get it cleaned up by the people who made the mess. I call on the MTBE industry to do the right thing. The right thing is to stop fighting in court and in Congress, own up to your responsibility by sitting down and working out cleanup plans with these affected communities.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the bill is mostly bad news. At a time of record-high energy prices, the bill hands out tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies for the oil and gas, coal and nuclear power industries already making record profits.

The bill also cuts States out of LNG siting decisions, giving power to the Federal Government, which, of course, always knows what is best.

In addition, the bill does precious little to make our cars more energy efficient or to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. There is no effort to make our cars more energy efficient. Seventy-five percent of the oil we use every day goes right into our gas tanks. This bill acts like it is okay that mileage on our autos has gone down in recent years, there is no connection between that and today's record gas prices.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill calls for new offshore drilling under the guise of conducting a so-called inventory.

My friends on the other side will argue that this is just a study so we know what is out there. MMS already conducts surveys every 5 years on offshore resources. We already know where the offshore oil and gas is: in the central and western gulf where drilling is currently allowed and is under way, so why the inventory?

Putting it simply, this is just a first step in opening up offshore areas now off limits to new drilling. This means new drilling off States like Florida, North Carolina, and California. Make no mistake: this is the oil companies' attempt to begin dismantling the long-standing, bipartisan moratorium on new drilling in these areas.

Voting for this bill means you support drilling off Florida, California, North Carolina, and other States. I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, of course, in support of H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005; and I am very pleased with the conference agreement before us today as the culmination of years of hard work and determination amongst my colleagues and friends. I certainly commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Ranking Member DINGELL). I have been here 25 years, and I have never seen an operation like the one we have gone through this last week where the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), worked together on hammering out a good bill; not perfect for either one of them, but both of them working hard for what is best, the "greatest good for the greatest number." These two men worked together, did not agree on everything, but worked together for the good of the people, basically for the young people of this country who will have to fight a war for energy if we do not find our own energy, and we have plenty of it here.

We need this bill before us today. We needed it 5 years ago. But I gladly accept it, because we simply cannot go another day without doing something we have to do to increase our domestic production of oil and gas, increase our energy efficiency, and step up our conservation efforts, all towards the goal of being less reliant on foreign countries, people that do not trust us, people that we do not really trust for our energy needs.

I am especially pleased about the inclusion of my Ultra-deepwater and Unconventional Offshore Natural Gas and Research and Development Program, which will enable the development of new technology to increase natural gas production from the 1.900 trillion cubic feet of technically recoverable reserves in North America, enough to meet over 85 years of demand at current rates of consumption.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for the Nation, it is a good bill for the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, it is good for our country, and it is good for the generation of high school juniors and high school seniors who, using this energy policy, will be able to ask themselves which university or college will I enter, rather than which branch of service will I enter. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" for this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), another of our conferees.

Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.
Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we have before us today is a pretty good energy bill. The conferees worked hard to find a compromise on this legislation, and I think that the leaders of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it today.

I want to give particular congratulations and thanks to the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman Barton), and the gentleman from Michigan (Ranking Member Dingell), and also to Senator Domenici and Senator Bingaman. By all working together, we do have a bill.

Is it a perfect bill? No. And if we are going to work via compromise, it cannot be a perfect bill. I would have preferred to see fewer corporate tax breaks; and I think in conference, those of us on the main committee, we were blocked out on those tax provisions. I have some objections on some of these corporate tax breaks, overall I think they are fair.

In addition, I would have liked to have seen stronger measures for direct relief at the pump for Americans who are suffering right now as we pay record-high gasoline prices. In fact, in Michigan last week, as I noted to the conferees, gas spiked 80 cents in one day, it went up 80 cents, to $3.51. That was based on rumors and everything else. But that is how volatile the situation is out there.

So I actually had a provision that said, stop filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until a barrel of oil drops below $40 for 2 consecutive weeks. Unfortunately, the language did not make it into the final bill. But we do encourage the Secretary of Energy to look at this, and I would like to take this time to suggest to him that he do something immediately to help out our domestic gasoline market. We just cannot continue to be at $3.51.

Also, I would have liked to have seen stronger language on the underground storage issue. While we did make some improvements on this issue, I think we can ill-afford to allow our groundwater to become contaminated with gasoline from leaking underground storage tanks. In particular, we cannot allow MTBE to continue to contaminate drinking water. I am happy that the “safe harbor” provisions for manufacturers of MTBE that were in the House bill were dropped. Instead, there is a provision allowing lawsuits to be sent to Federal court if a defendant wants to make a request to do so. During the conference, I asked Chairman Barton about the MTBE provisions in the bill and whether the claims filed after the date of enactment would require a case to be sent to Federal court. The chairman indicated that it did not have to be sent to Federal court, but gave defendants in prospective suits the right to ask that the case be sent to Federal courts. I wanted to be sure that we were not conferring any new substantive or subject matter jurisdiction over MTBE cases. It is important to hear from Chairman Barton that to his knowledge, the legislation was not doing so.

I am happy to see that there are provisions in the bill to increase incentives for the nuclear power industry. Whether it is a State permit or a Federal permit, you will no longer be allowed to do it. I am very pleased with that provision that I have worked for for more than a decade to put the provision in there.

Also there are some provisions on nuclear energy, and I know that is sort of a controversial thing, but I, for one, believe if we are going to start worrying on dependency on foreign oil, that if we are really concerned about global climate change and climate change here in this country, we must revisit the issue of nuclear energy, and I am pleased this bill provides incentives to make the United States once again a leader in this area, and protect our environment, protect our climate and get America less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is not a perfect bill but is one that I can support. After 13 years and seeing so many changes on the floor, none of which I have supported. I am pleased to be able to lend my support for this bill, and once again I would like to thank the leadership for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we have before us today is a pretty good energy bill. The conferees worked hard to craft compromise legislation that I think the majority of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support today.

Is this a perfect bill? No. I would have preferred to see some of the corporate tax breaks pared back, but the Energy and Commerce conferees were shut out of discussions regarding tax provisions.

In addition, I would like to have seen stronger measures to give direct relief at the pump for the millions of Americans who are paying record high prices for gasoline right now. I had a measure that would have provided millions of dollars worth of relief to the U.S. market by suspending contributions to the strategic petroleum reserve until the price of oil dips below $40 per barrel for two consecutive weeks. Unfortunately, that was dropped in exchange for language allowing the Secretary of Energy to voluntary contributions if he sees fit. I would like to take this time to suggest that he do so immediately, allowing more oil into the domestic market.

I also would have liked to have seen stronger wording for secondary containment of underground storage tanks. While we did make some improvements on this issue, we can ill afford to allow our groundwater to become contaminated with gasoline from leaking underground storage tanks. In particular, we cannot allow MTBE to continue to contaminate drinking water.

I am happy that the “safe harbor” provisions for manufacturers of MTBE that were in the House bill were dropped. Instead, there is a provision allowing lawsuits to be sent to Federal court if a defendant wants to make a request to do so. During the conference, I asked Chairman Barton about the MTBE provisions in the bill and whether the claims filed after the date of enactment would require a case to be sent to Federal court. The chairman indicated that it did not have to be sent to Federal court, but gave defendants in prospective suits the right to ask that the case be sent to Federal courts. I wanted to be sure that we were not conferring any new substantive or subject matter jurisdiction over MTBE cases. It is important to hear from Chairman Barton that to his knowledge, the legislation was not doing so.

I am happy to see that there are provisions in the bill to increase incentives for the nuclear power industry. Whether it is a State permit or a Federal permit, you will no longer be allowed to do it. I am very pleased with that provision that I have worked for for more than a decade to put the provision in there.

Also there are some provisions on nuclear energy, and I know that is sort of a controversial thing, but I, for one, believe if we are going to start worrying on dependency on foreign oil, that if we are really concerned about global climate change and climate change here in this country, we must revisit the issue of nuclear energy, and I am pleased this bill provides incentives to make the United States once again a leader in this area, and protect our environment, protect our climate and get America less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is not a perfect bill but is one that I can support. After 13 years and seeing so many changes on the floor, none of which I have supported. I am pleased to be able to lend my support for this bill, and once again I would like to thank the leadership for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we have before us today is a pretty good energy bill. The conferees worked hard to craft compromise legislation that I think the majority of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support today.

Is this a perfect bill? No. I would have preferred to see some of the corporate tax breaks pared back, but the Energy and Commerce conferees were shut out of discussions regarding tax provisions.

In addition, I would like to have seen stronger measures to give direct relief at the pump for the millions of Americans who are paying record high prices for gasoline right now. I had a measure that would have provided millions of dollars worth of relief to the U.S. market by suspending contributions to the strategic petroleum reserve until the price of oil dips below $40 per barrel for two consecutive weeks. Unfortunately, that was dropped in exchange for language allowing the Secretary of Energy to voluntary contributions if he sees fit. I would like to take this time to suggest that he do so immediately, allowing more oil into the domestic market.

I also would have liked to have seen stronger wording for secondary containment of underground storage tanks. While we did make some improvements on this issue, we can ill afford to allow our groundwater to become contaminated with gasoline from leaking underground storage tanks. In particular, we cannot allow MTBE to continue to contaminate drinking water.

I am happy that the “safe harbor” provisions for manufacturers of MTBE that were in the House bill were dropped. Instead, there is a provision allowing lawsuits to be sent to Federal court if a defendant wants to make a request to do so. During the conference, I asked Chairman Barton about the MTBE provisions in the bill and whether the claims filed after the date of enactment would require a case to be sent to Federal court. The chairman indicated that it did not have to be sent to Federal court, but gave defendants in prospective suits the right to ask that the case be sent to Federal courts. I wanted to be sure that we were not conferring any new substantive or subject matter jurisdiction over MTBE cases. It is important to hear from Chairman Barton that to his knowledge, the legislation was not doing so.

I am happy to see that there are provisions in the bill to increase incentives for the nuclear power industry. Whether it is a State permit or a Federal permit, you will no longer be allowed to do it. I am very pleased with that provision that I have worked for for more than a decade to put the provision in there.

Also there are some provisions on nuclear energy, and I know that is sort of a controversial thing, but I, for one, believe if we are going to start worrying on dependency on foreign oil, that if we are really concerned about global climate change and climate change here in this country, we must revisit the issue of nuclear energy, and I am pleased this bill provides incentives to make the United States once again a leader in this area, and protect our environment, protect our climate and get America less dependent on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this is not a perfect bill but is one that I can support and I thank Chairman Barton and Ranking Member Dingell for their tireless efforts to come to the compromise before us today.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains about $80 billion worth of giveaways to the oil and gas and other industries in our country. Those giveaways are coming from somewhere.

The United States has a huge deficit. We do not have any money. There is only one part of our government that is running a surplus, and that is the Social Security Trust Fund, and what the Republicans are doing is erecting a huge oil rig on top of the Social Security Trust Fund to allow revenues that will be given to the wealthiest industries in America—the oil and gas industries—that are reporting the largest profits in the history of any industry in the history of the United States.

The Republicans are tipping the United States consumer and taxpayer upside down and shaking money out of their pockets.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) for using his chart once again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Thomas), the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, they have a saying in racing that to finish first, you have to finish. It is a pleasure to stand up after several frustrating years and Congresses to be here supporting an energy bill. As we move from a society totally dependent upon fossil fuels to alternative energy, it is important to make sure that the infrastructure that will carry us through to alternate energy is functioning adequately.

And I want to compliment the new chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee for his understanding that time is secondary to getting people to a level of agreement that allows us to present this bill on the floor today.

Of course, no bill is perfect, but if you do not have a bill, you cannot stand up and criticize it as the gentleman just did in the well. I am very
pleased with this work product in terms of its balance. We tried to create balance within the tax area. We are willing to spend money on an experimental basis on a number of alternative sources. As some do not prove out, I am hopeful that we do not turn them away prematurely because they started in the bill; that we move and look for those alternate sources of energy that can begin to augment the fundamental hydrocarbon structure and then move beyond that as expeditiously as possible.

It is a balanced bill. I think you will see balanced support. Once again, I want to compliment the chairman for doing something that heretofore has not been done. It is always easy when you do it. It has not been done before.

Congratulations to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton).

Mr. Speaker, the need to complete this comprehensive energy bill leads us to consider it without the normal accompanying statement of managers used to clarify and enhance understanding of the legislative text. Our colleagues, the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the ranking minority member of that committee, agree with me that those who follow tax legislation can and should consider this on the floor. We have a comprehensive statement of managers for the purposes of completing their understanding of what the tax incentives provide.

The joint committee publication has been submitted for publication in the Congressional Record. It can also be accessed on the joint committee’s website—http://www.house.gov/jct—for those who are interested. It is an extremely useful tool the public can employ to see just how much we have accomplished with this bill.

I would also note, as a matter of clarification, section 1326 of the conference report, which does not appear in the manager’s amendment, is meant to prospectively clarify the depreciation of property meeting either of the two standards in subsection (b) of the section. This provision should not be interpreted as undermining any taxpayor’s position versus the IRS in regard to current law. It is instead as a clarification of the treatment of property meeting either of the standards described in subsection (b) after April 11, 2005.

Mr. Boucher. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush), a valuable member of our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Rush. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I do not think that this piece of legislation is perfect, and there are many provisions in this bill that I disagree with, but overall I support passage of this conference report, because it contains many provisions that are important to me and to my district, including provisions affecting ethanol and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, also known as LIHEAP.

During the markup of this House version of the bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee, we passed my amendment, which will significantly increase authorized funding for LIHEAP to $5.1 billion. And I am very pleased that this increase was sustained during the conference committee and the hearings of the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that this provision is so important to my constituents and to constituents similar to mine who suffer during the ravaging winter months and are often penalized for a choice that they have to make between paying high energy costs and paying for medical care or paying for food.

I want to talk for a moment about this process that we have gone through this year. This year’s process has been infinitely better than last year’s shoddy process, whereby the majority went behind closed doors and drafted a conference report with zero input from the minority.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to let you know and let the Members of this House know that I really appreciate the fact that Chairman Barton has displayed a willingness to be fair and to work with me and other Democrats on this Senate initiative as part of this last minute long history of bipartisan cooperation in our great committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, particularly and especially when the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) was chairman. I want to commend that from Texas (Mr. Barton) for continuing this tradition. It should serve as a blueprint for the rest of the Congress. We could have a lot less sniping and get a lot more work done in the full House of Representatives were we to follow the leadership of Chairman Barton, the ranking member and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

And I urge my colleagues to vote yes for this conference report.

Mr. Markey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer).

Mr. Blumenauer. Mr. Speaker, when it has never been clearer that the United States needs to catch up to the rest of the world dealing with energy efficiency and global warming, even the supporters of this legislation agree with the taglines in the New York Times and the Washington Post, “it is not a disaster”, “it could have been worse”.

Forget about explaining to our grandchildren; how will the Members of this Congress explain to next Congress’ interns about why we settled for the lowest common denominator, continued to finance both sides of the war on terror with our continued dependence on Middle East oil. If we could not get landmark legislation, hopefully this bill will be a tombstone for the energy policy for the last century.

Mr. Barton of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Upton).

Mr. Upton. Mr. Speaker, Ben Franklin certainly would be proud, because as the father of daylight savings time, we are finally implementing his ideas in this legislation.

I want to thank the many Republicans and Democrats that are supporting this legislation in both bodies. And, of course, on daylight savings time, it will be the first Sunday in April, it goes through the last Sunday in October.

We learned, my coauthor, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), and myself, learned that there were U.S. Government study done back when maybe I was in junior high school that we that we would save 100,000 barrels of oil a day for every day that we extended daylight savings time. That was when we had 50 million fewer Americans.

Well, guess what we do in this bill? Beginning in 2007, we will change daylight savings time. It will start now the second Sunday in March, it will go through Halloween, through the first Sunday in November.

We know that traffic fatalities will decrease. We know that crime rates will decrease. We know that folks will get home with an hour more of sunlight, whether they are coming home from work or whether they are coming home from work. And by having it kick in 2007, we will allow other countries, whether they be Canada, Mexico, perhaps Europe, to establish their timelines the same as ours. We will add a little more sunshine to everybody’s day.

Mr. Boucher. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. Markey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Solis).

Ms. Solis. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I am in opposition to the Energy Policy Act of 2005. In my opinion, the bill does nothing to reduce our dependency on foreign oil. It does not reduce energy prices. It does not make our Nation more secure.

Instead, the bill will increase gas prices for consumers in California, where I come from, by requiring the increased use of ethanol. It threatens our water supply by rolling back the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, and a trade-off I do not find acceptable at all. It overrides our States rights to oppose drilling offshore by including language requiring an invention worse.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for choosing not to include MTBE safe harbor provisions in the bill, but that alone does not guarantee that this is a good bill.

The bill is a missed opportunity. I do not support this legislation. And I know we must continue this debate on cleaning up our environment and protecting our consumers.

Mr. Barton of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Burgess).

Mr. Burgess. Mr. Speaker, this has indeed been a long process. I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking
Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and I would like to engage the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) in a colloquy.

First of all, we want to thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with the entire Florida delegation to reach an agreement that will allow the States to increase control of their waters.

Included in H.R. 6 is a provision ordering an inventory and analysis of oil and natural gas resources in the Outer Continental Shelf. Many are concerned that this inventory is merely a precursor to drilling off Florida’s coast against the wishes of the Governor and our two U.S. Senators and the Florida delegation.

Currently, there is a moratorium against drilling in this area, over here, until 2012, and these areas called the stovepipe and bulge, here and here, to 2007. The top of the stovepipe is about 16 miles off the coast of Pensacola, home to a large amount of military operations.

Mr. Speaker, can we have the chairman’s assurance that he will continue to work with the Florida delegation to find a workable path and ensure that drilling or exploration will not occur in the areas off the Florida coast against the wishes of the State? Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. In addition, the chairman has stated in the past that each individual State should have the ability to control its own waters, and the decision to drill or take an inventory should rest with the State legislature and the Governor. Can the gentleman assure us that he will work with us to provide States with that ability?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to work with both of the gentlemen and the entire Florida delegation to resolve all of these problems so that we do what is in the best interest of Florida the other States and the country. I appreciate all the work that the gentlemen have put into this already.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), a valuable member of our Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member on our subcommittee for allowing me to speak for 3 minutes.

The comprehensive energy legislation is a positive step towards a stable energy future for America, and I want to thank all the Members who worked so hard in putting this together on such an aggressive schedule. I especially appreciate our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), of our full Committee of Energy and Commerce, and also our Chair of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), for their hard work. I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) on both his fairness in the committee mark-up and also in the floor action that we had. We actually made democracy work. But also I know the hard work as I watched a conference committee on TV in the effort to get this legislation where it is today. I think it is a great achievement.

The folks who are opposing it, their biggest argument is we do not do anything about lowering oil prices. Well, the easiest thing we could do is actually produce more domestically instead of importing it from everywhere, but they are the same folks that are opposing any more domestic production.

This bill does so many good things. Energy infrastructure, the bill addresses the bureaucratic blocks that hamstring the growth of our energy infrastructure, particularly regarding natural gas terminals and pipelines. And I am pleased the conference committee has chosen to follow the blueprint of the Terry-Green LNG legislation we introduced last year that first recognized LNG as an international and interstate commerce and thus subject to ultimate Federal jurisdiction.

We need to open at least 10 to 15 liquefied natural gas terminals in the lower 48 in the next 5 to 10 years in order to stabilize our natural gas prices, both residential and commercial prices, and protect millions of our manufacturing jobs.

The petro-chemical industry is in dire need of stable natural gas feedstock prices as elsewhere along the Gulf Coast. Our community would end up looking like the Rust Belt. This committee report helps that.

Domestic production, I am disappointed did not go far enough in domestic energy supplies. America’s vast offshore energy resources remain largely off-limits even though our coast would not be threatened by development. Contrary to political scare tactics of certain organizations, oil and gas are safe places whether it is Florida, California, or the east coast. We have been doing it off Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama for
years. Lower 48 production uses pipelines and not tankers so the Valdez is not even an example they can use.

Mr. Speaker, the other concern I have is the loss of the MTBE issue, but I understand the Senate did not want to take a vote on the floor. I want to sue for MTBE can go to the courthouse. MTBE actually lowered our air pollution problems in my community in Houston. It was under the 1990 Clean Air Act. I would just hope businesses and communities would still continue to try to find another substance that would clean up our air.

In conclusion, I am concerned about ensuring that we have adequate traditional energy sources because we have to rely on them for the next few decades. I will support anything we do in research to get alternatives, but we also need to make sure we can keep our lights on for this decade.

The only thing that can be guaranteed about this bill is that it will fail. I am disappointed that the legislation does not go nearly far enough to increase domestic energy supplies.

America’s vast offshore energy resources remain largely off-limits, even through our research to get alternatives, but we also need to make sure we can keep our lights on for this decade.

The comprehensive energy legislation is a positive step towards a stable energy future for America.

I want to thank all Members who have worked so hard on putting this together on such an aggressive schedule. This is a great achievement.

I. ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE

The bill addresses bureaucratic roadblocks that have hamstrung the growth of our energy infrastructure, particularly liquefied natural gas terminals and pipelines.

I am pleased that the conference committee has chosen to follow the blueprint of the Terry-Green LNG legislation we introduced 1 year ago. Our bill was the first to recognize that LNG is international and interstate commerce, and thus subject to ultimate Federal jurisdiction.

We need to open up 10–15 LNG terminals in the lower 48 States in the next 5–10 years in order to stabilize natural gas prices, residential and commercial electric prices, and protect millions of manufacturing jobs. The petrochemical industry is in dire need of stable natural gas feedstock prices, or else the Gulf Coast could end up like the Rust Belt.

This conference report ensures that ‘‘not-in-my-backyard’’ opposition will not stop electric prices through the roof and drive manufacturing jobs overseas to Asia and Europe in search of affordable natural gas.

II. DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

I am disappointed that the legislation does not go nearly far enough to increase domestic energy supplies.

America’s vast offshore energy resources remain largely off-limits, even through our coasts would not be threatened by development.

Contrary to the political scare tactics of certain organizations, oil and gas can be produced safely off of Florida, California, and the East Coast. Beaches and coastal areas in the lower 48 have no need to fear a Valdez-like accident from offshore production.

Lower 48 uses pipelines, the safest form of transportation in the world, and will not mean more oil tankers.

In many decades of oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico, we have not had disasters that ruin any of the beaches or estuaries in Texas, Alabama, or Louisiana. Tourism at Texas beaches like Galveston and South Padre Island is a huge industry and we protect it seriously.

III. MTBE

I am also disappointed that the Senate is unwilling to help clean up MTBE spills from leaking underground storage tanks.

MTBE was developed to eliminate lead in gasoline, and by fulfilling the 1990 Clean Air Act’s oxygenate requirement, MTBE has done much to reduce smog in American cities. Unfortunately, MTBE has caused problematic when they are stored in leaky tanks.

MTBE producers, many of which are not huge oil companies, never would have made MTBE without the Clean Air Act of 1990.

In a catch-22, they now face multibillion-dollar lawsuits for complying with federal law. As a result, U.S. industries are likely to be less willing to make environmentally beneficial products at the direction from Congress in the future.

This bill is a great first step and I support its final passage. However, America’s energy policy is not complete and it will require more work for future Congresses.

IV. CONCLUSION

I am most concerned with ensuring we have adequate traditional energy resources, because we will have to rely on them for the next several decades. An abundant, clean energy future is possible, but it is still many, many years away.

But I want to note that this bill is balanced: it has important energy efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable energy incentives and requirements. We will have more solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, hydro, clean coal energy as a result of this legislation.

I urge a ‘‘yes’’ vote on the conference report.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly sad that a Nation that produced the Apollo Moon Project today will produce something with the success of the Hindenburg.

The only thing that can be guaranteed about this bill is that it will fail. It is guaranteed that it will fail to reduce our dependence on Saudi Arabian oil.

According to the Department of Energy, our dependence will rise under this bill from 58 percent to 68 percent failure. It is guaranteed to fail to deal with global warming, and the reason is you took the money that should have gone to emerging high-tech industries that need the help, the Davids, and you gave 64 percent to the Goliaths of the oil and gas industry. Guaranteed failure.
achieves those three goals. Plenty will be said today about the many provisions contained in this conference report, I would only like to take a brief moment to address two of them that directly impact our nation's past, present, and future energy history: leaking underground storage tanks and state energy production tax credits.

Regarding LUST, or the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program, I am pleased that H.R. 6 contains language to help states more aggressively tackle the problems of leaking fuel in their groundwater. Currently, the Federal government has collected gasoline taxes of over $2 billion to provide cleanup. In reality, however, not much more than the interest on yearly receipts is actually used. We must reverse this trend.

H.R. 6 contains many new requirements that I believe will make our underground tank programs more effective and efficient and our environment safer and healthier. Specifically, this conference report requires at least 80 percent of all dollars appropriated from the LUST Trust Fund to be sent to the States for operation of underground tank programs. It provides increases in State funding from the LUST Trust Fund for States containing a larger number of tanks or whose leaking tanks present a greater threat to groundwater. H.R. 6 also requires onsite inspections of underground tanks every three years, with a brief period for the state to update its backlog. In addition, the conference report establishes operator-training programs, where they do not already exist, institutes a specific new funding category to cleanup tank-related releases, and excludes fuel additives like MTBE, prohibits Federal facilities from exempting themselves from complying with all Federal, State, and local underground tank laws, and asks States to submit an annual inventory to the U.S. EPA detailing the number of regulated tanks in its state and which of those tanks are leaking. Finally, and most importantly, this legislation allows states to stop deliveries of fuel to non-compliant regulated tanks in order to achieve legal enforcement.

These are all strong improvements that not only meet with the spirit, if not the letter of recent legislation recommended by the General Accounting Office, but also meet with the spirit, if not the letter of regulatory tanks in order to achieve legal enforce-

In fact, the other body, that means the Senate, had a provision on that issue. It was defeated.

Well, what are we doing here? We are asking the taxpayers to give more money to the oil, gas, coal, and nuclear industries in order to produce more energy domestically. For those who think that maybe at a time when we are dealing with a supply and demand problem that we also ought to reduce the demand, there is almost nothing in this legislation.

In many states, that means the President, to have a provision that would have called on the President to come up with some ideas to reduce the demand for energy and the waste of energy and waste of oil particularly, just the President to come up with some ideas. Well, that was forced out of the bill.

We have nothing to make automobiles more fuel efficient, nothing to reduce the demand. For those who think perhaps we ought to look for alternative renewable fuels, well, the Senate had a provision on that issue. It was not a very strong one. That was struck from the bill.

The Republican Party has always had a tension between those who believe in fiscal responsibility and reducing government spending, and those who want to reward their friends. This bill reflects the Republican Party, and many Democrats', support for their goal to reward their friends in big business.

Then the worst part of this bill, at a time when we are fighting in the Middle East, when we are asking our young men and women to risk their lives in part to protect our security from those who have been financed by oil imports into the United States and around the world, we are going to become even more dependent on importing more foreign oil.

This legislation is more than just a lost opportunity; it is a bill that I do not think is worthy of our support.

The problem we face in this country is that we are not able to streamline the process to bring about energy independence in this country and to lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources. A lot of that we did not include in this bill. Unfortunately, ANWR is not in this bill.

We have taken the step towards letting the oil companies drill off the coast of our Nation. We have taken the step to open up more national lands that we wanted to protect to be developed by the oil companies. In another bill we will open up Alaska lands to further drilling.

We cannot drill ourselves out of our energy problems. We are not going to drill ourselves out of the global climate problems. We have got to get a better energy bill than the one before us. I urge Members to vote against it.

Well, what are we doing here? We are asking the taxpayers to give more money to the oil, gas, coal, and nuclear industries in order to produce more energy domestically. For those who think that maybe at a time when we are dealing with a supply and demand problem that we also ought to reduce the demand, there is almost nothing in this legislation.

Well, that was forced out of the bill.

We have nothing to make automobiles more fuel efficient, nothing to reduce the demand. For those who think perhaps we ought to look for alternative renewable fuels, well, the Senate had a provision on that issue. It was not a very strong one. That was struck from the bill.

The Republican Party has always had a tension between those who believe in fiscal responsibility and reducing government spending, and those who want to reward their friends. This bill reflects the Republican Party, and many Democrats', support for their goal to reward their friends in big business.

Then the worst part of this bill, at a time when we are fighting in the Middle East, when we are asking our young men and women to risk their lives in part to protect our security from those who have been financed by oil imports into the United States and around the world, we are going to become even more dependent on importing more foreign oil.

This legislation is more than just a lost opportunity; it is a bill that I do not think is worthy of our support.

The problem we face in this country is that we are not able to streamline the process to bring about energy independence in this country and to lessen our dependence on foreign energy sources. A lot of that we did not include in this bill. Unfortunately, ANWR is not in this bill. We do not go as far as we should have in being able to streamline the process to bring in more alternative energy and renewable energy. A lot of that we were not able to do in this bill. But it is a first step. It is a step to move forward.

There are a lot of things that we were able to get into this bill that over a period of time will increase domestic production. It is a great start. It is a very important step for us to begin to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

One of the things that is frustrating with all of the process is that a lot of
my colleagues voted against every single increase, anything that had to do with increasing energy independence in this country. We need to continue to work on this.

Again, I congratulate the chairman because I do believe this is a good bill.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, as we consider this energy bill, here are a few numbers we might want to keep in mind: $7.4 billion. That was Exxon Mobil’s income in the second quarter, an increase of 32 percent. Net profit at Shell rose 35 percent, going from $4 billion to $5.5 billion. BP’s second-quarter profits soared by 29 percent, revenues were $55.6 billion. ConocoPhillips’ earnings up 33 percent.

One more number: $14.5 billion. That is the total amount of taxpayer handouts to oil and gas companies in this bill, the same companies reporting very good profits this quarter. With oil at $60 a barrel, not $14, not $28, not $32, we are paying oil companies to execute their business plans. So American taxpayers, American consumers are being asked to pay twice, once at the pump and then again on April 15.

The sad truth is that this conference report is a lost opportunity. There are some very, very good provisions in the bill, but instead we have missed an opportunity to present a comprehensive energy policy and filled it instead with gifts to Big Oil. We could have accomplished things on conservation, we could have accomplished things on renewable sources, but we chose to give $14 billion of taxpayer money away to companies to do their business plans. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for yielding me this time, and also the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), both of these gentlemen, for their leadership on the Energy Policy Act.

As a confeere to the tax title on H.R. 6, this bill delivers a huge win for Michigan soybean growers by securing an extension of the Federal Biodiesel Tax Incentive through 2010, a program that many farmers in my district depend on. Biodiesel makes sense on every level, our environment, national security, reducing dependence on foreign oil, and it is certainly better for farmers. The tax incentive is expected to increase demand for biodiesel, most often made from soybeans. And soybeans are Michigan’s fourth largest commodity in terms of farm income, and by far the largest crop grown in mid-Michigan.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes legislation I have been working on that provides consumers with a choice against the push of hybrid advanced technology, lean-burn diesel, and alternative-fuel vehicles. This incentive will help reduce the amount consumers pay at the pump, lessen our dependence on traditional fossil fuels, and achieve cleaner air.

This bill yields another side benefit between oil and gas production and efficiency and conservation. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) for yielding me this time and for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) of the subcommittee, but let me particularly offer appreciation to the conferees of the full committee and the ranking member of the full committee for the hard work and dedication that they have offered, and also the spirit of the conference, which was open and allowed the full debate on what has been an enormously difficult challenge.

This Congress has been swimming the difficult tides of negotiations in an effort to pass a comprehensive energy bill for a very long time, and I believe today that we have that comprehensive legislation. Always when we say comprehensive, we think perfect. It is not perfect. It is not the perfect storm. But it does give us a roadmap that we can follow.

I happen to agree with the elimination of the ANWR provision and the elimination of the MTBE liability provision, but I do think there are enormous strides we have made in renewables. And I want to thank again the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) of the Committee on Science, of which I am a member. We did work on renewables. I am delighted that amendments that we had, and I am delighted with the legislation regarding biomass for minority farmers and ranchers and the utilization of fuel cells that will help the research on how we can be more energy-efficient.

I am delighted to note that we will be working further on a 2-year study back to Congress for those areas offshore, Texas and Louisiana, where environmentally safe development is going on. Domestic development will now get a 2-year report from the Interior Department, which will give us a roadmap on how we can work.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also contains building standards to ensure that more of our buildings are environmentally safe or energy-efficient. So we have to have conservation as well as domestic development. As I indicated, we have some challenges in this legislation, but I do believe we have an effective roadmap.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say thank you to Energy and Commerce Chairman Mr. BARTON, and Ranking Minority Member Mr. DINGELL for doing work and dedicated work on this important conference report. For several Congresses now, we have been swimming the difficult tides of negotiations in an effort to pass a comprehensive energy bill that would be beneficial to all Americans. I would like to thank as well Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RALPH HALL, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BART GORDON.

While this report may not be perfect, it at least provides for no drilling and development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. In addition, the report has no MTBE liability clause. Despite this fact, I think it is important to work towards providing some protection for the States, and I look forward to working with Mr. BARTON and Mr. DINGELL in this effort. Furthermore, under the report, there are no EPA restrictions with respect to the Clean Air Act. In addition, EPA can still regulate diesel fuel and certain Enron contracts will now be governed by FERC.

Let me also note that I was able to obtain the following provisions in the report:

**BIOENERGY LANGUAGE**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for integrated bioenergy research and development programs, projects, and activities $49,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 05–09. This funding shall be used for the training and education targeted to minority and social disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.

**OIL AND GAS 2 YEAR STUDY**

Under this provision, two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at two-year intervals thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the heads of other agencies, shall transmit to Congress a report assessing the contents of natural gas and oil deposits at existing drilling sites off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

**BUILDING STANDARDS**

This section calls for an assessment whether high performance buildings are employing very high consensus standards and rating systems that are consistent current state of the art technology and research and development findings. High performance buildings have been defined as those that effectively integrate energy efficiency, durability, life-cycle performance, and occupant productivity. This study shall be agreed upon, in conjunction with the National Institute of Building Sciences, no later than 120 days after the enactment of the act.

The results of this study will provide the groundwork for future research, if deemed necessary and useful, as well as new performance standards. This standard is important because it focuses building-related standards directly and the building industry indirectly on the concept
of whole buildings or high performance buildings. The goal is to take the knowledge we have accumulated through years of Federal research and development and make sure that it is reflected in a comprehensive set of standards that represent best practices and current knowledge. For example, if we are building low income housing, we hope the builder will take into consideration safety of the inhabitants and how construction decisions will affect the tenants' monthly costs. If for a little higher construction cost, it is possible to cut monthly energy bills in half, then we have a winner.

SECONDARY ELECTRIC VEHICLE BATTERY USE PROGRAM

The act establishes a research, development, and demonstration program for the feasibility of using batteries in secondary applications, including utility and commercial power storage and power quality. The study will evaluate the performance, life cycle costs, and supporting infrastructure necessary to implement this technology. This is a good provision environmentally. If hybrids and other electric vehicles are to be successful, there is a problem of what to do with all the batteries. This provision funded a series of research projects to look for uses for these batteries which are likely to outlast the vehicles, in utility applications and elsewhere.

In closing let me note that I also sought to include a provision that was not included in the report. This provision would have required the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to encourage minority students to study the earth sciences and enter the field of geology in order to qualify for employment in the oil and gas and mineral industries. While this provision did not make the cut, I am dedicated to including this provision in an appropriate piece of legislation by the end of the fall session.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is socialism at its worst. The headline makers of capitalism: Exxon Mobil, Chevron, and Texaco take off when they are buying the biggest profits in the history of any industry in the history of the United States and bragging about it on the front pages of the newspapers of our country. They are bragging about it.

Right now, Adam Smith is spinning in his grave so fast that he would qualify for a subsidy in this bill as an energy source. That is how bad this bill is.

This bill so fundamentally violates all principles of capitalism that Exxon-Mobil, that Chevron-Texaco would come to the American people's Social Security System, put up an oil rig, and start drilling into the savings of American taxpayers, because that is who will subsidize all of these giveaways.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to note that although we love the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), I yield myself such time as I may consume to note that although we love the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING), the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation. It is a good step forward to increase our energy supplies, diversify our energy supplies, provide cleaner air, help our farmers, and strengthen our economy.

I first want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton), who has done a tremendous job of leading us to a great accomplishment, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell). It is an honor to serve on the committee where we have had a bipartisan process, to reach an agreement to move our country forward.

It is a bill that will give us clean coal, nuclear, new technologies for the future, fuel cell, hybrid, as well as increasing the production of our traditional fuels. It is a well-balanced bill, it is a well-crafted bill, and I am proud to support it and urge all the Members to support.

And to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey), he has been a happy warrior. It is good to know in that bastion of capitalism, Boston, that we do have a proponent for Adam Smith.

Mr. Speaker, my very strong support of this bill.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I too reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to Mr. New York (Mr. Hinchey). Mr. HINCHNEY. Mr. Markey, this is a troubling moment. If we were in the military, I think that we might have been charged with desertion.

The most important security issue that this Nation has to deal with is the issue of energy, doing things to decrease our dependence on foreign energy, particularly foreign oil. We are now importing about 60 percent of the oil that we use on a daily, monthly, and annual basis. This bill does little to deal with that problem.

Instead, what it does do is gift the oil industry with enormous amounts of tax concessions and breaks. The oil industry, of course, is now suffering from a very serious problem: They have more cash on hand than they know what to do with. They do not know what to do with all the money coming in from these high gasoline prices, high heating prices, and yet now we are going to dump a whole bunch more money on them.

We should be doing something that looks forward. If this bill were before Congress some people might say it was a forward-looking bill. But in 2008, it does nothing but look backward and does nothing to help our energy dependence and overall energy situation. I hope we defeat it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY). Could the gentleman yield me 1 minute of his time, if possible, or do you have to have the bill utilized?

Mr. MARKEY. Well, I have three more speakers. Could the Chair tell me how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Barton) has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the bill still have more time left than the opponents of the bill, and the time was divided 40 minutes to 20 minutes. So what we have been trying to do, honestly, is just to harness our smaller number of minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I control, which I believe is 1½ minutes, have an additional 1 minute added to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One minute to each side?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, no. I need 1 more minute from somewhere, Mr. Speaker. So if we cannot get it from other side, I just ask unanimous consent to add 1 minute to the time I control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas has 1 additional minute remaining.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER).

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, knowing that time is precious and that our colleagues from Florida have already engaged the gentleman from California, I would like to raise this question in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, as these discussions continue toward a plan that could affect future oil and gas leasing in the Gulf of Mexico, can the gentleman assure the delegations from all the States that border the Gulf of Mexico that any proposed plan would equitably and fairly consider the interests of those States?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I pledge to the gentleman that as we move forward with a long-term solution, that the interests of all the States bordering the Gulf will be protected, and the gentleman will be part of those discussions.

Mr. BONNER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, one final question. Can the gentleman also ensure that the Governors and appropriate officials from those States will be included in those discussions?

Mr. POMBO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the answer is yes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a member of the committee.
Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our committee chairman for the excellent work. In my district in Tennessee, our farmers are pleased that we are bringing this conference report to the floor. They understand affordable fuels, and they are looking forward to developing alternative fuels. Our small business community is excited about available energy.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think this sends a message that America, this Nation, this Congress, is serious about our energy security, about the need to bring new drilling to the United States Congress to come to this floor to pass legislation which will take money from the American taxpayers to hand over to the corporations who are now charging $2.30, $2.40, $2.60 at the pump to American consumers and reporting the largest profits in history. It is in history. If they need to do new drilling out in ultradeep areas of the oceans, they are saying to the Members, we want to erect huge oil drills on top of the Social Security trust fund and drill $80 billion of subsidies out of American taxpayers' pockets and hand it over to those companies. If you can sell the oil, the gas, the coal, the nuclear industries that are reporting the largest profits in history.

It is a moral and political failure because it is what is not in this bill that is the important energy agenda for our country. Our country puts 70 percent of all the oil that we consume in gasoline tanks. We only have 3 percent of the oil reserves in the world. OPEC has 70 percent. That is our weakness. Our strength is that we are the technological giant of the world.

There is nothing in this bill about improving the fuel economy standards for SUVs and automobiles. There is nothing in this bill that will mandate that electric utilities increase their use of renewable energy so we can break our dependence upon these sources of energy that weaken our foreign policy by getting us deeper into the Middle East, emitting more pollutants which cause more asthma, more breast cancer, more prostate cancer as the environment alters genes to increase disease in our society. None of that is addressed in this bill in 2005.

If we could roll back the clock to 1905, this would be a very good bill. It would be about oil, gas and coal. It is 2005, however. We should be talking about the new agenda, the new technology agenda for our country. This bill is a political and a moral and a technological failure.

In addition to draining revenues out of the taxpayers' pockets to subsidize the wealthiest industries, we ignore the technologies which could break our dependence on imported oil and could send a signal to OPEC which would drive down the price of oil which would help our country's national security. I urge a “no” vote on this historic failure.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is packed with royalty relief for big oil and gas companies, tax breaks for big oil and gas companies, loan guarantees for the wealthiest energy companies in America, even as they are reporting the largest quarterly profits of any corporation in the history of the United States.

It is politically and morally wrong for the United States Congress to come to this floor to pass legislation which will take money from the American taxpayers to hand over to the corporations who are now charging $2.30, $2.40, $2.60 at the pump to American consumers and reporting the largest profits in history. If they need to do new research, they have the money in their own backyards. That is capitalism. If they want to do new drilling out in ultradeep areas of the oceans, they have the profits to do that.

The American taxpayer should not be funding that drilling because, as American consumers, they are already paying for that drilling. The oil companies are saying publicly that they are making so much money they do not know what to do with all of the profits. But then they are telling publicly, they are saying to the Members, we want to erect huge oil drills on top of the Social Security trust fund and drill $80 billion of subsidies out of American taxpayers' pockets and hand it over to those companies. If you can sell the oil, the gas, the coal, the nuclear industries that are reporting the largest profits in history.

It is a moral and political failure because it is what is not in this bill that is the important energy agenda for our country. Our country puts 70 percent of all the oil that we consume in gasoline tanks. We only have 3 percent of the oil reserves in the world. OPEC has 70 percent. That is our weakness. Our strength is that we are the technological giant of the world.

There is nothing in this bill about improving the fuel economy standards for SUVs and automobiles. There is nothing in this bill that will mandate that electric utilities increase their use of renewable energy so we can break our dependence upon these sources of energy that weaken our foreign policy by getting us deeper into the Middle East, emitting more pollutants which cause more asthma, more breast cancer, more prostate cancer as the environment alters genes to increase disease in our society. None of that is addressed in this bill in 2005.

If we could roll back the clock to 1905, this would be a very good bill. It would be about oil, gas and coal. It is 2005, however. We should be talking about the new agenda, the new technology agenda for our country. This bill is a political and a moral and a technological failure.

In addition to draining revenues out of the taxpayers' pockets to subsidize the wealthiest industries, we ignore the technologies which could break our dependence on imported oil and could send a signal to OPEC which would drive down the price of oil which would help our country's national security. I urge a “no” vote on this historic failure.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I begin by commending my colleagues, all of them, for the work they did. I want to pay particular tribute to the staff which worked long and hard and did a superb job, and that is the staff on both sides of the aisle and at both ends of this building: Senate, House, Republicans and Democrats. I want to pay particular tribute to my friends who served as conferees, all of them, whether they signed the conference report or not.

I want to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) for his outstanding leadership and for the fair and decent way in which he conducted the business of the conference. I want to pay tribute to Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN who did such an outstanding job in in the Senate and to the kind of negotiations which brought us here.

I would observe that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) ran the conference the way it used to be run, in an open, decent, and fair fashion; and I express to him my thanks for the way in which he conducted himself and the honorable and fine way in which he conducted the business of the conference in the House.

My colleagues will remember I voted against the measure in April. It was my view at that time that it hurt consumers, taxpayers, and the environment. Consumer protections in electricity and natural gas markets now, however, will be strengthened, and taxpayers will no longer be on the hook for MTBE cleanups, and the environmental risk has been reduced. Environmental laws have been protected, and it is a much better piece of legislation.
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I would observe that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) ran the conference the way it used to be run, in an open, decent, and fair fashion; and I express to him my thanks for the way in which he conducted himself and the honorable and fine way in which he conducted the business of the conference in the House.

My colleagues will remember I voted against the measure in April. It was my view at that time that it hurt consumers, taxpayers, and the environment. Consumer protections in electricity and natural gas markets now, however, will be strengthened, and taxpayers will no longer be on the hook for MTBE cleanups, and the environmental risk has been reduced. Environmental laws have been protected, and it is a much better piece of legislation.
Others of my colleagues will cite subsides for traditional energy industries, and sometimes on this matter they are right. I tried, but failed, to reduce many of these. But we need to encourage development of multiple domestic sources of energy, and many of these subsides in this bill will help us develop those sources; and I would remind my colleagues that Congress has not infrequently, indeed, many times in our history, provided economic incentives for the economic development of this country. We are a richer, better, stronger, and happier country for that reason.

Are we overpaying some particulars? Probably. Would this be the bill I would have drawn had I begun with it? No. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a solid and a good beginning to developing an energy strategy for the 21st century. It is the best that can be constructed at this time. It has been done by hard work of our chairman and members of the conference who worked so hard. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Barton of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. Mr. Speaker, I call the body’s attention to the quote above the podium from Daniel Webster that starts off: “Let us develop the resources of our land.” That is what this bill is all about.

I do not recognize the bill that my friend from Massachusetts just talked about. I think America is a land of hope and opportunity. We are a land of can-do and optimism. America is not a land of fear. It is not a land where we want the government to tell us what to do and how to make choices.

Our country is built on the premise that men and women, given the proper information, can make intelligent choices about what is best for them. This bill before us is based on that principle. We have strong environmental protection. We have strong protections against those that misuse the authorities, but this bill is based on the premise that we believe in private free market capitalism to develop the resources of this land in a cost-efficient fashion which benefits all of America. All of America.

And there are numerous provisions in this bill to give incentives to renewable and clean energy resources. There are numerous provisions in this bill to increase the efficient use of those resources which are provisions in this bill that say it is okay to use clean coal; it is okay to build a new nuclear power plant in this country if we do it in the proper way with the proper permits and the proper inspections. And, this bill is the beginning of our LNG facilities to bring more natural gas into our great Nation if we need it and if it is done with the proper consultation with State, local, and Federal agencies.

This is a very, very good bill. It is for America’s future. Please vote “yes” for this bipartisan, bicameral, for-America bill.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Domenici-Barton Energy Policy Act.

I want to congratulate the House Conference and thank them all for their hard work. I would like to especially recognize the efforts of the chairman of the conference, Mr. Barton and the Dean of the House, Mr. Dingell.

Working together with their Senate counterparts, the House Conferences did what many said was impossible: complete the most comprehensive energy legislation in a generation in less than one month.

Mr. Speaker, completing this job was important for our Nation. Americans have waited too long for this legislation to get finished. Americans need this legislation to lower their energy costs, to drive economic growth and job creation and to promote greater energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important to the Nation for a number of reasons.

First, this bill addresses the burden that higher gasoline prices place on American consumers by reducing our dependency on foreign oil.

This legislation encourages domestic production of oil by streamlining the permit process for new wells. It also promotes greater refining capacity so more gasoline will be on the market; and it increases gasoline supply by putting an end to the proliferation of boutique fuels.

In addition, this bill helps us reduce our dependence on foreign oil by unleashing the power of the American farmer.

This legislation includes a historic Renewable Fuel Standard, which will result in the doubling of the use of clean-burning and renewable ethanol. The production and use of 7.5 billion gallons of ethanol by 2012 will displace over 2 billion barrels of crude oil. America has a strategic reserve of motor fuels in the cornfields of Illinois, the fields of rice in California, and the cane fields of Florida and its time we tap it.

This legislation also helps alleviate the hidden tax on American consumers, farmers, small businesses and manufacturers that is higher natural gas prices. Increased natural gas prices have had an adverse impact on the American economy for too long. Several provisions in H.R. 6, including the streamlining of the LNG infrastructure permitting process and the inventory of America’s off-shore resources, are significant steps toward ensuring that our Nation has an adequate and affordable supply of natural gas.

Additionally, this bill provides incentives for the development of clean energy technologies. Included in this legislation are tax credits and funds for the promotion and development of clean coal technologies. There are important incentives for the construction of new nuclear power plants, including the President’s proposal for risk insurance to protect against the difficult and lengthy regulatory process of building a nuclear plant. And, this bill continues our Nation’s commitment to producing our electricity through the use of solar, geothermal and wind power.

Another important component of this legislation enhances our electricity transmission infrastructure so it can accommodate the growth of our economies, our children across this Nation will drink contaminated water because we chose to insulate an industry from being held accountable for their negligent actions. It means that our children will have the opportunity to take our children to view the natural treasures that inspired them in their youth because we needed to open up these lands to allow oil and gas companies to expand their operations.

This is a very, very good bill. It is for America’s future. Please vote “yes” for this bipartisan, bicameral, for-America bill.
We will never drill our way to independence domestically, yet we have an energy bill that is stuck in the past that yet again seeks to drill a little deeper, in more places. This legislation includes a permanent authorization of an oil and gas leasing program in the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska without preserving any rights to the coastal plain of this 23 million acre region. Further, this bill authorizes an inventory of the oil and gas resources beneath the Outer Continental Shelf, OCS—a first step towards reversing the two decade moratorium that prohibits oil and gas drilling on the OCS.

This bill also fails to protect American consumers. I am frustrated that an amendment I offered with Representative NANCY JOHNSON to ensure that consumers receive accurate information regarding the fuel efficiency of automobiles was gutted because it was characterized as an attempt to change CAFE standards. This is a consumer protection issue and not an attack on the automobile industry that vigorously opposed our legislation. Americans do care how efficient their car is, and it is a failure of the Senate leadership that will not require auto-makers to walk into a showroom to pick out a new car with a sticker in the window that reflects accurate information on the car’s city and highway gas mileage.

Before I conclude my remarks I would like to recognize that there are some good points in this bill. For example, the bill provides continued support for the highly successful Energy Star program at the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy, which promotes energy efficiency in buildings and products. The bill also authorizes annual 10 percent increases in research on energy efficiency and renewable energy. Additionally, it includes a few creative ways to reduce the consumption of energy, such as Representative MARKEY’s provision to extend daylight savings time by one month.

We need a responsible and sustainable approach to addressing our Nation’s energy needs. On behalf of the residents of the 12th District, I pledge to continue to work toward the development of a balanced, comprehensive energy policy that finds environmentally friendly, sustainable ways to decrease our dependence on foreign oil and slow the degradation of our planet.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the conference report to the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I believe that the passage of the conference report for H.R. 6 is a momentous event. This conference report is a culmination of many years of hard work and negotiating on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress. Our country is finally adopting a national energy policy, an act that is long overdue.

The conference report for H.R. 6 includes numerous important measures to promote the use of clean and renewable fuels and emerging energy technologies, improves the delivery and reliability of electricity transmission, requires energy conservation and mandates efficiency standards.

With all of these great provisions in H.R. 6, I am disappointed that the conference report includes a provision to conduct an inventory of all oil and gas resources beneath all waters of the Outer Continental Shelf. I have constantly fought to protect Florida’s coast from offshore oil drilling. I have joined my colleagues in the Florida delegation, Republicans and Demo-
Big Oil—step right up and fill the tank with the hard earned money of America’s middle class.

Big Coal—step right up and pardon that coughing in the background; it’s only Americans choking from new pollution spewing into the atmosphere.

This legislation does not address the economic peril Americans face every time they fill up at the pump, but it will give over $14 billion in tax breaks and subsidies to big Republican donors.

This energy legislation represents thinking as old as the dinosaurs, and just as extinct. America needs an energy vision and a commitment to the rapid development of sustainable, renewable, energy resources.

The opportunities and technologies exist today to start us on a road to energy freedom and independence. But we are not going to get there with a bill that encourages predatory dinosaurs like Big Oil to roam the earth and destroy everything and everyone in their path.

I urge my colleagues to vote against an energy legislation that was written as if we lived in 2005—B.C.”

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the energy bill on the floor today. As our dependence on foreign oil increases, this plan fails to directly confront our nation’s future energy challenges. It provides a false sense of security to the American people that this Congress is serious about addressing our future energy needs and the skyrocketing cost of oil.

Some of my colleagues have lauded this bill, saying that it is the most comprehensive energy bill to be brought to the House floor in 30 to 40 years. While the bill may be wide-ranging, it provides no solutions, no tools, and no blueprint for reducing our demand for foreign oil or for giving families and small business owners relief at the gas pump.

Over 58 percent of the oil used to transport our nation’s food from farms to consumers, heat our homes, and get us to work or school, is imported from overseas. Even the Department of Energy acknowledged that this bill will do next-to-nothing to lower gasoline prices or reduce America’s demand for foreign oil. In fact, the Energy Information Administration, EIA, predicts our dependence on foreign oil will increase to more than 68 percent by 2005 regardless of whether this energy bill is signed into law or not.

If this bill does become law, Congress will have missed a monumental opportunity to make real progress in reducing our demand for foreign oil Even small efforts in this direction were rejected. For example, during conference negotiations, Republican conferees voted against a modest Senate proposal that would have required the President to reduce U.S. oil consumption by 1 million barrels a day by 2015.

This energy bill also fails to raise the efficiency standards for automobiles, which have not been increased in decades. Instead of challenging our nation’s talented engineers to build safer cars, trucks and SUVs that can travel further on less gasoline, Republican conferees willed to lobbyists who do not seem to believe in the American worker’s “can do” ingenuity anymore.

Instead of diversifying the portfolio of the energy resources we depend on to power our nation, a Senate provision that would have required electric utilities to generate 10 percent
of its electricity from renewable sources was dropped during conference. A handful of States, including my home State of Wisconsin, have adopted similar targets and have had tremendous success. The use of renewables in these States has significantly increased while their dependence on coal has decreased. We have provided the initial “doomsday” predictions by electric utilities wrong.

Rather than make Herculean efforts to bring renewable technologies to the market and expand their use, the bill provides oil and gas companies billions of dollars to subsidize their exploration and production efforts. While these taxpayer subsidies do not make much sense when the oil industry already expects to have 40 percent higher profits this year, with Exxon Mobil, BP, and Royal Dutch/Shell expecting to post a combined profit of more than $60 billion.

Despite the many misplaced priorities in this bill, I was pleased a number of provisions were included in this conference report that will benefit our Nation as well as Wisconsin. For example, conferees made the wise decision to fully fund the use of renewable energy technologies. While the language in the conference report is an improvement from the original House language, this would, in effect, give hydropower dam owners special rights to influence federal licensing decisions and decisions in the decision-making process. That is a step backwards from current law that I am not willing to take. In Buffalo we need more local control, not less.

In addition direct impact on my constituency, this bill will do nothing to reduce high oil and gas prices. The Administration’s own Energy Information Administration acknowledges that with this bill, “changes to production, consumption, imports, and prices are not less.” They even find that gasoline prices under this legislation would increase by between three and eight cents per gallon.

Clearly, this measure is a short sighted political move aimed at winning friends and contributors instead of what it should be—a long term plan to ease the energy burden on consumers and make the world a safer and energy independent—and that’s a shame.

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, I know all too well how energy needs shape our foreign policy and our national security agenda. Our desperate need for oil pits us against China and India. It forces our military to spend billions of dollars on oil, and the use of renewable sources of energy.

While I applaud the hard work of my colleagues in removing many of the worst provisions from the original House bill, this final version does little to reduce our Nation’s dependence on foreign oil, to decrease rising oil and gas prices, to increase our national security, to protect our environment, or to encourage investment in renewable energy technologies. Provisions in the conference report would give hydropower dam owners special rights to influence federal licensing decisions and decisions in the decision-making process. That is a step backwards from current law that I am not willing to take. In Buffalo we need more local control, not less.

In addition direct impact on my constituency, this bill will do nothing to reduce high oil and gas prices. The Administration’s own Energy Information Administration acknowledges that with this bill, “changes to production, consumption, imports, and prices are not less.” They even find that gasoline prices under this legislation would increase by between three and eight cents per gallon.

Clearly, this measure is a short sighted political move aimed at winning friends and contributors instead of what it should be—a long term plan to ease the energy burden on consumers and make the world a safer and energy independent—and that’s a shame.

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources, I know all too well how energy needs shape our foreign policy and our national security agenda. Our desperate need for oil pits us against China and India. It forces our military to spend billions of dollars on oil, and the use of renewable sources of energy.

While I applaud the hard work of my colleagues in removing many of the worst provisions from the original House bill, this final version does little to reduce our Nation’s dependence on foreign oil, to decrease rising oil and gas prices, to increase our national security, to protect our environment, or to encourage investment in renewable energy technologies. Provisions in the conference report would give hydropower dam owners special rights to influence federal licensing decisions and decisions in the decision-making process. That is a step backwards from current law that I am not willing to take. In Buffalo we need more local control, not less.
families, disabled individuals and senior citizens are not able to afford their energy costs. My district is particularly hard hit with extreme cold temperatures, which cause more families to face unaffordable heating costs and put families and seniors at a higher risk of life-threatening illness or death if their homes are too cold in the winter or too hot in the summer.

Because of its detrimental effects on the people in my district I will vote against the Energy Policy Act conference report today. It ignores my constituents’ needs and only adds to their burdens by reducing local decision making, increasing oil and gas prices, increased their tax burden, creating more pollution, and leaving them less secure from foreign threats.

I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the energy bill conference report before us today is horrible for the consumer, horrible for the environment, and makes America neither energy independent nor more secure as a nation. This conference report does too little to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency. By providing incentive reductions to corporations over consumers, and pollution over conservation, this bill makes the United States much less secure.

America’s continued reliance on Middle East oil for the majority of our energy needs is the single factor that contributes to our lack of national security. This conference report fails to adequately address our reliance on foreign oil.

Worst of all, the conference report includes a huge provision, inserted in the middle of the night by House Energy and Commerce, that would give $1.5 billion to big oil companies from the single largest factor that contributes to our oil for the majority of our energy needs.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Science Committee Chairman SHERRY BOEHLERT and Energy Subcommittee Chair JUDY BIGGERT for their hard work, leadership, and their willingness to work with the minority in developing Title IX, the Research and Development title of this bill.

I would also like to call attention to a few provisions of the bill that I believe really illustrate the importance of utilizing our wide base of domestic science and technology resources in industry, the D.O.E. National Laboratories, universities and colleges, and training and trade organizations.

Section 924(b) directs the Secretary of Energy to initiate a program in the field of advanced small-scale portable power technologies. Institutions such as Tennessee Tech University, Vanderbilt University and the University of Missouri are conducting valuable work with fuel cells, advanced batteries, microturbines, nanotechnology, and thermo-electricity. Advances in these fields will have limitless applications both military and civilian.

Section 932(e) establishes a bio-diesel demonstration program for a new breed of fuels that have the capability of replacing most or all of the petroleum diesel component in current bio-diesel. At least five independent oil companies in Middle Tennessee State University have generation units that it could make available to test these new fuels at various levels of concentration, and I hope that DOE would consider MTSU as an appropriate site to conduct these tests.

Section 933 establishes a university program to demonstrate the feasibility of operating a hydrogen-powered vehicle by utilizing an innovative suite of off-the-shelf components that can be mass-produced. Research is being done today at Middle Tennessee State University that would show the practicality of running current engine technology off purely sun and water as the power sources.

Sec. 1010 seeks to recognize the contributions smaller colleges and universities can make in research and development activities and encourage collaborative collaboration with the traditional research institutions.

If by identifying the colleges and universities according to the Carnegie Classification system, this amendment defines accurately the categories of research institutions that will benefit most from college research.

Section 1104 instructs the Secretary to support expanding ongoing activities of the National Center for Energy Management and Building Technologies. This important organization involving business and Action Contractors National Association, the Sheet Metal Workers, universities, and the national labs together to make sure that technology and skills are transferred in the heating and cooling industry. In my opinion, logical opportunities for expansion involve additional universities that are near other national laboratories like Oak Ridge and to initiate research, technology transfer, and training for related technologies such as ground source heat pumps.

Sec. 404 instructs the Secretary to award grants to institutions of higher education that have substantial experience in coal research and show the greatest potential for advancing clean coal technologies. Schools such as Southern Illinois University, the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and the Center for Electric Power at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University that would show the practicality of running current engine technology off purely sun and water as the power sources.

Specifically, this section amends the Solid Waste Disposal Act to direct the Administrator of EPA to distribute to States at least 80 percent of the funds from the Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund for use in paying the reasonable costs for State enforcement efforts pertaining to underground storage tanks. This limit of 80 percent should be viewed as the floor and not an allocation ceiling. The Committee understands that past congressional legislation that twice passed the House without a single vote in opposition contained an 85 percent limit, but in deference to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and its Office of Underground Storage Tank (OST), the limit in the bill lowered to 80 percent to allow the Agency to meet its historical allocation to the States without statutory binding OUST. In addition, this section establishes guidelines for...
revisions to the allocation process that the Administrator may revise after consulting with state agencies responsible for overseeing corrective action for releases from underground storage tanks.

This section also contains language that flows directly from Section 122(g) of the comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9622(g)) and mimics the intent of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Public Law 107-118). In seeking a cost recovery action, the Administrator (or State) shall consider the owner or operator's ability to pay by weighing the ability of the owner or operator to pay all corrective action costs and still maintain its basic business operations, including consideration of the overall financial condition of the owner or operator and demonstrable constraints on the ability of the owner or operator to raise revenues. In requesting consideration under these provisions, the owner or operator shall promptly provide the Administrator (or State) with all relevant information needed to determine the ability to pay corrective action costs and allow for alternative payment methods as may be necessary or appropriate. If the Administrator (or State) determines that the owner or operator cannot pay all or a portion of the costs in a lump sum payment, the operator shall be held fully accountable for misrepresentation or fraud and the Administrator (or State) is authorized to seek full recovery in the case of fraud or misrepresentation of all the costs for the corrective action without consideration of the factors in the section.

This section addresses two other items. First, it prohibits the EPA Administrator from providing LUST Trust Fund dollars to states that have permanently diverted their underground storage tank cleanup funds to non-emergent items that are completely unrelated to underground storage tank programs. There has been concern that some states were using their underground storage tank funds to cover the costs of other state funding priorities. This provision is meant to apply prospectively and address the most egregious examples of state diversion. This section also states the EPA to withhold approval of a State under the LUST Trust Fund that is not in compliance with federal regulations that became effective before the effective date of the rule. This provision is meant to insist on the withdrawal of approval for one month of training.

Next, this section establishes a mandatory requirement that States conduct on-site inspection of underground storage tanks located within their State that is regulated under Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act at least once every three (3) years. To aid the States in this effort, the legislation allows the States to contract with third-party inspectors to carry out these inspections. Finally, since 62 percent of the States either do not conduct regular inspections or inspect their USTs between every 4 to 10 years, the legislation allows a State to petition the U.S. EPA for a one-time grant of a one-year extension to the first (3) year inspection cycle in order to meet the requirement of inspecting all tanks. While the language contains giving States every opportunity to do meaningful inspections and comply with all legal requirements, any grants of leniency needed to EPA by the State and EPA is not required to provide the extra year. In addition, pursuant to section 9008 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991g), nothing in these provisions prevents a State that wants to have a more frequent inspection regime of their underground storage tanks from doing so.

This section authorizes funds to be used to conduct inspections, issue orders, or bring actions under this subtitle by a State to carry out State regulations pertaining to underground storage tanks under this subtitle, or by the Administrator, for tanks regulated under this subtitle. Since many persons are concerned that appropriate protective measures are being taken by the States in regards to all underground storage tanks, both public or private, this section establishes right-to-know reporting requirements for all government-owned tanks. In these reports, the States submit to the Administrator a list identifying the location and owner of each underground storage tank that is not in compliance with section 9003 and specifies the date of the last inspection and describes the actions that have been and will be taken to ensure compliance with the underground storage tank Act. The Administrator shall ensure that each State that receives Federal funds to make available to the public a record of underground storage tanks under this subtitle. The Administrator shall prescribe, after consultation with the States, the best manner and form to make available and maintain this record, considering the most practical and efficient means to maintain its intended purpose. This section also establishes incentives for performance measures that may be taken into consideration in determining the terms of a civil penalty under Section 9006 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

On-site inspections are one of the best ways to ensure routine compliance with LUST program rules. This section prescribes inspection requirements for underground storage tanks. These provisions, which are consistent with the core recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (now the Government Accountability Office) requires, for the first time ever, that every state conduct routine inspections of every underground storage tank (UST) every three years. The language in paragraph (c)(1) of Section 1523(a) reflects two concerns. In order to give States time to pass the appropriate state laws and hire the necessary personnel, which is essential since only 19 states currently operate UST Corrective Action programs. Under this year-round schedule, the provisions in this section allow the States no more than an initial 2-year “grace period” to start their inspection programs. During this 2-year period, the provisions establish that States must eliminate their backlog of non-compliant underground storage tank systems that have been out of compliance with federal regulations that became effective in 1998.

This language reflects Congress’s clear intent that States eliminate any backlog in the inspection of and enforcement against non-compliant tanks. This provision is intended to apply to those LUST systems in operation on or before December 22, 1998. The legislation also recognizes that States may not be in the best position to transition to immediate implementation of the requirements in this section. In fact, in a June 2000 Report to Congress on a Compliance Plan for the Underground Storage Tank Program, EPA stated that a significant number of new inspectors would need to be hired or retained and trained by EPA or the States before States could complete inspections. In addition, EPA estimated a total annual cost of hiring an inspector at $70,000 and $1,000 for one month of training.

Next, this section establishes a mandatory requirement that States conduct on-site inspections of each underground storage tank located within their State that is regulated under Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act at least once every three (3) years. To aid the States in this effort, the legislation allows the States to contract with third-party inspectors to carry out these inspections. Finally, since 62 percent of the States either do not conduct regular inspections or inspect their USTs between every 4 to 10 years, the legislation allows a State to petition the U.S. EPA for a one-time grant of a one-year extension to the first (3) year inspection cycle in order to meet the requirement of inspecting all tanks. While the language contains giving States every opportunity to do meaningful inspections and comply with all legal requirements, any grants of leniency needed to EPA by the State and EPA is not required to provide the extra year. In addition, pursuant to section 9008 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6991g), nothing in these provisions prevents a State that wants to have a more frequent inspection regime of their underground storage tanks from doing so.

In its May 2001 report and subsequent testimony before the Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, GAO stated that one of the main causes of leaks from underground storage tanks was poor operation of the tank system by owners and operators. In its recommendations to Congress, GAO suggested instituting operator-training programs as an important prevention tool against future leaks. This section instructs the Administrator, with the cooperation of the States, to publish guidelines for use by the States that specify training requirements for persons having primary responsibility for on-site operation and maintenance of underground storage tanks, persons having daily on-site responsibility for the operation and maintenance of underground storage tanks, and daily on-site employees having primary responsibility for addressing emergencies presented by a spill or release from an underground storage tank. This comprehensive list reflects the concern that responsible persons are not only in a position to prevent leaks, but also to respond quickly once they occur. Of note, the language is clear that in designing these operator-training requirements, EPA should make every effort to differentiate the type of training between those persons, like underground storage tank owners and regional managers, who require more comprehensive and involved training and those persons, such as convenience store or gasoline station clerks whose job turnover is high and responsibilities are low, where training obligations should be more basic and minimally intensive in nature.
stated that the use of a delivery prohibition, by States, against habitually non-compliant tanks has been the most effective enforcement tool in motivating underground storage tank owners and operators into resolving outstanding problems with their systems. This section of the bill covers underground storage tank owners and operators. Congress must be protected from leaving underground storage tanks in a way that allows for the safety of the public and for the protection of the environment. Congress has asked the EPA Administrator to address the issues that the American people care about – lower gas prices at the pump, a healthy environment, safe water to drink, and cleaner air.

The section builds on the existing financial responsibility option, the conferenc report references the existing financial responsibility authority contained in section 9003(d) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act that applies to owners and operators. It is the intent of this bill that the Secretary of the Interior would apply underground storage tank installations and manufacturers in the same way that they currently apply to owners and operators of underground storage tanks.

In order to avoid the creation of unfunded mandates, this section authorizes the appropriations for FY 2005 through 2009. Specifically, this section authorizes $50 million per fiscal year from the General Treasury to cover administrative expenses and those areas in the bill that are not specifically authorized to receive direct appropriations from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund. In addition, the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, $1 billion (or $200 million per year) is authorized for cleanups of releases from leaking underground storage tanks, $1 billion (or $200 million per year) is authorized for the cleanup of releases of oxygenated fuel additives from leaking underground storage tanks, $500 million (or $100 million per year) for on-site inspections and enforcement, and $275 million (or $55 million per year) for delivery prohibition and State tank program disclosure and operations improvements. Of further note, the reference to Section 9508(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code in the newly created section 9014(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act should be considered to mean Section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the date of enactment.

In 1992, Congress enacted the Federal Facilities Compliance Act to send a clear signal to Federal departments and agencies that they should not hide behind claims of sovereign immunity to compliance with federal and local environmental requirements. This section further reinforces the point that the Federal government must be as protective of the environment and responsible to public health laws at all levels of government as private citizens are. This section also revises requirements for Federal agencies with jurisdiction over underground storage tanks or systems, or engaged in any activity that may result in specified actions regarding such tanks or regulated substances related to their responsibility as less activities. Specifically, these agencies need to report to Congress on their compliance with UST requirements. This section also waives claims of sovereign immunity with respect to substantive or procedural UST requirements. Finally, this section continues the President’s authority to exempt any Federal tank from compliance with such requirements if the exemption is in the “paramount interests of the United States.”

Recognizing the unique governmental relationship between the Federal government and sovereign tribal governments and their tribal lands, this section seeks to protect persons on these lands in similar ways to protection requirements in other States. Specifically, this section instructs the Administrator, in coordination with Indian tribes, to develop and implement a strategy, giving priority to releases that present the greatest threat to human health or the environment, to implement and take necessary corrective actions in response to releases from leaking underground storage tanks on tribal lands, and to report within two years to Congress on the status of these programs on tribal lands.

More recently, information has become public that has identified the causes of leaks from underground storage tanks and suggested ways to creatively address these sources of leaks. One of these sources, a draft study, which covered 22 States, was released by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in August 2004 showed that of all new releases at new and upgraded UST sites, 54 percent were due to improper installation and physical or mechanical damage to UST parts and 12 percent were due to corrosion. Though the EPA has not used its existing authority to administratively require secondary containment, some States have implemented their own laws requiring this feature or tertiary containment. On top of some technical feasibility questions, barriers to some States enactment of secondary containment requirements include costs, since installing a secondary containment system costs about $27,000-$32,420 or about 20 percent more than an installed, single walled tank system. Additional concerns are impacts on underground storage tanks because it renders an underground tank system out of service for 21 days. To address the helpfulness of ground-water protection device as well as allow states to contaminate other matters raised by groundwater professionals and the petroleum equipment industry, this section allows a State to choose between either secondary containment requirements or installer and manufacturer requirements. If a State chooses secondary containment, then any new installation of an underground tank that is within 1,000 feet of community water system or potable water well must be secondarily contained. In addition, any tank or piping that is replaced on an underground storage tank that is within 1,000 feet of a community water system or potable water well must be secondarily contained. In addition, any tank or piping that is replaced on an underground storage tank that is within 1,000 feet of a community water system or potable water well must be secondarily contained.

We kept the heat on the MTBE give-away and the massive roll-back of the Clean Air Act until they were withdrawn. We fought to protect the Arctic National Refuge, making it too costly to open; persuading them to withdraw from the energy bill their plan to drill in the pristine wilderness.

Nonetheless, like its predecessors, this energy bill is a missed opportunity. It does not address the issues that the American people care about—lower gas prices at the pump, a healthy environment, safe water to drink, and cleaner air. This bill is not good enough for the American people. Several of the most egregious provisions have been removed, thanks to the tireless work of the Democratic Members who served on the conference committee. And I thank them for their contribution.
enough, especially compared to the give-away for the established energy industries. Then there is the special gift for the gentleman from Texas, the House Majority Leader. After the gavel went down on the energy bill conference, a provision was included that sets up a special $17 billion fund for oil and gas facilities will be built. It weakens States gives the Federal Government the right to State authority in favor of Federal authority. It ed with provisions that override local and Water Act, and the Clean Water Act. It is load- the oil and gas industry from the Safe Drinking Enrons. And it fails to protect our national sance Enrons. And it fails to protect our national members from both sides of the aisle know authorizes an oil and gas inventory of the year. Let there be no mistake. This bill is still anti-Let there be no mistake. This bill is still anti- environmental. It authorizes an oil and gas inventory of the Outer oil, and a leading contender to host the confer- The energy bill carves out exemptions for and strengthen the country our dependence on foreign sources of energy, plement from Texas’ record profit of $60 billion this year, while this quarter’s profits are 40 percent better than last year. Mr. Speaker, this bill is anti-environmental. It authorizes an oil and gas inventory of the Outer oil, and a leading contender to host the confer- The U.S. has been at the top of the eco- nomic food chain for most of recent history. One of the major reasons we’ve been so suc- cessful is that we recognized early-on that the foundation for economic growth is built with energy and minerals. But our continued suc- cess fostered apathy and disinterest in the energy and mineral resources that created this success. In the past, U.S. concerns about en- ergy and minerals supplies simply centered on the general issue of availability of these re- sources for our national purposes. It did not matter if those resources were located in the U.S. or in another country. Over the years, inadequate domestic energy and minerals policies created a regulatory sys- tem that discouraged domestic investment. Capital began flowing overseas into re- sources-rich countries where regulatory and investment climates in the energy and min- erals sectors were more attractive. As a result, the U.S. produced less and became increas- ingly reliant on foreign sources of energy and minerals. Last year, the U.S. imported more than 63% of its energy needs, increasingly at the mercy of foreign govern- ments. Yet the U.S. government continues the cycle of tolerating irresponsible energy and mineral policies, thereby continuing to discour- age investment in domestic energy and min- eral production. The end result is that the U.S. continues to send money and jobs overseas and becomes more dependent on foreign sources for our energy needs. Crude oil prices have hit nominal all-time highs, and natural gas prices are sustaining elevated prices levels for the foreseeable future. Additionally, U.S. trade deficit in energy is more than 25 percent of our total balance of payments, and continues to increase at a rapid rate,
have become wards of the federal government; promote sequestration of carbon dioxide as a means of enhancing oil and natural gas production from old and existing wells; maximize federal coal production and returns to the U.S. treasury; seek to establish North American energy independence by launching a comprehensive American energy policy; and make recommendations on how Canada, the U.S., and Mexico can coordinate their energy policies to reach energy independence within 20 years; seek extensive review of the impact and challenges to U.S. interests created by the Chinese government's aggressive pursuit of global energy assets; and promote tribal energy development through self-governance of energy resources in Indian Country.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 is a good first step in the effort to lower energy prices and reduce our dependence on foreign energy. But there is no question that we must do more to increase domestic production. As demand across the globe continues to skyrocket, it is imperative for America to produce more American energy. Doing so will create jobs, grow our economy and strengthen national security.

Tapping the abundant energy resources we have in America will become more and more necessary as we go forward. All we need is the political will in Congress to let an American workforce get these supplies here at home.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the energy conference report before us. While the reliability standards and efficiency incentives in this legislation are not without merit, the entire package is tragically little more than a case study in missed opportunities and misplaced priorities.

First, and most astonishingly, this bill does nothing to wean the United States from its dependence on foreign oil. In failing to make meaningful progress on energy independence, the conferees scrapped a measure designed to reduce our oil consumption by a million barrels a day by 2015 and refused to make long overdue improvements in our corporate average fuel economy, CAFE, standards for cars. The price will be less secure for the Nation and continued pricing pressure at the pump.

Second, rather than making robust investments in the renewable and advanced efficiency technologies of the future, this legislation lavishes billions of dollars on the polluting and inefficient technologies of the past. Particularly during this period of record profits, does anyone really believe taxpayers need to be giving oil and gas companies another tax break? The conferees' decision to abandon the renewable portfolio standards for the first time in the Senate bill is a serious mistake, and I regret that a forward-looking alternative called the New Apollo Energy Project I championed with Representatives JAY INSLEE and RUSH HOLT was blocked from receiving consideration on the House floor earlier this year.

Finally, this conference report turns back the clock on decades of hard-fought, bipartisan environmental protection. The Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act and National Environmental Protection Act are all undermined, while State authority over siting decisions for liquefied natural gas importation terminals is preempted. Additionally, the legislation abdicates all responsibility for the most looming ecological challenge of our time: climate change. Senate language calling for carbon caps to combat global warming was stripped from the final bill, and an amendment I offered with Representatives WAYNE GILCHREST and JOHN OLVER to take the modest step of establishing a national greenhouse gas registry was quashed in April by the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation goes further where it shouldn't—and not nearly far enough where it should. It is content to see the world through the rear view mirror of a parked SUV while the rest of the world is flying down the highway. Millions of Americans, many of whom have been brought up in the 21st century, the United States deserves an energy policy worthy of its people and of the historic leadership we have always provided on the world stage. This is not that energy policy. I urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

H.R. 6 is a truly balanced bill that will ensure the infrastructure necessary to meet energy demand for the next few decades, reduce dependence on foreign sources of oil, making us safer at home, and create thousands of new jobs for American workers. This was accomplished, in large part, by the inclusion of several important energy tax incentives.

Along with investments in renewable and clean energy incentives and domestic oil and gas production, H.R. 6 makes a significant commitment to coal. As my colleagues know, coal produces 51 percent of our Nation's electricity and many experts estimate that number will grow in the coming years. H.R. 6 includes a 7-year recovery period for new investments in pollution control facilities installed in coal-fired electric generation plants. The shorter recovery period will allow companies to make it easier to comply with new EPA regulations.

For the first time we are making a real commitment to investing in clean coal technologies. The bill provides more than $1.6 billion in tax credits to fund IGCC and advanced clean coal coal projects. It is estimated that we have a 250-year supply of coal. H.R. 6 ensures that this source continues to be a part of our Nation's energy policy and today we make a real commitment to ensure that it is more efficient and cleaner. I would like to personally thank my chairman, BILL THOMAS, and his staff for their hard work on the energy tax incentives package.

Throughout the last 5 years, the Ways and Means Committee has been the genesis of many massive social and economic reforms including tax relief bills, a Medicare and prescription drug plan, and a critical trade agreement. H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, is yet another major accomplishment under Chairman THOMAS's leadership.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 conference report. In particular, I want to thank the conferees for including a provision that will establish the National Priority Project Designation. This national award program, modeled after the Malcolm Baldridge National Quality Award Act, would promote and recognize large sustainable design building and renewable energy projects. In April, I sponsored the National Priority Project Proposal as an amendment to the Energy Policy Act, which the House adopted by voice vote. The Senate adopted a similar amendment, also by voice vote, to its version of energy legislation in June. The Solar Energy Industries Association and the American Wind Energy Association had both endorsed this legislation.

This proposal establishes four categories of designations: wind and biomass energy generation projects; solar photovoltaic and fuel cell energy generation projects; energy efficient building and renewable energy projects; and "first-in-class" projects. The legislation sets minimum renewable energy generation thresholds for wind, biomass, solar, fuel cell and building projects. Energy efficient and renewable energy building projects must meet additional criteria to be considered for designation, including: compliance with third-party certification standards; comprehensive integration of renewable energy and energy efficient features; and the use of at least 50 percent renewable energy overall.

The DestINY USA project, located in my congressional district, will likely apply for certification under this program. DestINY USA is designed as the largest fossil fuel free building project in the world, with plans to deploy up to 600 megawatts of renewable energy generation capacity. It will employ the entire spectrum of renewable energy generation sources, including solar, wind, biomass, geothermal and micro-hydroelectric. DestINY is just one example of the type of innovative, high technology projects that could qualify for designation. By providing an additional incentive for creativity and a commitment to renewable energy, the National Priority Project Designation will get the goal of assuring "secure, affordable and reliable energy."
Missourians can fill their gas tanks up in Springfield and drive 3½ hours to St. Louis. When they get there, they’ll be filling their tanks up with a completely different type of gasoline. But if St. Louis ever runs short on their boutique fuel, gas stations there can’t sell what they need. They’ll have to order it from Springfield.

This conference report caps the number of these special fuel blends and allows communities faced with a shortage due to unforeseen circumstances, such as a refinery fire, a waiver to use conventional gasoline.

This plan relies on simple economics: If we create a larger market for a greater amount of gasoline, we’ll help drive prices down.

This proposal moves the country one step closer to lowering the sky-high price of gas for consumers.

Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee, I would like to clarify a point regarding section 1233, “Native Load”. It is my understanding that section 1233 does not affect the Commission’s authority under sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act to ensure that rates are just and reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory or preferential.

As Chairman of the Conference, I would also like to clarify a point regarding section 1286, “Refund Authority”. This section provides for new Energy Regulatory Commission authority to order refunds from overcharges on sales by large municipal utilities. I understand the phrase “organized markets”, and possibly other related words following that phrase may be ambiguous. I believe the FERC should carefully consider the purposes of this section when interpreting those words. That purpose is to protect all consumers from exorbitant electricity prices, regardless of whether the seller is a fully regulated public utility or, in the case of this provision, a publicly owned and only partially regulated utility. The impact and the injury from the exorbitant price is equally injurious and equally in need of redress.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to give the words in question real meaning and to note that the term could have chosen other words, such as auction market or ISO or RTO managed market, to convey a more narrow and specific scope.

As Chairman of the Conference, I want to address a drafting error in Section 135, “Energy Conservation Standards for Additional Products.” An incorrect section mistakenly included starts on page 101, line 14 and ends on page 102, line 4. Sentence (v)(l) was not included starts on page 101, line 14 and ends on page 102, line 4. Sentence (v)(l) was not included, which did not receive concern during negotiation of the conference report. Congressmen dealt with Members of the Conference, industry representatives, and various environmental and energy efficiency advocates come up with significant compromises to thank Congressmen NATHAN DEAL for his hard work on this issue, and for bringing the mistake to my attention. I will work to correct this later.

As Chairman of the Conference, I want to clarify some points regarding Section 1541, “Boutique Fuels”. This provision is an amendment to section 211(c)(4)(C) of the Clean Air Act to limit the number of boutique fuels.

First, it is important to note that in section 1541 ethanol when blended into gasoline in a concentration of 20 percent by volume be considered a fuel additive.

Second, in implementing this new provision, the EPA must determine the total number of fuels approved under 211 (c)(4)(C) as of September 1, 2004 and publish such a list in the Federal Register. The plain meaning of this provision would be that fuels initially approved by the Environmental Protection Agency before this date would constitute the “upper limit” on the number of fuels that may be approved at any one time in the future under the provisions of this section.

Specifically, as long as a fuel was initially approved by the Environmental Protection Agency before September 1, 2004, the fuel may be sold and used pursuant to a State Implementation Plan and the provisions of 211 (c)(4)(C) as such provisions existed before the amendment of that section by the pending legislation. In addition, the amendments that we are enacting to section 211(c)(4)(C) do not require that a fuel actually be distributed or sold prior to September 1, 2004, only that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency initially approved the fuel as meeting the requirements for a waiver prior to September 1, 2004.

This interpretation of section 1541 would also hold if the implementation date for the sale or distribution of any fuel previously approved by the Administrator prior to September 1, 2004 was later changed at any point in time. The amendments made today to section 211(c)(4)(C) would not prevent this sale or distribution from occurring nor impose any additional requirements or limitations on the implementation of matters related to the use of this previously approved fuel or a program providing for its use.

Finally, the changes to existing law regarding waivers for fuels as part of a State Implementation Plan only apply to those fuels which were not previously approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency before September 1, 2004. Programs such as the Texas Low-Emission Diesel program are not affected by the provisions of section 1541 even though a later State Implementation Plan revision or action by the State or federal Environmental Protection Agency may have revised the beginning date of sale of the fuel or other matters related to the implementation of the fuel program.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is finally considering the Energy bill Conference Report today. More importantly it is greatly improved.

I have had mixed feelings about the Energy bill. Members and staff on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard to improve it. This hard work has resulted in several key changes that will result in my approval of this Conference Report.

One important change is that clean air initiatives were included. My state of Texas ranks first in the nation in toxic manufacturing emissions, first in the number of environmental civil rights complaints, and second on the amount of ozone pollution exposure. The clean air provisions are very important to me and my constituents.

I am also pleased to know that provisions for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge have been removed from the bill. The MTBE issue is also important to me. It is good to know that the provisions granting retroactive liability protection for MTBE producers have been removed.

Although the Energy bill is not a perfect one, the compromise we are considering today is greatly improved.

Because of these changes, Mr. Speaker, I now support this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it also. No bill is perfect and certainly this one is not perfect but I appreciate the efforts made to improve it.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 6. President Bush and the Republican majority have pushed this legislation on the premise of fuels. The energy industry is a deplorable problem, that we need it to wean ourselves from our dependence on imported oil which poses a threat to our economic and national security.

Sadly, the bill we have before us today fails to do that. Today we import 58 percent of the oil we consume, and based on the fact that we will have to import 68 percent to meet demand by 2025. Experts indicate that at best, this bill would only slightly slow that rate of growth of dependence, rather than actually decrease our dependence on imported oil.

We cannot continue to increase our consumption of fossil fuels. By definition, these fuels are finite in supply. They will run out some day, plain and simple. And as long as we continue to rely on them, we are going to be faced with an impending crisis.

The bill gives billions of dollars in tax breaks and subsidies to encourage oil and gas production, but these will not do much more than high gasoline and natural gas prices already do to stimulate domestic production of fossil fuels. The energy industry is the most profitable industry in the nation, incentives should not be necessary.

This bill could have really done something to reduce our consumption of oil by increasing fuel economy standards for vehicles, but it failed to do so. Increasing the single biggest step we could have taken to reduce our oil dependency.

This bill could have really done something to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels by including a renewable portfolio standard, which would have required the use of sustainable energy sources, but it fails to do so. Instead its subsidies and tax breaks encourage more of the same old thing—fossil fuels and nuclear power plants whose waste we do not know what to do with.

Instead of encouraging energy conservation, renewable energy use, and curbs on emissions that damage our environment, the bill creates new exemptions in some of our nation’s bedrock environmental laws, like the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The bill also repeals the Public Utility Holding Company Act, which was instituted to protect the interests of consumers. In the wake of Enron, this is the wrong direction to go. And the bill affects the work of State officials by granting the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission new authority to approve the location of terminals to handle the imports of liquefied natural gas.
To solve our energy problems in the future and reduce our reliance on foreign sources of energy, we need a truly visionary energy policy that employs renewable energy sources and encourages energy efficiency and conservation. This bill does not provide that vision, and my colleagues and I oppose it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is now the third Congress energy policy legislation has been under consideration. During the course of the past period I have consistently opposed the House versions of this legislation. Today, however, I am pleased to be in the position of voting for the conference agreement to support it. The fundamental reason for my being able to now support this legislation is because many of the most troubling provisions in the past House versions which caused my opposition are now no longer present in the final product before us today.

I have been troubled in the past by the inclusion of provisions waiving the National Environmental Policy Act, the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to development, inappropriate and unseemly taxpayer giveaways for coal, oil, and exploration, and the inclusion of significant liability relief for certain oil companies. I was not gullible enough to think that the conference would clean the slate entirely of giveaways to Big Oil, but aside from that issue, these provisions that I have long opposed are, for the most part, not present in the pending legislation.

In addition, I have opposed past versions of this legislation because they contained provisions which unfairly provided western coal produced on federal lands a competitive advantage over all other coal producing regions, including my home State of West Virginia. Those provisions have been mitigated in the pending measure.

And finally, I have been opposed to past versions of this bill because they lacked visionary and significant incentives to burn coal more cleanly and to utilize coal in a more efficient manner. The pending measure finally contained incentives of that nature, which will allow us to employ coal as a means to help maintain from sources of energy.

This is not a perfect bill, by no means. It still contains royalty relief for large producers of oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico. It also contains provisions which some believe can be a precursor to lifting the wildly popular moratoria on oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico. It also contains provisions waiving the National Environmental Policy Act, the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to development, and contains provisions that I have long opposed are, for the most part, not present in the pending legislation.

I am particularly excited about from an acquisition perspective, you and your staff remained responsive and helpful. Also, I also want to commend all the conferees for working hard to listen to each other and compromise when appropriate.

There are two sections of this bill which I am pleased to support in H.R. 2419 for the economic and national security of our country. Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Chairman BARTON, thank you for the way you managed this difficult process. Being an outside conferee on a bill this size can often be an exercise in futility. But throughout this Conference, you and your staff remained responsive and helpful. Also, I also want to commend all the conferees for working hard to listen to each other and compromise when appropriate.

First is the section authorizing the continued use of Energy Savings Performance Contracts—these contracts have, over recent years, provided agencies with an effective tool to rapidly improve the energy efficiency of their buildings without incurring costs to the taxpayer.

Second, this legislation authorizes the use of Other Transactions for the Department of Energy's critical research and development efforts. These arrangements support research and development without using standard procurement contracts, grants or cooperative agreements.

Other Transactions authority has been used successfully by the Department of Energy for years to great effect. I appreciate the Science Committee's willingness to work with me and the Senate to craft language that allows the use of this valuable tool where appropriate. It is a shame when the government is denied a technological advance simply because our federal policy makers are unable to find a route for funding.

I want to note that the conference has decided to include a request for a report on China and the CNOOC offer to acquire Unocal. This report will be conducted simultaneously with the regular review conducted by the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States. The report will essentially develop the same information required by the CFIUS review. In other words, the Conference has decided to duplicate the review process. The Conference's time has been spent studying our Nation and how we plan to secure our energy over the next 50 years instead of worrying about the actions of our most valuable trading partners. With this one exception, the Energy Policy Act is a step in the right direction of answering the difficult problem.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 conference report. If U.S. energy policy were the Titanic, Republicans would give a tax credit for bailing water rather than changing navigation techniques to avoid a future crisis. Fossil fuels are increasingly expensive, polluting, contribute to war and global unrest, and will run out within the next 50-100 years, and yet President Bush and Republicans in Congress want to ride the sinking ship of oil dependence to its disastrous conclusion.

This compromise between the House and Senate Republicans shows the good, the bad, and the ugly of politics.

Good: After four years getting nowhere with drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and environmentallysound technologies to avoid a future crisis, Fossil fuels are increasingly expensive, polluting, contribute to war and global unrest, and will run out within the next 50-100 years, and yet President Bush and Republicans in Congress want to ride the sinking ship of oil dependence to its disastrous conclusion.

This compromise between the House and Senate Republicans shows the good, the bad, and the ugly of politics.

Good: After four years getting nowhere with drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and environmentally sound technologies to avoid a future crisis, Fossil fuels are increasingly expensive, polluting, contribute to war and global unrest, and will run out within the next 50-100 years, and yet President Bush and Republicans in Congress want to ride the sinking ship of oil dependence to its disastrous conclusion.

This compromise between the House and Senate Republicans shows the good, the bad, and the ugly of politics.

Ugly: The bill exempts oil and gas companies from the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. To squeeze up oil production, oil companies can now inject fluids laced with toxic chemicals into oil and gas wells that penetrate groundwater. According to the bill, the EPA no longer has any ability to regulate these activities or force oil companies to prevent contamination of drinking water supplies.
Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post today noted that the nicest thing that it could say about the comprehensive energy bill is that it could’ve been a lot worse. That’s the sentiment that many of my colleagues and I feel today—that while clear improvements have been made in conference—a tribute to Chairman BARTON’s leadership—that H.R. 6 essentially preserves the status quo.

There is no doubt that the underlying bill is a vast improvement on the bill we marked up this spring in committee and on the floor. Two of the most egregious provisions, liability protection for MTBE polluters and drilling in the pristine Arctic wilderness are out. We are also finally enacting electricity reliability standards and I was pleased to have worked with my colleagues Mr. TOWNS and Mr. FOSSIELLA to preserve New York’s high reliability standards stronger than the electricity title. New York has unique needs that necessitate this provision including having a high concentration of load in a small geographic area. Additionally, nearly 40 percent of the State population live close to the two-thirds of oil we there and 3 million New Yorkers use the underground subway system every day. Finally, New York is home to the NYSE and other critical financial institutions. Although, we should have done this years ago in response to the rolling blackouts of 2003, I am proud to be a part of the inclusion of such an important policy development.

However, I am deeply disappointed that this bill neither reduces our dependence on oil nor addresses climate change. The Energy Information Agency has stated that under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, by 2025, U.S. oil consumption is projected to increase to 28.3 million barrels per day and our country would increase its imports of foreign oil by 85 percent. It even found that gasoline prices under the bill would increase more than if the bill was not enacted. What this country critically needs, but is not in this bill, is a policy to reduce our addiction to oil through the promotion of alternatives and clean renewables, improve automotive fuel efficiency, and reduce greenhouse gasses.

Further, it is a travesty that this bill will open up our treasured wildlands to destructive oil and gas activities and evade environmental and consumer protections. I wish the konferences had included more funding for smarter, cleaner, safer, and cheaper energy policy in this bill that puts innovation and technology to work. While I am pleased that the Energy Policy Act includes $5 billion in tax breaks and incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, the number pales in comparison with the $9 billion earmarked for oil, gas, electricity and coal. Even our esteemed U.S. Energy Secretary, Sam Bodman, op- posed the Bush Administration’s measure stating, “these industries don’t need incentives with oil and gas prices being what they are today.” We must target scarce Federal dollars wisely.

Our energy policy is intricately tied to our national security and our economic well-being. We must be vigilant in opening dialogues between diverse groups of policy experts like the Set America Free Coalition and National Commission on Energy Policy as we continue to build and improve on current energy policies. As the Chair of the National Security Caucus, I know we need to diversify our energy sources, reduce our dependence on unstable oil sheikdoms, and create skilled jobs while reducing energy costs. We must create policies that will protect the environment and our future. While there is improvement in this conference report, on balance, our goals cannot be achieved under this Energy Policy Act, and so regretfully I must vote against it.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005. While this bill still contains provisions that I oppose, it is a far better bill than the one’s that I have voted against in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that this bill contains a provision that will allow the Interior Department to conduct an inventory of oil and natural gas resources off the east coast of the United States, including my State of North Carolina, and other areas currently under a drilling moratorium. I do not think that this is in the interest of the Administration’s continued promise that these areas will never be drilled for oil. Let me state clearly that I continue my strong opposition to any effort to drill for oil off of the North Carolina coast.

This bill also includes the 1935 Public Utility Holding Company Act, which was passed in the wake of the Depression to ensure that the public would not be taken advantage of by utility companies. We know this is still being done, we have heard with the stories such as Enron. This law has protected the rural rate payers in States like North Carolina, and I oppose its repeal.

Even in light of the negative aspects of this bill, I am voting for it because of the positive changes that have been included that will help put our country on the right track. This bill doubles the requirement for renewable fuels, and extends the tax credit for biodiesel. This will help our farmers and help us reduce our dependency on foreign oil. This bill also remove any legal waivers for companies that have poisoned our waters with MTBEs, and excludes the provision to allow drilling and development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), to preserve this national treasure for future generations. I would also add that I am pleased about the increases in tax incentives for renewable energy such as wind and solar power.

Mr. Speaker while this is not a perfect bill, it is a step in the right direction. And it deserves our support.

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the comprehensive energy bill before us, a bill that purports to address the energy challenges facing this country, yet ignores the most fundamental issues and fails to set us on a path to a more sustainable future.

Despite the fact that the transportation sector is the biggest emitter of harmful pollutants into our air, this bill fails to increase the efficiency of our cars. The technology is there, the demand is there, but the will is not. Although the bill offers incentives for consumers to purchase hybrid vehicles, this country’s broken fuel economy program prevents it from having an effect. When an auto maker sells more fuel efficient cars, they are then given flexibility to crank out more gas guzzlers, which increases our dependence on foreign oil.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 also fails to require our utilities to derive even a small percentage of their power from renewable energy, as voters in Colorado overwhelmingly approved last year. Enactment of a national renewable portfolio standard, an option for policy makers, would generate millions of new skilled jobs, attract new capital investment, create jobs, and reduce pollution.

This legislation, which acknowledges that global warming is a problem, sets up yet another federal advisory committee to “develop a national policy to address climate change.” Maybe I am mistaken, but isn’t that Congress’ job? We had the opportunity in this bill to create a market-based system to curb greenhouse gas emissions that are warming our earth, polluting our skies, and endangering our security by keeping us dependent on foreign oil. Again, we had the opportunity, but with this bill, we are passing the buck for other Congress to deal with, when the problem is even more out of control.

Bill setbacks seek our most basic environmental laws, such as the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act. It presents some nice handouts to industry, such as billions in giveaways to oil companies that are already drowning in profits due to high oil prices, while the Nation is experiencing huge deficits and slashing education and health care programs.

This bill fails to recognize that high energy costs are a function of both supply and demand. While it is quite plausible that decreasing the production of fossil fuels, it does not even acknowledge the oil scarcity problem. Instead of drilling and more drilling, we should be helping to curb the Nation’s appetite for this rapidly declining resource by encouraging the development of alternative technologies.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that this bill is a marked improvement over previous iterations. I applaud Chairman BARTON for his devotion to ensuring an open, transparent process with full debate on the issues. He has given us the opportunity and the responsibility to bring this bill to the floor for a full and open process, and I thank him for that. The bill he has put forward takes steps towards greater energy efficiency and conservation, ensuring the reliability of the electricity grid, and providing customers with incentives to purchase vehicles powered by alternative fuels.

But the problems with this legislation far outweigh its benefits, and as such I am forced to oppose it. I wish this Congress had the courage to enact reforms that would set this country on a more sustainable path, but instead it seems content to stick with a status quo that emphasizes extraction over conservation, pork over investment, and development over efficiency. Americans deserve better.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on the Energy Policy Act. This day has certainly been a long time coming. The last major energy bill I was able to support was the National Energy Efficiency Act of 2001. Since that time there has been a clear need for follow-up legislation to address the significant energy challenges facing the country, but Congress and the Bush administration have repeatedly dropped the ball.
Over the last 4 years, Congress has twice come close to approving irresponsible energy legislation that would have done significant harm to consumers, the environment, taxpayers, and plain common sense.

As others have noted, the bill before us today is not perfect, but it is much improved. I am especially pleased that the conference dropped the harmful provisions in the House-passed bill that sought to open the Arctic Refuge to drilling and shield the MTBE industry from any cleanup for environmental damage they have caused. There are still a number of provisions in this package that I would change; in particular, I would drop the harmful provisions in the House-passed bill.

Today I am dropping the provisions in this package that I would change; in particular, I would drop the harmful provisions in the House-passed bill.
### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2361, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 392, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 4, answered "present" 23, not voting 41, as follows:

**[Roll No. 446]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Roll No. 446</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Yeas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2985, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 27, answered "present" 24, not voting 7, as follows:

**[Roll No. 447]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Roll No. 447</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Yeas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Deal (GA)
DeFazio (NY)
DeGette (CO)
DeLauro (CT)
Delahunt (MA)
Delaney (MD)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks (WA)
Dingle (MI)
Dooley (GA)
Dra tulle (GA)
Dreier (NJ)
Duncan (SC)
Edwards (PA)
Eilers (NY)
Emanuel (IL)
Emerson (IA)
Engel (NY)
Engel (PA)
Eshoo (VA)
Fallin (OK)
Fawley (WA)
Fischer (NE)
Fleming (AZ)
Fonagy (OH)
Forbes (NY)
Forbes (VA)
Foster (TN)
Fortenberry (NE)
Fossella (NY)
Frelinghuysen (NJ)
Galla
gy (NY)
Gerlach (KY)
Gibbs (GA)
Gibchrest (TX)
Gillmor (CA)
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez (TX)
Goode (VA)
Goodlatte (VA)
Gordon (NY)
Granger (TX)
Graves (NC)
Green (WI)
Green (NJ)
Green, G. (NJ)
Grijalva (AZ)
Gutierez (TX)
Hal (VT)
Harman (NC)
Harris (CO)
Hart (NY)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes (NY)
Hayworth (GA)
Herger (NY)
Herrnstein (IA)
Higginson (CO)
Hinojosa (TX)
Hoecke (NE)
Hollen (NC)
Holt (NY)
Honda (CA)
Hoeler (OH)
Hostettler (OH)
Hoyer (MD)
Hulshof (MO)
Hunter (CA)
Hyde (NY)
Inglis (SC)
Isakson (GA)
Jackson (FL)
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson (IN)
Jenkins (GA)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (GA)
Kanjorski (PA)
Kaprielian (CA)
Kaptur (OH)
Keller (CA)
Kelly (CO)
Kennedy (MA)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind (ND)

NAYS—27
Baird (OH) Baldwin (MA) Barroow (MI) Brown (OH) Brown (OK) Brasil (CA) Bruan (CT) Burgan (AZ) 
Capano (NY) Canies (NY) Cooper (NY) Dugnett (MA) Frank (MA) Israel

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—24
Akin (GA) Barrett (SC) Barrett (MD) Berns (MO) Box (AZ) Fox (FL) Frank (AZ) Garrett (NJ) Gohmert (TX) 
Gutknecht (WI)

NOT VOTING—7
Brady (PA) Frenesey (MO) George (PA) Paul (PA) Schakowsky (IL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.
So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and Joint Resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:
S. 302. An act to make improvements in the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.
S. 447. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal Land in the State of New Mexico.
S. 555. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
S. 1317. An act to permit Women’s Business Centers to re-compete for sustainability grants.
S.J. Res. 19. Joint Resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 30th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1295
Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1295.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
There was no objection.

HELP EFFICIENT, ACCESSIBLE, LOW-COST, TIMELY HEALTHCARE (HEALTH) ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 385 and as the designee of the majority leader, I call up the bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden of the liability system places on the health care delivery system, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of H.R. 5 is as follows:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2005’’.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.
(a) FINDINGS.—
(1) EFFECT ON HEALTH CARE ACCESS AND COSTS.—Congress finds that our current civil justice system is adversely affecting patient access to health care services, better patient care, and cost-efficient health care, in that the health care liability system is a costly and ineffective mechanism for resolving claims of health care liability and compensating injured patients.
(2) EFFECT ON HEALTH CARE COSTS.—Congress finds that the health care and insurance industries are industries affecting interstate commerce and the health care liability litigation systems existing throughout the United States are activities that affect interstate commerce by contributing to the high costs of health care and premiums for health care liability insurance purchased by health care system providers.
(3) EFFECT ON FEDERAL SPENDING.—Congress finds that the health care liability litigation systems existing throughout the United States have a significant effect on the amount, distribution, and use of Federal funds because of:
(A) the large number of individuals who receive health care benefits under programs operated or financed by the Federal Government;
(B) the large number of individuals who benefit because of the exclusion from Federal taxes of the amounts spent to provide them with health insurance benefits; and
(C) the large number of health care providers who provide services for which the Federal Government makes payments.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to implement reasonable, comprehensive, and effective health care liability reforms designed to—
(1) provide the availability of health care services in cases in which health care liability actions have been shown to be a factor in the decreased availability of services;
(2) reduce the incidence of defensive medicine and lower the cost of health care liability insurance, all of which contribute to the escalation of health care costs;
(3) ensure that persons with meritorious health care injury claims receive fair and adequate compensation, including reasonable noneconomic damages;
(4) improve the fairness and cost-effectiveness of our current health care liability system to resolve disputes over, and provide compensation for, health care liability by reducing uncertainty in the amount of compensation provided to injured individuals; and
(5) provide an increased sharing of information in the health care delivery system, which will reduce unintended injury and improve patient care.
SEC. 3. ENCOURAGING SPEEDY RESOLUTION OF CLAIMS.

The time for the commencement of a health care lawsuit shall be 3 years after the date of manifestation of injury or prior to the minor's 8th birthday, whichever occurs first. In no event shall the time for commencement of a health care lawsuit exceed 3 years after the date of manifestation of injury unless tolled for any of the following—

(1) proof of fraud; or
(2) intentional concealment; or
(3) the presence of a foreign body, which has caused or contributed to injury or death, in the person of the injured person.

Actions by a minor shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of the alleged manifestation of injury, except that actions by a minor under the full age of 6 years shall be commenced within 3 years of manifestation of injury or prior to the minor's 8th birthday, whichever occurs first. Such time limitation shall be tolled for minors for any period during which a parent or guardian and a health care provider or health care provider organization have committed fraud or collusion in the failure to bring an action on behalf of the injured minor.

SEC. 4. COMPENSATING PATIENT INJURY.

(a) UNLIMITED AMOUNT OF DAMAGES FOR ACTUAL ECONOMIC DAMAGES INCURRED.—In any health care lawsuit, nothing in this Act shall limit a claimant's recovery of the full amount of the available economic damages, notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (b).

(b) ADDITIONAL NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—In any health care lawsuit, the amount of non-economic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, regardless of the number of parties against whom the action is brought or the number of separate claims or actions brought that same injury, except that actions by a minor under the full age of 6 years shall be commenced within 3 years of manifestation of injury or prior to the minor's 8th birthday, whichever occurs first. Such time limitation shall be tolled for minors for any period during which a parent or guardian and a health care provider or health care provider organization have committed fraud or collusion in the failure to bring an action on behalf of the injured minor.

(c) NO DISCOUNT OF AWARD FOR NON-ECONOMIC DAMAGES.—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (b), future noneconomic damages shall not be discounted to present value. The jury shall not be informed about the maximum award for noneconomic damages. An award for non-economic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, or the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced to the amount of noneconomic damages actually compensated.

(d) FAIR SHARE RULE.—In any health care lawsuit involving injury or wrongful death, any party may introduce evidence of collateral source benefits. If a party elects to introduce such evidence, any opposing party may introduce evidence of any amount paid or contributed or reasonably likely to be paid or contributed in the future by or on behalf of the opposing party to source of any collateral source benefits. No provider of collateral source benefits shall recover any amount against the claimant or receive any lien or credit against the claimant's economic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, or the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced to the extent of any reduction in the amount of economic damages required by law. If separate awards are rendered for past and future noneconomic damages and the combined award exceeds $250,000, then the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced first.

(e) FAIR SHARE RULE.—In any health care lawsuit, each party shall be liable for that party's several share of any damages only and not for the share of any other person. Each party shall be liable only for the amount of damages allocated to such party in direct proportion to such party's percentage of responsibility. Whenever a judgment is rendered as to any party, a separate judgment shall be rendered as to each such party for the amount allocated to such party. For purposes of this section, the trier of fact shall determine the proportion of responsibility of each party for the claimant's harm.

SEC. 5. MAXIMIZING PATIENT RECOVERY.

(a) COURT SUPERVISION OF SHARE OF DAMAGES ACTUALLY PAID TO CLAIMANTS.—In any health care lawsuit, the court shall supervise the arrangements for payment of damages to protect against conflicts of interest that may have the effect of reducing the amount of damages actually recovered by the actual claimants. In particular, in any health care lawsuit in which the attorney for a party claims a financial stake in the outcome by virtue of a contingency fee, the court shall have the power to restrict the payment of a claimant's damage recovery to such attorney, in direct proportion to the claimant based on the interests of justice and principles of equity. In no event shall the total of all contingent fees for representing a claimant in such a health care lawsuit exceed the following limits:

(1) 40 percent of the first $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).
(2) 35 percent of the next $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).
(3) 30 percent of the next $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).
(4) 25 percent of the next $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).
(5) 20 percent of the next $50,000 recovered by the claimant(s).
(6) 15 percent of any amount by which the recovery by the claimant(s) is in excess of $600,000.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The limitations in this section shall apply whether the recovery is by judgment, settlement, mediation, arbitration, or any other form of alternative dispute resolution. In a health care lawsuit involving a minor or incompetent person, a court retains the authority to authorize or approve a fee that is less than the maximum permitted under this section. The requirement for court supervision in the first two sentences of subsection (a) applies only in civil actions.

SEC. 6. ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any health care lawsuit involving injury or wrongful death, any party may introduce evidence of collateral source benefits. If a party elects to introduce such evidence, any opposing party may introduce evidence of any amount paid or contributed or reasonably likely to be paid or contributed in the future by or on behalf of the opposing party to source of any collateral source benefits. No provider of collateral source benefits shall recover any amount against the claimant or receive any lien or credit against the claimant's economic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, or the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced to the amount of any reduction in the amount of economic damages required by law. If separate awards are rendered for past and future noneconomic damages and the combined award exceeds $250,000, then the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced first.

(b) MAXIMUM AWARD.—In determining the amount of punitive damages, if awarded, in a health care lawsuit, the trier of fact shall consider only the following factors:

(1) the severity of the harm caused by the conduct of such party;
(2) the duration of the conduct or any concealment of it by such party;
(3) the profitability of the conduct to such party;
(4) the number of products sold or medical procedures rendered for compensation, as the case may be, by such party, of the kind causing the harm complained of by the claimant;
(5) any criminal penalties imposed on such party, as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant; and
(6) the amount of any civil fines assessed against such party as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant.

(c) N O DISCOUNT OF AWARD FOR NON-ECONOMIC DAMAGES.—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (b), future noneconomic damages shall not be discounted to present value. The jury shall not be informed about the maximum award for noneconomic damages. An award for noneconomic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, or the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced to the amount of noneconomic damages actually compensated.

(d) FAIR SHARE RULE.—In any health care lawsuit involving injury or wrongful death, any party may introduce evidence of collateral source benefits. If a party elects to introduce such evidence, any opposing party may introduce evidence of any amount paid or contributed or reasonably likely to be paid or contributed in the future by or on behalf of the opposing party to source of any collateral source benefits. No provider of collateral source benefits shall recover any amount against the claimant or receive any lien or credit against the claimant's economic damages, if available, may be as much as $250,000, or the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced to the amount of any reduction in the amount of economic damages required by law. If separate awards are rendered for past and future noneconomic damages and the combined award exceeds $250,000, then the future noneconomic damages shall be reduced first.

(e) FAIR SHARE RULE.—In any health care lawsuit, each party shall be liable for that party's several share of any damages only and not for the share of any other person. Each party shall be liable only for the amount of damages allocated to such party in direct proportion to such party's percentage of responsibility. Whenever a judgment is rendered as to any party, a separate judgment shall be rendered as to each such party for the amount allocated to such party. For purposes of this section, the trier of fact shall determine the proportion of responsibility of each party for the claimant's harm.

SEC. 7. PUNITIVE DAMAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Punitive damages may, if available, be awarded against the manufacturer or distributor of a medical product, or a supplier of any component or raw material of such medical product, based on a claim that such product caused the claimant's harm where

(i) such medical product was subject to premarket approval, clearance, or licensure by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety of the formulation or performance of the product

or

(ii) such medical product caused the claimant's harm where

(1) the severity of the harm caused by the conduct of such party;
(2) the duration of the conduct or any concealment of it by such party;
(3) the profitability of the conduct to such party;
(4) the number of products sold or medical procedures rendered for compensation, as the case may be, by such party, of the kind causing the harm complained of by the claimant;
(5) any criminal penalties imposed on such party, as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant; and
(6) the amount of any civil fines assessed against such party as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) may not be construed as establishing the obligation of the Food and Drug Administration to take any action to preclude or modify any action or practice that was lawful or reasonable at the time for the production or sale of medical products, whether or not such medical product was subject to premarket approval, clearance, or licensure by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety or performance of the product.

SEC. 8. ADDITIONAL HEALTH BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Punitive damages may, if available, be awarded against the manufacturer or distributor of a medical product, or a supplier of any component or raw material of such medical product, based on a claim that such product caused the claimant's harm where

(i) such medical product was subject to premarket approval, clearance, or licensure by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety of the formulation or performance of the product

or

(ii) such medical product caused the claimant's harm where

(1) the severity of the harm caused by the conduct of such party;
(2) the duration of the conduct or any concealment of it by such party;
(3) the profitability of the conduct to such party;
(4) the number of products sold or medical procedures rendered for compensation, as the case may be, by such party, of the kind causing the harm complained of by the claimant;
(5) any criminal penalties imposed on such party, as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant; and
(6) the amount of any civil fines assessed against such party as a result of the conduct complained of by the claimant.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) may not be construed as establishing the obligation of the Food and Drug Administration to take any action to preclude or modify any action or practice that was lawful or reasonable at the time for the production or sale of medical products, whether or not such medical product was subject to premarket approval, clearance, or licensure by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety or performance of the product.

2. LIABILITY OF HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—A health care provider who prescribes, or who dispenses pursuant to a prescription, a product, whether or not licensed, or cleared by the Food and Drug Administration shall not be named as a party to a product liability lawsuit involving such product and shall not be liable to a claimant in a class action lawsuit against the manufacturer, distributor, or seller of such product. Nothing in this paragraph prevents a court from ordering health care providers and cases involving products liability claims against the manufacturer,
distributor, or product seller of such medical product.

(3) Packaging.—In a health care lawsuit for harm which is alleged to relate to the adequacy of packaging or labeling of a drug which is required to have tamper-resistant packaging under regulations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services (including regulations related to packaging), the manufacturer or product seller of the drug shall not be held liable for punitive damages unless such packaging or labeling was found by the trier of fact by clear and convincing evidence to be substantially out of compliance with such regulations.

(4) EXCEPTION.—(1) shall not apply in any health care lawsuit:

(A) a person, before or after premarket approval, clearance, or licensure of such medical product, knowingly misrepresented to or withheld from the Food and Drug Administration information that is required to be submitted under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331 et seq.) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) that is material and is causally related to the harm which the claimant allegedly suffered; or

(B) a person making an illegal payment to an official of the Food and Drug Administration for the purpose of either securing or maintaining approval, clearance, or licensure of such medical product.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF FUTURE DAMAGES TO CLAIMANTS IN HEALTH CARE LIABILTY ACTIONS

In general.—In any health care lawsuit, if an award of future damages, without reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding $50,000 is made against a party with sufficient assets to pay an award of periodic payments of such a judgment, the court shall, at the request of any party, enter a judgment ordering that the future damages be paid by periodic payments. In any health care lawsuit, the court may be guided by the Uniform Periodic Payment of Judgments Act promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

Applicability.—This section applies to all actions which have not been first set for trial or retrial before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM; ADR.—The term “alternative dispute resolution system” or “ADR” means a system that provides for the resolution of health care liabilty actions in a manner other than through a civil action brought in a State or Federal court.

(2) CLAIMANT.—The term “claimant” means any person who brings a health care lawsuit, including a person who asserts or claims a right to legal or equitable contribution, indemnity or subrogation, arising out of a health care liability claim or action, and any person on whose behalf such a claim is asserted or such an action is brought, whether deceased, incompetent, or a minor.

(3) COLLATERAL SOURCE BENEFITS.—The term “collateral source benefits” means any amount paid or reasonably likely to be paid in the future to or on behalf of the claimant, or any service, product or other benefit provided or reasonably likely to be provided in the future to or on behalf of the claimant, as a result of the injury or wrongful death, pursuant to:

(A) any State or Federal health, sickness, income-disability, accident, or workers’ compensation law;

(B) any State, Federal, or local health, sickness, income-disability, or accident insurance that provides health benefits or income-disability coverage;

(C) any contract or agreement of any group, organization, partnership, or corporation to provide, pay for, or reimburse the cost of medical, hospital, dental, or income disability; or

(D) any other publicly or privately funded program.

(4) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—The term “compensatory damages” means objectively verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding $50,000, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(5) CONVICTION.—The term “conviction” means a judgment of a court which is final and on which an appeal is not pending.

(6) ECONOMIC DAMAGES.—The term “economic damages” means objectively verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding $50,000, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(7) HEALTH CARE LAWSUIT.—The term “health care lawsuit” means any health care liability claim concerning the provision of health care goods or services by any health care provider, including all claims, which are based upon the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(8) HEALTH CARE SERVICE OR MEDICAL PRODUCT.—The term “health care service or medical product” means any health care service or medical product intended for use, sale, or transportation in commerce, or which is produced for use, sale, or transportation in commerce, or which is produced for commercial advantage or use in a trade or business, or which is produced by a manufacturer, producer, vendor, or seller of a medical product, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(9) INJURY.—The term “injury” means an accident or disease, either so licensed, registered, or certified to provide health care services, and being either so licensed, registered, or certified, or exempted from such requirement by another statute or regulation.

(10) LIABILITY.—The term “liability” means objective verifiable monetary losses incurred as a result of the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services, such as past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, cost of obtaining domestic services, reduction to present value, equaling or exceeding $50,000, and all other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(11) LIABILITY LITIGATION.—The term “liability litigation” means any health care service or medical product liability action concerning the provision of health care goods or services by any health care provider, including all claims, which are based upon the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(12) LIABILITY PROGRAM.—The term “liability program” means a program, organization, group, organization, partnership, or corporation, whether or not engaged in a trade or business, which is engaged in the compensation of injuries arising out of the provision of health care services, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(13) LIABILITY PROGRAM INTERVENTION.—The term “liability program intervention” means any health care service or medical product liability action concerning the provision of health care goods or services by any health care provider, including all claims, which are based upon the provision of, use of, or payment for (or failure to provide, use, or pay for) health care services or medical products, regardless of the theory of liability on which the claim is based, or the number of plaintiffs, defendants, or other parties, or the number of causes of action.

(14) MEDICAL PRODUCT.—The term “medical product” means a drug, device, or biological product intended for humans, and the terms “drug”, “device”, and “biological product” have the meanings given such terms in sections 301(g)(1) and 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321) and section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)), respectively, including any component or raw material used therein, but excluding health care services.

(15) NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—The term “noneconomic damages” means damages for physical and emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, mental anguish, disfigurement, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium (other than loss of domestic service), pecuniary damages, injury to reputation, and other nonpecuniary losses of any kind or nature.

(16) PUNITIVE DAMAGES.—The term “punitive damages” means damages awarded, for the purpose of punishment or deterrence, and not solely for compensatory purposes, against a health care provider, health care organization, a manufacturer, distributor, or vendor of a medical product. Punitive damages are neither economic nor noneconomic damages.

(17) RECOVERY.—The term “recovery” means the net sum recovered after deducting any disbursements or costs incurred in connection with prosecution or settlement of the claim, including all costs paid or advanced by any person. Costs of health care incurred by the plaintiff and the attorneys’ office overhead costs or charges for legal services are not deductible disbursements or costs.

(18) STATE.—The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other...
lateral source benefits. Regarding collateral source benefits, or man-

If there is an aspect of a civil action brought for a vaccine-related injury or death to whole life, a reduced applicability or scope which a health care lawsuit may be com-

The provisions governing health care lawsuits set forth in this Act shall be construed to preempt any State law (whether effective before, during, or after the date of enactment of this Act, notwithstanding section 4(a)); or

To the extent that title XXI of the Pub-

H.R. 5.

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(1) To the extent that title XXI of the Public Health Service Act establishes a Federal rule of law applicable to a health care lawsuit brought for a vaccine-related injury or death, (A) this Act does not affect the application of the rule of law to such an action; and

(b) Other Federal Law.—Except as pro-

(a) HEALTH CARE LAWSUITS.—The provi-

(b) Protection of States’ Rights and Other Laws.—(1) Any issue that is not gov-

(2) This Act shall not preempt or supersede any State health care law that imposes pro-

(c) State Flexibility.—No provision of this Act shall be construed to preempt

(3) limits on the contingency fees lawyers can charge; a fair-share rule by which dam-

(4) economic damages is paid by all other States. MICRA’s reforms, which are included in the HEALTH Act, include a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages; limits on the contingency fees lawyers can charge; a fair-share rule by which damages are allocated in direct proportion to fault; reasonable guidelines, but not caps, on the award of punitive damages; and a safe harbor from punitive damages for products that meet FDA safety requirements.

According to the nonpartisan organi-

According to the chair of the OB/GYN department at the Yale School of Medicine, “Within 2 years we will be faced with a very real possibility of having to shut down our high-risk obstetrical practice, a practice that cares for the sickest mothers in the State.” As for legitimate cases of medical malpractice, nothing in the HEALTH Act prevents juries from awarding very large amounts to victims, including children. The HEALTH Act does not limit in any way an award of economic damages to injured victims. Economic damages include lost wages or home services, medical costs, the cost of reducing drug use and therapy and lifelong rehabilitation care.

In fact, in just the last few years, ju-

In California’s Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act, called MICRA, which has resulted in California’s medical liability premiums increasing only one-third as much as they have in other States.

The HEALTH Act. Researchers at the Har-

it is the sense of Congress that a health in-

The HEALTH Act, which is identical to two other bills that passed the House dur-

Emergency medicine, brain surgery and ob-

For example, a 30-year-old homemaker, and a $27 million award to a 10-year-old boy, a $59 million award to a 3-year-old girl, a $50 million award to a 10-year-old boy, a $12 million award to a 30-year-old homemaker, and a $27 million award to a 25-year-old woman. Other examples include damages of $7, $22, $25, $30, and $49 million, all in just the last few years. None of these same sizes would be available under the HEALTH Act.
that “we found no evidence that women or the elderly were disparately impacted by the cap” on noneconomic damages in California under MICRA.

The HEALTH Act will work. According to the Congressional Budget Office, “Under the HEALTH Act, premiums from malpractice insurance companies would increase by 7 percent, [which] would increase the [unemployment] insurance tax receipts by $20 billion to $100 billion in the first year and less than $4 billion per year thereafter.”

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of those who need health care, for the sake of health care providers who simply want to practice their professions, please join me and these selfless organizations in supporting the HEALTH Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). The Chair understands that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONyers) will control 40 minutes as the designee of the minority leader, and the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) will control 20 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONyers. Yes, sir. That is correct.

Mr. CONyers asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.

Mr. CONyers. Mr. Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, the reason that many people might support this bill is that they do not know that inside the bill, if they were asked, are you for legislation that limits damages, be they higher or lower than the limits provided for in the HEALTH Act.

Finally, this legislation is supported by some 200 organizations, including the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Nurse Practitioners, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the Council of Women’s and Infant Health Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the material I referred to previously is as follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, Denver, CO, July 26, 2005.

Hon. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Hastert and Representative Pelosi: On behalf of the National Conference of State Legislatures, I am writing to express strong, bipartisan opposition to the passage of federal medical malpractice legislation, H.R. 5, the “Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-Cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2005.

My colleagues, I urge you to please do not accept this antipatient, antivictim legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the material I referred to previously is as follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES.
of state law. All 50 states have statutes of limitations for medical malpractice suits. All 50 states have rules of civil procedure governing the admissibility of evidence and the use of experts. More than half of the states have caps on noneconomic damages and limitations on attorney’s fees in medical malpractice cases.

This “crisis” or “emergency” again at NCSL’s last Fall Forum. Our review included assessing whether circumstances had developed or were so unique that only federal action could provide an adequate and workable remedy. We again examined recent state actions, policy options and experiences. We discussed at length how various proposed or anticipated pieces of legislation fared against NCSL’s core federalism questions. Those questions included (1) whether preemption is needed to remediate serious conflicts imposing severe burdens on national economic activity; (2) whether preemption is needed to achieve a national objective; and (3) whether the states are unable to correct the problem. The resounding bipartisan conclusion was that federal legislation is unnecessary.

NCSL’s opposition extends to any bill or amendment that directly or indirectly preempts any state law governing the awarding of damages by mandatory, uniform amounts or the awarding of attorney’s fees. Our opposition also extends to any provision affecting the drafting of pleadings, the introduction of evidence and statutes of limitations. Furthermore, NCSL opposes any federal legislation that would undermine the capacity of aggregate parties to seek full and fair redress in state courts for physical harm done to them due to the negligence of others.

The purpose of our letter is to inform you of our concerns. For additional information, please contact Susan Parnas Frederick or Trina Caudle in NCSL’s Washington, D.C. office.

Respectfully,

Senator Michael Balmori, New York Senate, Chair,
NCSL Law & Criminal Justice Committee.

PUBLIC CITIZEN

Re: please oppose H.R. 5—“Health Act of 2003.”

Dear Representative: H.R. 5, a bill dealing with civil liability for medical malpractice, would shield doctors, HMOs, hospitals, nursing homes, drug makers, and medical device manufacturers from civil and financial responsibility for harms inflicted by their misconduct. At the same time, it would punish victims of medical negligence by making it more difficult for them to recover fair compensation for their injuries. We strongly oppose this bill and urge you to vote against it.

We are enclosing a detailed fact sheet evaluating the major provisions of this misguided legislation, whose more egregious features include:
- An overall, non-adjustable $250,000 cap on non-economic damages—the lowest limit imposed by any state that has adopted caps since they first appeared 30 years ago—regardless of the severity of injury, number of malfeasors, or number of defendants involved.
- Insulation from liability for nursing homes, HMOs, drug companies, and medical device manufacturers, and protection from punitive damages for products that are FDA approved or generally recognized as safe and effective.
- Federalized standards for medical malpractice liability that preempt existing state laws in an arena that is traditionally the purview of the states. Those states have been severely injured by the negligence of others. No one has stated that their pain and...
suffering injuries are not real or severe. These patients should not be told that, due to an arbitrary limit, they will be deprived of the compensation they need to carry on. Yet H.R. 534, if enacted, would reward the most seriously injured persons who are most in need of recompense receiving less than adequate compensation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) the primary author of the bill itself.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me the time.

With all due respect to the distinguished ranking member, let me say that in response to his comments, this is a special interest bill. That is right. It is a special interest bill for the American consumer of health care, for our patients. That is where the special interest is; not, Mr. Speaker, the insurance industry, not drug companies or manufacturers of medical devices.

The insurance industry, of course, offers a broad range of products. It could be health insurance. It could be automobile insurance, although as honorees with the House, it could be an umbrella policy for general liability. And, yes, of course there is a product line called medical liability insurance.

But let me tell you what is happening to the insurance industry in regard to that business. In my home State of Georgia, 3 years ago we had 20 companies that offered that line of business. Today we have one. We have gone from 20 to 1, and that is a mutual company.
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If these insurance companies were making out like bandits, as the other side of the aisle and the opposition to this commonsense suggestion is suggesting, then they would not be quitting the business in droves. They would be continuing to stay in the business and raising those premiums and making these tremendous profits.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the industry of insurance in regard to other product lines. The gentleman may be right on that. But in regard to this line of business, I can tell you they are losing money even with the returns on their investments, as did Mag Mutual in Georgia several years ago. In fact, the return on their very conservative portfolio of investments, they still are losing money because of these outrageous claims and the expense of defending so many frivolous lawsuits.

In regard, Mr. Speaker, to the drug manufacturers of medical devices that the distinguished ranking member mentioned, this bill would only relieve them of punitive damages, that is all, punitive damages, if it is shown that they did deliberately market a drug or a device that they knew was harmful to a patient and they deliberately withheld that information from the FDA. It does not relieve them of liability for being named in a lawsuit. It is only the punitive damages.

If they are guilty of something like that, of withholding information deliberately, we went through this with the tobacco industry in regard to lung cancer, the punitive damages can be in the hundreds of millions and, maybe if it is a big Fortune 500 company, billions of dollars.

So this is a distraction from the real problem. And the real problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we have an unleveled playing field. That is all it is. This bill, H.R. 534, is not going to take away anybody’s right to sue if they have been injured and to seek economic damages and payments for medical care for the rest of their lives.

The gentleman from Texas explained to us that many of these cases in California, a State that since 1979 has had a cap on noneconomic so-called “pain and suffering” and in the cases that he just talked about, $10 million, $20 million, $30 million worth of economic awards, people are not being denied access to that care, Mr. Speaker. It is not only to balance the playing field so that we do not have this situation in this country where we are supposed to have the greatest health care in the world, and yet our specialists are dropping out. They are not delivering babies. They are not involved in high-risk pregnancies. They are not staffing emergency rooms. They are not doing new surgery.

Because of all the defensive practice of medicine, every specialist in every area has his or her specialty and also the specialty of defensive medicine, and it is driving up the cost of health care and people cannot afford to get health insurance. That is all we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, of leveling the playing field to make it fair for everyone. And so this idea that the other side suggests that we are taking away anybody’s rights is absolutely not true, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say some of the things that this bill does do besides limiting noneconomic to $250,000. What it does, Mr. Speaker, is something called “collateral source disclosure.” Current law did not allow a jury to know that a plaintiff in a case that has health insurance or has a disability policy. So when they are calculating all of these economic losses and loss of wages, it is not known by the jury that maybe that disability policy gives them 80 percent of their earnings or their income for their whole life or that they have health insurance.

The other thing, and I will conclude on this, Mr. Speaker, the other thing that this does is it is almost a violation of joint and several liability where, when multiple defendants are named, the person, the doctor who has the deepest pockets, who may have had very little to do, if anything to do, maybe just wash their hands, they have to pay the whole bill. It is not fair. They have to pay the whole bill. It is unfair.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), a subcommittee Chair of the Committee on Financial Services.
Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5. Listen to why. For many years, the world has come to New York for medical care. But between 1998 and 2002, 70 percent of New York’s neurosurgeons, 60 percent of the OB-GYNs in New York, 60 percent of New York’s orthopedic surgeons, and 60 percent of the general surgeons in New York were sued.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible that all of these physicians were bad doctors. We often believe that there are some physicians that may be better than others, but it would be difficult to come to the consensus that more than half of the physicians in several vital practice areas have performed this poor.

This is a problem. In New York, the average jury award increased from $1.7 million in 1994 to $6 million in 1999, which was an increase of 350 percent. New York physicians are now paying 54 to 59 percent more in 2005 for the same insurance coverage they had in 2002. This is in part due to an across-the-board average rate increase of 7 percent for the 2004–2005 policy year. In 2001, six of the top eight medical malpractice awards in the United States came from New York courts. In 2002, 7 of the top 10 jury verdicts in medical negligence cases were from New York courts. And in 2003, it was four of the top 10.

The cost is not just to the doctors. It is a cost we all ultimately share. There are steps this Congress can take in solving the problem. The HEALTH Act is a step that is both reasonable and fair. It allows for the full recovery of economic damages. In other words, when damages can be quantified, they are unlimited under the HEALTH Act.

The HEALTH Act will help solve the national crisis that we are seeing in medical malpractice liability insurance.

Without this legislation doctors will not leave the wilderness. In 2003, 60 percent of New York’s orthopedic surgeons were sued. And in 2003, it was four of the top 10.

The HEALTH Act is going to help solve the national crisis that are we seeing in medical malpractice liability insurance.

As a member of the Medical Malpractice Crisis Task Force, I must recognize that there is a problem, and this legislation is one great step in the direction towards solving that problem.

Please support the HEALTH Act of 2005.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just let the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) know about the General Accounting Office report that found there is no evidence that caps on damages have reduced paid claims. They found, instead, that the contention that premiums are rising because there is a surge in jury awards is a myth and that while premiums have increased claims payments of insurance companies have remained essentially flat.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, and I thank him for his continued leadership on this issue.

It looks as if this is deja vu. We have been at this table for a number of years, and I am delighted that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) cleared it up. When you have a daughter that is a lawyer, you know you have a great affection for lawyers. And I appreciate the fact that he recognizes that as physicians care for the sick, they know the role of jus-tice open. For that reason, if anyone gets up on the floor of the House and cites the number of lawsuits, 60 percent of the doctors being sued, that has nothing to do with those cases that prevailed.

Most Americans understand the distinction between frivolous lawsuits and so does the court system. But, really, this bill is patently false, and Americans should know that because I have heard from so many with so many tragic incidents, amputated legs, individuals at hospitals who have died not because of malpractice, but because they caught an infection in the hospital.

But as it relates to insurance and low rates, let me cite a study that is the prevailing trend in America. A new study by the former insurance commissioner of Missouri, Jay Angoff, shows that insurance companies are gouging doctors. The study shows that insurance premiums are skyrocketing, while payouts have remained constant some cases even decreased. There is no evidence that we are making a dent with this medical malpractice oppressive legislation—oppressive legislation, in insurance rates.

In particular, it is a shame that when you have a tragedy in your family, someone who lost their life because of negligence, and there are three defendants, the general trend is that you go against the defendant with the deepest pockets. That defendant who is well-situated will go against the others who contributed to that terrible tragedy.

Now, this bill locks the door, closes out the bus driver, the teacher, the nurse’s aid, the oil refinery worker, absolutely closes them out. It also denies children who are innocent, under 18, enhanced economic damages. That was my amendment, to take away that cap of $250,000, to take away that cap of $250,000 because we do not know long range with all these tables what someone will be needing the rest of their life after they have been maimed, after they have been disabled, or after they have died, and what their family will need.

This is a tragic day because first of all this bill came to the floor with no committee work, no rules work of sorts, all amendments died; and we have failed. Herman Cole of Connecticut we have failed, whose wife slipped into a coma when in a procedure for a tubal ligation. Her blood pressure dropped dangerously and damagingly low and the doctor and anesthesiologist ignored warning signs. What is he supposed to do? What is he supposed to do about his wife, Sadie, who is now in a vegetative state?

This is a bad bill. I hope my colleagues will have the courage to vote for those who have been injured and vote against special interest.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, the “Medical Malpractice Bill.” Not only is the overall bill bad, but the process in which the majority followed was flawed as well. This bill came straight to the floor and bypassed both committees of jurisdiction. This begs the question, “What are the proponents of the bill so
afraid of that they need to rush to the floor. Both the House Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committees have been bypassed and this should not have been done on such an important piece of legislation. Given the new information that is available about the insurance industry’s role in driving up costs, shouldn’t the committees at least have had the opportunity to review the new information?

Turning to the bill itself, it should be noted that this bill applies across the board to all cases, not just frivolous cases. It applies no matter how much merit a case has, or the extent of the misconduct of the hospital, doctor, or drug company. The bill applies regardless of the severity of the injury. Those most hurt by the bill are the most catastrophically injured. In addition, it undermines our constitutional right to trial by jury. The bill limits the power and authority of jurors to decide cases based on the facts presented to them. Washington politicians should not be making these decisions—juries should.

This legislation also reduces the accountability of hospitals, nursing homes, HMOs, and drug companies. This will hurt patient safety. Patient safety must come first. We should be cracking down on the small number of doctors responsible for most of the malpractice. This will reduce both incidents of malpractice and lawsuits. Doctors and hospitals must be required to tell their patients or the patients’ families when they have made a medical error, rather than allowing them to keep their mistakes secret.

This bill completely ignores the insurance industry’s major role in the high price of medical malpractice insurance premiums. We must protect the legal system and make it accessible for all doctors. Reforming justice, accountability, and adequate compensation for devastating injuries or death.

In discussing the flaws of this bill, I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to mention some of the families who have survived medical malpractice.

Kim and Ryan Bliss of Florida, whose 8½-month-old daughter died when the doctor inserted an adult IV in her jugular and caused an air bubble to go directly into her bloodstream.

Herman Cole of Connecticut, whose wife slipped into a coma when, during a procedure for tubal ligation, her blood pressure dropped dangerously and damagingly low and the doctor and hospital ignored the warning signs. Herman’s wife Sadie has been in a vegetative state ever since.

Diane Meyer of Nevada, whose 13-month-old daughter died while awaiting surgery to repair a malfunctioning shunt in her skull, while the attending physician slept through the procedure. Diane was set to vibrate and didn’t wake him, leaving two neurosurgery residents in charge of her care.

Deborah Gilham of Maryland, who suffered injury when, during a routine laparoscopic procedure to look for a cyst on her left ovary, her physician punctured her colon.

Before closing, let me take a moment to speak on two amendments I would have offered had the rule not been so restrictive. My first amendment would have eliminated one of the many egregious provisions in the bill. In essence, it would eliminate the one-size-fits-all limit on awards for non-economic loss (i.e., pain and suffering damages) of $250,000. Typically, such damages exceed $250,000 only in cases involving catastrophic injuries such as deafness, blindness, loss of limb or organ, paraplegia, severe brain damage or loss of reproductive capacity. Limiting patients’ rights to sue for medical injuries would have virtually no impact on the affordability of malpractice coverage. States with little or no tort law restrictions experience the same insurance rates as states that have enacted tort restrictions.

My second amendment focused on the $250,000 cap for non-economic loss (i.e., pain and suffering damages). This amendment would have carved out an exception for plaintiffs or a person representing a minor. In summary, the $250,000 cap for non-economic loss (i.e., and suffering damages) would not apply with respect to an injury to an individual who is a minor. Minors are more vulnerable in regards to injuries they suffer and the consequences of those injuries. Furthermore, the impacts of an injury suffered by a minor due to malpractice will be felt for a much longer time period than for an adult. This is especially true of children who suffer injuries at birth due to malpractice. These children will more likely have to suffer the consequences of these injuries for the rest of their lives.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and an expert on this subject.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, like so many States, Wisconsin was facing a medical liability crisis. Just because medical liability reforms don’t improve the process, not just because insurance carriers were discontinuing the sale of medical liability insurance, but because too many physicians felt forced to leave their practice, leave their specialty, or leave the State for a more affordable State.

But 10 years ago in Wisconsin, we figured out a reasonable answer. I led the fight to create a new medical liability system where injured parties receive every single dollar of economic damages to which they are entitled. But where there is a modest cap on noneconomic damages, things like pain and suffering, loss of society, loss of companionship, you know what? It worked.

We hear a lot about studies here. We know as a fact in Wisconsin it worked. In a short period of time, Wisconsin became one of only six States not to have a medical liability crisis. As a result, as the State medical society reported, physicians, especially those in high-risk specialties, have moved into Wisconsin and the Wisconsin courts struck down any reasonable measure our reforms work, the Wisconsin courts struck them down. We can only hope that Wisconsin enacts a new medical liability reform act. But until then we should pass the HEALTH Act. It will not only help Wisconsin doctors and patients but those in every State facing a medical liability crisis.

This bill is State-friendly. It does not preempt State reforms. If a State like Wisconsin has a cap on noneconomic damages, whether it is higher or lower, that cap will take effect. More important, it is doctor-friendly. It is patient-friendly. It will help us get a handle on at least a small portion of our health care costs. It will encourage doctors to continue to practice in vital specialties, and it will attack defensive medicine. I urge support for the HEALTH Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Judiciary.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

One of the problems we are going to have during this debate is the fact we are here under a closed rule. We will not have the ability to highlight or fix the shortcomings of the bill, so we will go back and forth on sound bites. We have already heard that this has been described as a proconsumer bill, notwithstanding the fact that I am not aware of any recognized consumer group that is supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, we say we have lost doctors because of the malpractice crisis, but we did not say anything about the reimbursement rates for some specialties, who are not getting paid as much, nor is there a suggestion that tort reform has actually produced more doctors. Because we have the same list of ineffectual initiatives that we have had in other tort reform bills, reducing victims’ rights without doing anything with malpractice rates, we will try to discuss provisions of the bill.

First, the rule rejected the alternative offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that would have actually reduced malpractice costs and helped underserved areas without going anywhere in helping and relieving from the liability the HMOs and pharmaceutical companies, which means that the doctors will have to pay more of the responsibility for malpractice. We cannot consider that.

But let us come to the specifics. This legislation preempts State law. The National Conference of State Legislators has already considered this bill, and they have rejected it. Their opinion, the National Conference of State
Legislators, have suggested this bill will make matters worse.

We have caps on damages, not on damages for wages and things like that, but for elderly, for children, for those who are without lost wages, they will be hurt. Incredibly, the cap on damages has not been shown to do anything about malpractice premiums. Those States with caps are paying the same malpractice premiums as those without caps.

We have heard about this fair share provision that says everybody just pays their fair share or more. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is a group with insurance, and which insurance company will pay. Some States have dealt with this and said if a doctor is at least 60 percent responsible, he can be held fully responsible, but for others, maybe you can have a fair share. This says everybody involved. In other words, you have to go after each and every physician, with a separate case, which will cost each and every one for every 1 or 2 percent responsibility they have. We have had the problem of having to sue so many doctors. Well, this requires you to sue each and every doctor.

We have heard about the collateral source rule; that if you have insurance, and listen up small businesses, if you are providing health care for your employees, and you have an employee who gets into a malpractice-induced coma, and somebody has to pay it, and your employee has gotten a recovery from the malpractice insurance, if the small business is paying the responsibility, the physician, the guilty party, will get credit for all of your health insurance, and you are going to have to continue to pay under that health insurance.

We limit attorneys’ fees in this legislation, which will do nothing to reduce malpractice premiums. We have different statutes of limitations, which will confuse people, and lawyers will miss the filing deadlines because of all this confusion.

We need insurance reform which will reduce premiums, not just attack victims. We need worthwhile legislation that will reduce the premiums. This will not do it. We need to defeat the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, concerns of reform claim that the current crisis is driven by a small number of so-called bad doctors. But as Yale Medicine Professor Dr. Robert Auerbach has explained, “The American Trial Lawyers Association has perpetrated myths on the American public, including the myth that a very small proportion of all physicians are responsible for the majority of claims. This is a sort of statistical magic, because, unfortunately, a small proportion of the physicians in high-risk specialties, such as obstetrics and gynecology and neurosurgery, are responsible for a disproportionate number of the claims.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), former chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

First of all, I am for medical malpractice reform. I think it is extremely important we address this issue. However, I have a real problem with this bill. In section 7, item (c), under punitive damages, this bill will protect the pharmaceutical industry against class action lawsuits by parents who have had their children damaged by mercury in vaccines that causes neurological problems, such as autism.

We had hearings on this for about 6 years, and we had scientists from all over the world, and the mercury in vaccines is a contributing factor to autism and other neurological disorders in children. It is in adult vaccines as well.

Now, I will not go into specifics of the bill, but according to attorneys I have talked to in the last couple of days, it protects the pharmaceutical companies against class action lawsuits. I would not have a problem with that if there was another avenue for these people to get some money.

We created the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund to take care of that. It was supposed to be nonadversarial. Unfortunately, parents have gotten nothing out of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund, even though there is $3 billion there. So there is only one avenue they have, and this legislation, the way I read it, blocks that.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) has worked with me on this, and I think he shares some of the same concerns that I have, and he is welcome to say a word or two if he wants to, but what I want to ask of the manager of the bill, would the gentleman work with me to try to clean this up so that we at least have an avenue to deal with this?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have spoken about this before. I happen to think that the problem lies with current law and not with this particular piece of legislation. But in any case, I share the gentleman’s concern that we work with him to address those concerns as this bill progresses to conference committee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his assurances.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding to me, and let me just add to what the gentleman was saying. There is a lot of active research on this, and the research is not conclusive, so we do not need to act right now.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a Dear Colleague letter which I sent to Members regarding this legislation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

The Vaccine Liability, Vaccine-Medical Malpractice Legislation Will Hurt Autistic Children and Their Families.

Dear Colleague: As we debate medical malpractice this week, I want to bring to your attention a provision that would waive vaccine manufacturer liability. Section 7(c) of the legislation states that no punitive damages may be awarded against a manufacturer or distributor of a medical product based on a claim that the product caused harm, unless the company violated FDA regulations. Essentially, this means as long as the vaccine goes through the regular FDA approval process, the company is shielded from liability.

In the 1980’s, roughly 1 in 10,000 American children were diagnosed with some kind of autism spectrum disorder. Today, that number has risen to 1 in 166 with the number rising alarmingly as children have been required to get more and more shots containing the mercury-based preservative thimerosal. During my tenure as Chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform, and as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and Wellness, I chaired numerous hearings examining the alarming increase in autism in this country over the last two decades. We conducted a four-year long investigation into the facts and theories surrounding the connection between mercury in vaccines (thimerosal) and autism and other childhood and adult neurodevelopmental disorders, such as Alzheimer’s. Credible scientific evidence points to a connection between thimerosal, autism and other neurodevelopmental disorders.

Many of the families of thimerosal’s victims did not know about the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund when the no-fault compensation system that provided for quick and fair recovery for those who experienced injuries related to a vaccination which Congress established were unable to file claims within the 3 year Statute of Limitations. Thousands of families were left out in the cold, unable to get to the compensation they are entitled to. They are out there with nothing. Their houses are being sold, they are going bankrupt, they are spending all their money and leading desperate lives trying to help their kids, and they cannot do it. Therefore, the only recourse they had was to file a class action lawsuit.

As the number of thimerosal injured children continues to grow, concerns of financial impact of these class action lawsuits, and the growing scientific research demonstrating a connection between thimerosal and autism, and the subsequent effect on the pharmaceutical industry’s bottom line prompted supporters of the Pharmaceutical industry to slip sections 1714 through 1717 into the Homeland Security Bill, effectively killing all thimerosal class action lawsuits. In the 11th hour without any debate, without anybody knowing about it or even discussing it, these lawsuits were stopped in the tracks.

Fortunately, the language was ultimately removed after being discovered by several Members concerned Members of House and Senate, Section 7(c) of the Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely
Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has demonstrated that they either do not have a plan to fix the problem of the uninsured, or they simply do not care. Instead, they drag out the same tired giveaways to insurance companies year after year while trampling on the rights of consumers and patients.

This bill is a perfect example. It does nothing to address the real causes of rising malpractice rates, but instead protects insurance companies from their own poor business practices. It protects the insurance companies from the injuries. It protects the manufacturers of medical devices. It protects everyone except the victims of medical malpractice.

We are told the bill is necessary to drive down insurance rates becausejuries are awarding too much money to plaintiffs. But the fact is lawsuits account for less than 2 percent of health care costs, as they always have, according to CBO. The average jury award has hardly increased as all in the last decade. In the last year, claims payments have decreased, gone down, by 9 percent, according to HHS, yet insurance premiums continue to rise.

So where is the crisis? Not in huge runaway juries and not in exorbitant awards. Yet we have here a spectacular assault on the rights of consumers and patients. A cap on noneconomic damages of $250,000 might have been reasonable in 1975 when it was first imposed in California, but today and with increasing inflation, it is worth less and less.

When we considered this bill in committee last year, I offered amendments to raise the cap to $1.5 million, or at least to index it to inflation so it does not get inflated faster than the consumer. Party line vote: Cannot do that.

But the biggest weakness of this bill is that it will not work. Anyone who thinks insurance rates will go down as a result of this bill is being sold a bill of goods. This bill merely hands the insurance executives will, out of the goodness of their hearts, reduce the rates they charge doctors. But there is no mechanism to guarantee this. Instead, the bill will simply lead to higher bottom lines for the insurance companies and protect the careless insurance companies and the careless manufacturers.

Every attempt by Democrats to mandate that savings be passed along to doctors in the form of lower rates was voted down by the Republicans. Mr. Speaker, we should not be misled by this bill’s supporters. Do not believe for a second that insurance rates will fall by 9 percent, according to HHS, yet payments have decreased, gone down, in the last decade. In the last year, claims payments have decreased, gone down, by 9 percent, according to HHS, yet payments have decreased, gone down, in the last decade.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, the last two commentators in opposition to this bill talked about the biggest problem with this bill being the lack of consumer protection.

I am going to tell my colleagues that the biggest consumer protection in this bill is the lawyer fees. When a person is injured severely, they ought to walk out of that courtroom at the end of the day with the preponderance, the largest portion, of that judgment in their pocket and not in the pocket of the lawyers. And that is consumer protection at its very best.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER), a valued member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I support common-sense medical liability reform because it will increase patients’ access to lifesaving health care, and it will save taxpayers over $30 billion a year in unnecessary defensive medical tests.

Let me give a real-life example. The Orlando Regional Medical Center is a large hospital located in the heart of my district in Orlando, Florida. It is home to the only Level I Trauma Center in central Florida which specializes in treating patients with severe brain and spine injuries.

Unfortunately, this important trauma center is in danger of closing because we only have a handful of neurosurgeons left in Orlando, and they cannot afford to pay the medical liability insurance premiums of over $250,000 a year. As a result of this liability crisis, the center had no choice but to turn away over 1,000 patients last year.

Now, what happens when neurosurgeons are not available? We do not have to guess. I personally met with Mrs. Leahy, Dyess, who testified before the Committee on the Judiciary. Her husband, Tony Dyess, suffered a very serious head injury in a car accident. The family had excellent medical insurance. What they did not have was a neurosurgeon. All the neurosurgeons in her area had left town because they could not afford the liability insurance. As a result, it took 6 hours to transport Mr. Dyess to a different location, but it was too late. He needed to be treated in the first hour. Mr. Dyess is now permanently brain damaged. He is unable to communicate, work, or to provide for his family.

Mr. Speaker, some opponents of this legislation say it is not Congress’ problem, let us just leave it up to the States. Well, it is our problem, because the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services estimates that this legislation will save taxpayers over $30 billion a year by avoiding unnecessary medical tests which are ordered by doctors under Medicare and Medicaid because of defensive medicine.

It does not have to be that way. Neurosurgeons in California, where they have a $250,000 cap, pay an average of only $59,000 a year in liability insurance, not the $250,000 they pay in Orlando, Florida. Let us bring common sense back to our health care system and give patients access to trauma centers and neurosurgeons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I move by unanimous request that we amend H.R. 5 to include a cap on premium increases for the duration of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. LATHAM. The Chair cannot entertain that request at this time.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I am making a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman restate his request?

Mr. WEINER. Certainly. My unanimous consent request is that H.R. 5 be amended by unanimous consent, the consent here of both the majority and the minority, that premium increases, health insurance premium increases, be limited to zero for the duration of the period of this bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will have to see the gentleman’s amendment to see if it meets the Speaker’s guidelines for recognition.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to what guidelines the gentleman refers. I know there have been guidelines about bringing a bill up at all, but I am not aware of any rule that governs the consideration of a bill once it has been brought forward. Could the Speaker enlighten us as to what guidelines he is discussing?

I am not aware of guidelines that deal with the bill once it is before us. I understand they have dealt with whether or not you consider the bill.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). It would be inappropriate for the chair to entertain a unanimous consent request for the consideration of a nongermane amendment absent conformity with the Speaker’s guidelines.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Would someone point to the rule for unanimous consent requests is not in order? I had not previously heard that. Further, I understand they have dealt with whether or not Members were recognized. Once recognized, as the gentleman from New York was, I am not aware of any restriction on what the gentleman can do as long as it is within the rules. Those guidelines I do not have recognition, as I understood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for unanimous consent requests is at the discretion of the Chair following the guidelines followed by several successive Speakers.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Is the Chair ruling a unanimous consent request which expresses the unanimous desire of the House of Representatives, is the Chair refusing that to be put to the body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reiterate that no unanimous consent request is at the discretion of the Speaker’s guidelines. Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Does that mean any unanimous consent request pertaining to a bill is out of order unless it meets what standard? Could the Chair enlighten us as to how one would become in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A unanimous consent request for the consideration of a nongermane amendment would have to have received clearance by the majority and minority floor and committee leadership. The Chair has not seen the gentleman’s amendment and is unaware of such clearance.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Is the concern not seen the gentleman makes a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Chair saying is, if we all agree upon that, could the gentleman will submit his amendment, the Chair would examine it. Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, if I can I can further heard on the unanimous consent request, and believe the paperwork is on the way, it is a very simple matter. The sponsor of the legislation says he wants to do what is right for right for consumers. Over and over we have heard the connection between the legislation and reducing premiums. All I am saying is I believe that, let us include the language herein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WEINER. No, I want to be heard on my unanimous consent, and I was recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman from New York. Mr. WEINER on his unanimous consent request. The gentleman is, however, recognized for the time yielded to him.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I still have a unanimous consent that is, I believe, in the hands of the Parliamentarian now.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I think all of the assembled Parliamentarians, staffs, the histrionics of the other side, the apoplexy over the idea that perhaps we might actually reduce premiums is fairly instructive to this debate.

We had no hearings on this. We had no chance to mark it up. We had no chance to introduce a reduction in premiums.

The gentleman from Georgia said this is a pro-consumer thing. If you really wanted it to be pro-consumer, you would reduce premiums. I would ask any Member on the other side of the aisle who supports this bill to simply say, We do not really care about reducing premiums.

Mr. Speaker, who are we fighting for in this bill is the insurance industry; they are getting protected. The HMOS, they are getting protected. The pharmaceutical companies, that is who is being protected by H.R. 5. But, frankly, do not deceive the American public by what this bill will do.

Insurance prices will not go down. Do Members know how we know this? First of all, the industry themselves have said in public that they have no intention of reducing what they paid our premiums unless this legislation is passed. We can look at other States that have caps. Find me one where insurance premiums went down. Look at California, ask them whether their premiums have gone down.

Frankly, the only way we know for sure that premiums will go down is to cap the premiums, but you will not do that. Not only will you not do that; you will do everything possible to avoid even considering it. That is why committee was bypassed.

And do not also say that doctors are going to face fewer claims as a result of this legislation. They are already seeing far fewer claims since they did in 2001. There were 29 per 1,000 physicians in 2001. There are 19 per 1,000 physicians in 2003. If we had a hearing in committee, we might find out what it is this year. You cannot say that, and you also cannot say this: you cannot say the amount being paid out in claims against physicians has reduced in States where there are caps.

We want you to be a Nation where there are caps. Let us look at the States where the caps are in place. The lowest number of claims per 1,000 physicians is in a State that does not have a cap, and the highest are among the States that do have the caps. What this issue is really all about, it is about who you all are fighting for and who are we fighting for.

You are fighting to take away the right of a jury. Your citizens, your constituents who apparently are brilliant enough to elect you, but not smart enough to solve a case that deals with medical malpractice, you are taking the right of a family who wants to take on a megapharmaceutical company or a mega-HMO, and the only way they can bring that suit is to make sure
they get enough money out of that company that they learn the lesson and they do not do it again.

Mr. Speaker, there is some irony here. You control the legislature, you control the judiciary, and still you do not trust any of those people to make the decisions. Only you know how much each and every one of these cases will yield.

Mr. Speaker, I have an alternative idea: get rid of the bad doctors, get rid of the bad lawyers, get rid of the bad judges, and get rid of this bad bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for a unanimous consent request.

REQUEST TO OFFER AMENDMENT
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment which is in writing at the desk and is germane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Frank moves to strike on page 11 lines 10 through 25 and page 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentleman from Massachusetts is heard.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I sought to offer which was kept out by an objection from the bill’s manager would have dealt with the section referred to by the gentleman from Indiana. I also, like the gentleman from Indiana, am prepared to vote for, as I have in the past, some restrictions on medical malpractice.

But what we have in this bill which has not gotten a lot of attention, and the gentleman from Indiana pointed it out, is a total exemption from punitive damages for drug manufacturers who get an FDA approval even though we have seen flaws in the FDA approval process.

What the majority has now made clear, they are insisting that this be taken in whole. The gentleman from Indiana made a good point, an objection to this amendment, and I share his objection. What I do not share is his faith that this is going to be taken care of.

The gentleman from Indiana, my good friend, was uncharacteristically mellow today in accepting an assurance that this will be looked at and looked at until it is signed into law, and then people will still be able to look at it as the law and those companies will have that exemption.

So what I offer today, and one might have thought under democratic procedures this would have been allowed, was simply to vote on that. I was, in the spirit of bipartisanship, acting on the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana. Forget about everything said about medical malpractice; the amendment I sought to offer and was blocked from consideration as we were by the Committee on Rules’ heavy-handedness, simply would have allowed this body to decide whether as part of a medical malpractice bill you would give an exemption from punitive damages to drug manufacturers. That is not medical malpractice. That is not related to the core of this bill. The majority will not even allow this to be discussed.

I think it is wrong to give that kind of exemption certainly without a lot more consideration, but what is even more wrong is this further abuse of power. The majority simply will not allow this House, like the gentleman from Indiana, elected representatives of the people, to decide on whether or not we give an exemption to the drug manufacturers.

They take medical malpractice, a sympathetic issue, and use it to cloak immunity for the drug manufacturers in part, and then arrogantly refuse to allow the House to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, I will say what I have said before. We are working with the people of Iraq and we are trying to get them to implement democracy. To the extent anyone from Iraq is watching the proceedings here, I would say to them, Please do not try this at home.

Please do not, in the Iraqi Assembly, show the contempt and the disregard and the arrogance for minority rights and democratic procedures, and maybe majority rights. I should amend this, They are not afraid of minority rights; they are afraid if we had an open and honest vote on this that a majority would decide not to let the drug companies carry out upon that darkness.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is right. I did vote for this bill last year, because I thought it was about medical malpractice and did not read it carefully. In fact, what happened was I voted for this bill in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), a former member of the Committee on the Judiciary and now a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the HEALTH Act. It is called the HEALTH Act for a very good reason. It is going to help a number of Iraqis and all people who now are finding it very difficult to have access to health care.

We have considered this bill twice in the last Congress, I believe once in the first Congress when I was here, and obviously the Members is simply disingenuous. This issue is so well known, not only to Members, but to the general public, that it scores as one of the most important issues when asked nationwide what we need to address.

The other side of the aisle suggested we deal with bad doctors, bad lawyers, and bad judges. Well, bad doctors, bad lawyers, and bad judges have not acted to deal with the States. The problem is that medical malpractice reform should have been dealt with by the States, but my State of Pennsylvania has not handled the problem. Many States have not acted to deal with this problem and avert further crisis.

Patients needing care face a real crisis in access to care. The wait is too long, the cost is too high. Physicians are quitting because of the high cost of medical malpractice insurance. From 2003 to 2004, Pennsylvania doctors faced double-digit medical malpractice insurance increases. The reason: out-of-control lawsuits.

According to the National Medical Practitioners Database, payouts in my State of Pennsylvania have risen from $37 million in 1991 to $578 million in 2003. These excessive lawsuits have gotten so out of control, as I mentioned earlier, that many doctors have quit the practice of medicine. That means patients do not have physicians to even see.

Last year I met with a dozen doctors from my district. Of the dozen, nearly all of them raised their hand when I asked them if they had children. One doctor said his wife refuses to allow her children to study medicine. We need to address this issue, and we need to address it today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is right. I did vote for this bill last year, because I thought it was about medical malpractice and did not read it carefully. In fact, what happened was I made the mistake last year that the gentleman from Indiana might make this year. I believed that they would honestly talk about medical malpractice, and it did not occur to me they would try to sneak into this bill something that gave partial immunity to the drug manufacturers.

So I admit that I did not read it thoroughly, but I will not when the gentleman is managing bills make that mistake again.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I had a revelation during the course of the exchange about capping premiums. What I found particularly fascinating was that my good friend from Georgia, our own Dr. Phil, is an advocate for wage control. In other words, cap those fees as long as I guess, it is lawyers. Maybe not for CEOs, but at least we know that he is a proponent of wage controls for lawyers.
But when it comes to price control, it seems that the majority has a problem. So you are in favor of capping wages, but not in favor of capping prices, because really that is what it comes down to. I guess it is a new tradition within the Republican Party.

In any event, for all the reasons that others have suggested, I think not only does this qualify as a bad bill because it is not going to accomplish the goal of lowering premiums, but I think, and I would suggest, it is a cruel bill, because on so-called non-economic damages impacts the most vulnerable among us, mothers who stay at home and particularly children, because they have no economic damages. They do not have such economic damages as the loss of potential earnings. So apart from their medical bills, all of their losses are noneconomic, like a lifelong physical impairment, or maybe a mental disability, or disfigurement. This bill will deny them the possibility of a life that at least has a modicum of respect and dignity in compensation for their loss, a loss which, by the way, they had no involvement in other than being the victim.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and a former member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, they are asking what are we for and what is this bill all about? I will tell you what we are for, what this majority is for, and what this bill is about. It is about preserving access to health care in our local communities, lots of communities, like my Seventh District of Tennessee. It is not about sitting here and saying, oh, we think all it is going to take to address health care is a big, fat Federal Government. It is about access to health care in our local communities.

Americans know that our health care costs are soaring. They also know that trial lawyers many times view our hospitals and our health care providers as a limitless ATM. That is the reason I cosponsored this legislation. My constituents have had the personal stories of losing a loved one where they have access to less and less available health care. We know that only one in seven OB-GYNs now deliver babies for fear of being sued, and the national medical liability rate has risen almost 25 to 30 percent below what they would be, 500 percent since 1976.

This is an issue that affects our families. It affects women. It affects children. It affects our rural communities. This bill is a way to assist in preserving health care for our local communities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), who has followed this subject ever since he has come to Congress.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I speak as both the son of a doctor and the son of a nurse. I introduced the Vioxx amendment that would prohibit this special liability protection for the pharmaceutical companies. Many Americans across the country are watching the Vioxx trial in Texas where the Ernst family has lost their loved one, a marathon runner, a personal trainer, a father, who lost his premature death because he took Merck’s Vioxx medication, and the FDA was not provided with all the information that should have warned of the dangers from that. According to the FDA’s doctor, seal to give protection, 55,000 premature deaths occurred because of Vioxx. That is the trial the American people are watching.

And then they tune in here to this Congress trying to do? They are trying to protect Merck and the other pharmaceutical companies in a way that no other industry would get that type of protection from any liability. This Congress would intervene all the way down in Texas where the Ernst family is trying to get their proper redress from the premature death of a marathon runner who had a heart attack because the information was withheld.

The irony of this whole situation is just last year, this Congress, bipartisan, said the FDA did not have the proper resources to regulate these medications. And now you want to hide behind the FDA’s Good Housekeeping seal to give protection to an industry in a way that no other industry in America gets.

Last year this Congress gave the pharmaceutical industry $132 billion in additional profit through the prescription drug benefit. Now you want to give them liability protection in a way that no other industry gets. You are like the gift that keeps on giving. There is a gift ban that is on in this Congress, and the pharmaceutical industry has got to be held accountable just like everybody else.

The Ernst family lost a loved one. According to the FDA, about 55,000 other deaths also have occurred. Let us have a debate about medical malpractice. Don’t muck it up with your political goals of trying to protect the pharmaceutical industry and other families from the proper redress of the courts.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, regarding Vioxx, some have alleged the company knowingly misrepresented or withheld information from the FDA or hid the protections in the bill because the bill specifically in section 7 says and excludes any instances in which a person, before or after pre-market approval, clearance, or licensure of such medical product, knowingly misrepresented to or withheld from the FDA information that is required to be submitted. If we look at the language of the bill, we can see that what the gentleman said is not relevant.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to the U.S. Congress, I served 14 years in my State general assembly. I spent a lot of time on this issue, dealing with issues like caps on non-economic damages, collateral sources, punitive payments, joint and several liability modifications, and venue shopping. I just heard some statements from the other side, well-intentioned, but, I must respectfully say, misguided, that simply mandating a premium reduction will not solve this problem. What will happen is what happened in my State.

In 1975, a State-administered medical liability program was created because no one wanted to write insurance in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1975. We were in a crisis. That did not solve the problem. That State-administered program is broke. My general assembly has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to pay doctors’ medical liability premiums and hospitals’ losses. That is even if you mandate that premium reduction. It sounds good, but it does not fix it.

The Governor of my State, Ed Rendell, a Democrat, I talked to his insurance commissioner a couple of years ago, and, if this is the problem, let’s look at the numbers. For every dollar paid at that time in medical liability premiums, there was $1.27 in losses incurred; $1 in, $1.27 out. That is an insurance problem. No one wants to write insurance. So if you mandate a premium reduction or hold it harmless, the State is going to have to set up a program, and they are going to have to find the money, and they are going to turn to the taxpayers. That is what is happening.

This legislation we are dealing with helps deal with this issue because providing for caps on noneconomic damages, Mr. Speaker, will help restore some level of predictability and stability to the insurance marketplace. You need to have people wanting to write insurance in these States. Competition will help you actually drive down costs. I know that some might find that unbelievable, but it will work. It has to work.

Mr. Speaker, in favor of H.R. 5, the Health Act of 2005.

This bill addresses one of the central issues in health care today: the way in which unpredictable, out-of-control legal judgments are driving up health care costs. This bill sets caps on punitive and non-economic damages that result from malpractice litigation. This is important because, as the Congressional Budget Office has noted, under this act, medical liability premiums would be an average of 25 to 30 percent below what they would be under current law. This is an insurance bill.
risk” disciplines such as neurosurgery, orthopedics, emergency medicine, and obstetrics. In my district, the crisis created in part by outrageous malpractice judgments is best exemplified by the experience of St. Luke’s Hospital.

St. Luke’s has been recognized nationally 17 times for clinical excellence. Despite this accomplishment, St. Luke’s became the target of a frivolous, outrageous lawsuit in the fall of 2000. As a direct result, St. Luke’s professional medical liability costs increased more than $4 million in just 2 years.

As a result of medical liability issues, Pennsylvania hospitals face challenges retaining neurosurgeons, without whom trauma centers cannot operate. In fact, a few years ago, another regional hospital serving my district—Easton Hospital—lost all of its neurosurgeons to other States. And Lehigh Valley Hospital, an extraordinary three-hospital network and the largest employer in my district, experienced a fivefold increase in their liability costs over the past few years.

Nothing about this bill prevents a litigant from bringing his case to court today in California, which was the model for the current health act, plaintiffs with legitimate claims still enjoy large recoveries. The Government Accountability Office, GAO, has determined that California has controlled medical liability insurance rates and premiums better than any home State, Pennsylvania. In fact, in Pennsylvania medical liability crisis is so acute that the legislature has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to assist physicians and hospitals with rapidly rising medical liability premiums. That’s like placing a Band-Aid on a gaping wound. Structural reform is needed; taxpayers bailouts—Band Aids, if you will—don’t solve the underlying problem.

For all these reasons, I believe that congressional intervention is essential in the form of support for the Health Act of 2005.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) smoked about this bill a couple of minutes ago when he simply asked that the bill include a provision that would require a flat medical malpractice premium rate. He smoked out the truth, and what we now know is that this bill is not about providing access to health care. It is not about solving a health care crisis. What it is about is protecting the insurance industry.

In fact, a study by the insurance commissioner of Missouri found that while malpractice premiums for doctors doubled from 2000 to 2004, malpractice claims during the same period increased less than 6 percent. Insurers themselves admit that capping medical malpractice payments will not reduce premiums. In fact, States that have caps have higher premiums than States without caps in every medical field, including internists, surgeons and OB-GYNs.

The proponents of this bill claim that large payouts are driving up the cost of medical malpractice insurance. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the opposite is occurring in Florida where the average amount insurers are paying for claims has gone down 14 percent since 1991. At the same time, however, premiums charged by insurers have increased 43 percent. In particular, overall claim payouts for Florida’s largest medical insurer, FPIC, have doubled in the last 4 years. Outrageously, remarkably, this same insurer saw a 154 percent increase in profits for the first quarter in 2004.

This legislation needs to be seen for what it is. It is not about helping doctors, it is not about helping patients. The only goal of this legislation is to ensure even higher profits for insurance companies while not doing a blasted thing to help the sick people in America, to help the people that provide the medical services to our people. This bill will not do one iota to improve health care in this country. The gentleman from New York smoked it out just right.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak on this important issue today.

Mr. Speaker, we, of course, passed this bill some 2 years ago last March. Down in Texas we passed a bill 2 years ago this September and a constitutional amendment that would essentially provide the same type of cap on noneconomic damages that we are discussing here today in H.R. 5.

It has been said before that the States are great laboratories for the Nation. If that is the case, let us examine what has happened in Texas in the 2 years since the cap has been passed. When I ran for Congress in the year 2002, we started the year 2002 with 17 insurers in the State of Texas. By the time I took this office at the start of 2003, we were down to two insurers. It is pretty hard to get competitive rates when you have driven 15 insurers out of the marketplace of the State. Proposition 12 in September of 2003, which allowed a cap on noneconomic damages, we have had 12 insurers come back to the State, which has provided competitive rates, and Texas Medical Liability Trust, my old insurer of record before I left medical practice, immediately dropped its rates 12 percent after the passage of Proposition 12 and then dropped its rates another 5 percent for a total of 17 percent in the first year since Proposition 12 was passed.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, an unintended consequence of the passage of Proposition 12 in Texas was what has happened in private, not-for-profit hospitals.

The Cristus Health Care System in south Texas, a self-insured hospital system, realized a $12 million savings from the 9 more obstetricians that proposition was passed, money that was put back into nurses’ salaries, capital expansion, the very things we want our hospitals to spend money on if they were not having to pay it for non-economic damages.

And, finally, I just cannot let pass the statement about price controls. Physicians have lived under price controls for certain all of their professional care, for the last 25 years. We have managed, sometimes poorly. But what happens when we have price controls is we end up with lines, and one of the biggest problems we have right now is the doctors are dropping out of practice, and we do not have the practitioners there to provide care for the patients.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me this very precious time.

Mr. Speaker, I am a doctor’s wife. There is nobody in this body that wants medical malpractice reform more than I. My husband’s medical malpractice has gone up exponentially every single year for exactly no reason, and if I thought for a minute that this legislation would cure that problem and provide relief for the doctors of this country, I would be all over this legislation.

Unfortunately, this piece of legislation will not do what the Republican side of the aisle says it will. And if the Republican leadership really wanted to provide relief for the doctors, we would have legislation on the floor that the bipartisan Congress could vote on and support and pass and put before the President for signature.

This is a bill not to help the doctors. This bill contains and limits claims against negligent hospitals, drug companies, medical device manufacturers, nursing homes, HMOs, and insurance companies. This bill is not for doctors. This bill is a gift to the insurance companies. There is no provision, there is no mention of a 28-page bill, that would ensure that the savings that was realized by the insurance companies would be passed on to the doctors. The doctors will continue to suffer while the insurance companies will get happier and richer.

There is a medical crisis in this country. There is a crisis in access to health care. This is not the legislation that is going to cure that. And for those people who talk lovingly and glowingly of the insurance companies and the marketplace and competition will lower the cost for the doctors, let us have another thought about that. Since when, since when, can the doctors put their faith in the insurance companies when it is the doctors who are the insurance brokers that are messing up the doctors? I do not like to see the doctors being used by the insurance companies to do the insurance companies’ dirty work.

Let us get a real check here. Let us not pass this dog of a piece of legislation. Let us work together and pass legislation that is truly going to provide medical malpractice reform and
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lower premiums for the doctors. They need it, and they deserve it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

I rise because this outstanding bill we are voting on today is so important to my constituency. Skyrocketing insurance premiums have been diminishing the nation’s health care delivery system for far too long. Women have been affected severely as OB/GYN doctors have stopped delivering babies because financially it does not make sense for them to practice in that area. The physicians who bring life into this world are too often forced to reject high-risk patients out of fear of future litigation. Trial lawyers continue to harass America’s doctors. Physicians continue to face the burden of skyrocketing insurance premiums.

As a mother and grandmother, I know this is not acceptable. The HEALTH Act of 2005 will provide the means to take action and thwart the efforts of greedy trial lawyers. In turn, this will help Americans, specifically women, get better access to the health care they need and deserve. More doctors will stay in business, creating more treatment options, less expensive care, and better access to health services for all Americans.

Health care dollars should be spent on patients in the hospital, not on lawyers in a courtroom. This bill will direct more health care dollars to treating and curing patients, which is what our health care system should be about.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I urge our Senators to drastically improve America’s health care system by passing this bill as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2% minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), who serves with distinction on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this unconscionable medical malpractice liability bill. This bill will do nothing to lower the skyrocketing health care costs in this country. All it will do is deprive people who are already sick and injured of justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that most Americans do not have access to affordable health care and that many specialists and trauma centers are closing their doors. But instead of addressing our health care crisis head on, my Republican colleagues have come up with H.R. 5.

H.R. 5 is deplorable as it is ineffective. Trying to stabilize medical malpractice insurance rates by capping legitimate victims’ damages is akin to trying to put out a forest fire with a squirt gun. I know that H.R. 5 will not magically keep medical malpractice insurance rates down and keep doctors in business because the bill is modeled after California’s Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act, better known as MICRA.

My Republican colleagues love to sing the praises of MICRA. But guess what? MICRA did not work. MICRA’s caps on pain and suffering damages have not reduced insurance rates for doctors in my State. MICRA was passed in 1975. Medical malpractice insurance rates did not stabilize until years after MICRA was passed. In fact, between 1975 and 1993, California’s health care costs rose 343 percent, nearly twice the rate of inflation and 9 percent higher than the national average each year.

When California’s insurance rates stabilized, it was because the State passed legislation to directly deal with the insurance problem. They passed an insurance reform bill known as Proposition 103. It is a shame that the Republican leadership of the House is further victimizing victims instead of getting at the root of the real problem. Where is their leadership on the real health care issues that Americans care about? Where is a Republican House bill to provide health care for every working family? Where is a Republican House bill to encourage more students to go into medicine and nursing and for practicing doctors to keep their doors open? Where is a Republican House bill that deals directly with medical malpractice insurance rates?

My Republican colleagues have not offered bills that will help reform our health care system. Legislation like H.R. 5 will bring needed medical liability reform to health care providers in Washington State.

As I travel around eastern Washington, I hear from desperate doctors and health care providers that these lawsuits are increasing costs to patients and driving doctors out of business. It is not unusual to hear that doctors are being forced to drop their insurance or stop delivering babies, or younger doctors are quitting to practice overseas. This is a time when we have a health care personnel shortage. This has happened in areas within my district, such as Odessa, Republic, and Davenport, where we have no OB/GYNs, and pregnant women must travel over an hour now for care. Additionally, it is becoming impossible to recruit and retain specialists, such as neurosurgeons and cardiologists, when 30 to 50 percent experience lawsuits annually. Emergency care is in even better shape with trauma surgeons being sued each year. This is unacceptable for 21st century health care.

Skyrocketing medical liability insurance costs for doctors and health care providers has caused the American Medical Association to declare that Washington State is in a medical liability crisis. In the past 10 years, the average jury findings in my State have increased 68 percent. As well, the number of million-dollar settlements has risen almost ten times.

This is an important bill that limits excessive lawsuits, but also ensures that those who are truly harmed are going to get their day in court. Over the past few years, it has been enacted, Washington would have saved an estimated $53 million. HHS estimates that by setting reasonable guidelines for these noneconomic damage awards, we will save between $70 billion and $126 billion in national health care costs annually.

H.R. 5 will bring common-sense reform to outrageous liability rates and will protect patients’ access to quality and affordable health care.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

All the public should know on this bill is that no Democrats were allowed to make any amendments to this bill. They were not allowed to debate this bill. Even the great gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that would have said that all of the savings from the pain and suffering of patients would
then go to lowering of premiums for doctors, every Republican voted against that because the insurance industry does not want the money to go to lower premiums for doctors. And then this year when I wanted to make an amendment in the Committee on Energy and Commerce that would have said the same thing, lower premiums, I was not allowed to make the amendment. Out here on the House floor, I was not allowed to make the amendment.

So it is not about lowering the premiums for physicians with the money that is “saved” from the money that would have gone to someone whose family had been harmed because they might have lost their sight, their limbs, their ability to bear children, their ability to fully function in society. All of those savings for the insurance industry, they are very real. But the lowering of medical malpractice fees is only illusory.

And secondly, this bill will protect the pharmaceutical industry from liability as long as the drugs that harm patients are FDA-approved. The FDA approval is designed to protect patients from harmful drugs, but it should not waive a company’s responsibility for drugs they put on the market. With all of the recent reports about how FDA approved drugs that harmed people, from Vioxx to Bextra to Accutane to Paxil, now is not the time to limit patients’ access to the courts, but that is just what the pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry is going to get on the House floor today.

Vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and former attorney general of California.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to make an editorial comment on some of the suggestions that have been made that MICRA does not work in California and refer only to those parts of this bill that are patterned after MICRA.

Prior to the time that I came to Congress for the first tour, I did medical malpractice cases in California, primarily on the defense side for doctors and hospitals, but I also handled some plaintiffs’ cases. In fact, I think I had one of the first successful lawsuits against an HMO in the entire country.

MICRA came into California at a time when we had a crisis, when we had a medical crisis of doctors leaving the State of California or stopping their practice.

It was particularly acute in some specialties, but it was across the board. The evidence is there. The history is there. I can tell you it was there; I saw it.

In 1975, the legislature, in response to that problem, passed MICRA. That is what this is patterned after. It had a $250,000 limitation on pain and suffering. It had these other recommended changes with respect to recovery. It has not stopped successful lawsuits against doctors who have, in fact, committed malpractice.

But what it has done is it has taken a part of the process that basically abused the process out. And what it has done is stabilize what was otherwise a tremendous spiral in the medical malpractice premiums that doctors saw. Not only did this not work that is not the case in California. What I can tell my colleagues is it stopped the exit of doctors from the State of California. It stopped the exit of specialists from practice in the State of California. And while it did not diminish entirely the increases, it stopped the trajectory of increases. As a result, it did provide a very serious partial solution to the problem that we found in California.

That is the model. To the extent this bill is modeled after MICRA, that is the model we are talking about.

So if people want to talk about pilot projects, we have a 20-plus-year pilot project in the State of California. Ask the medical community whether or not it has been effective. Ask the patients who now have availability to the services of doctors who otherwise they would not have had we not done something in the State of California.

So for those who are wondering whether or not this will work, at least that part of the bill that is patterned after MICRA will. We have now had a 20-plus-year pilot project, and it has proven to be successful.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to know that this bill is based on the California program of MICRA, and premiums for medical malpractice insurance grew more quickly between 1991 and 2000 than the national averages. Just remember that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5. It is an ill-conceived, ill-crafted bill that does nothing to help drive costs down. Studies have shown that this is not the way to go. In fact, insurance companies are the ones that are gaming us right now.

In California, malpractice rates have actually come down because we have enacted this work, as mentioned earlier. We need to do more to provide for, I would say, a level playing field so that the insurance companies do not walk away taking advantage of our consumers.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5. As many of my colleagues have pointed out, there are various troublesome aspects of this bill, including the recent study that demonstrated clearly the rising cost of insurance premiums, while the claims have remained steady in terms of the ultimate litigation outcomes of those claims that have been filed. So we should be careful about legislation that is not more comprehensive to hold insurance companies accountable as well.

But H.R. 5 is also troublesome because of its blatant disregard for States’ rights. In its 2004 legislative session, a bill modeled on H.R. 5 was defeated in committee on a unanimous bipartisan vote. I think this sends a strong signal that H.R. 5 does not provide the type of comprehensive solution to medical malpractice insurance premiums that States are looking for and will stifle innovation in the States that has been important to the health care industry.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply very quickly to the point that was made, and that is that this bill does not violate any States’ rights. Section 7(a) very clearly says that any State has any cap of any amount, be it higher or lower than the caps in the bill, then that State’s cap will prevail. So this recognizes States’ rights. It is friendly to States’ rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and also chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Law.

Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this bill. I rise in strong support of the bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

The costs of the tort system continue to take their toll on the Nation’s economy. Medical professional liability insurance rates have doubled in recent years, causing major insurers to drop coverage or raise premiums to unaffordable levels. We have heard case after case where this last occurred nationwide. In fact, in my home State of Ohio, it has been designated as a “crisis State” by the American Medical Association. According to some estimates, premiums are now rising in Ohio anywhere from 10 percent to 40 percent, which is not newsworthy.

We have to find a better and more effective way to hold insurance companies accountable as well.

The HEALTH Act, this act that we debated here this afternoon, addresses this crisis by eliminating frivolous lawsuits and making health care more accessible and more affordable. We have been talking about the legislation that for years. This is a bill where we can actually do something about making health care more affordable.
The HEALTH Act has enjoyed strong support in the House of Representatives in past Congresses, and I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation if they are serious about bringing health care costs down. This year, for example, the Washington State insurance commissioner ordered insurers to refund more than $1 million in premiums to physicians because rate hikes were unjustifiable. But I tried to do an amendment, I did it in committee last time when we heard it, and I tried to submit it to the Committee on Rules: let us do a study. Let us figure out why these rates are high and why Dennis Kelly says they are not going down. The Republican majority refused to even allow a study of malpractice insurance rates and why they are so high. That is what this bill is really about. Because billion-dollar insurance companies have Federal antitrust exemptions, they can legally fix prices, and this has helped the industry gain a record $25 billion in annual profits.

Now, there is one thing we can agree on across the aisle: Congress must stop this price-gouging of physicians. But granting blanket liability protection to negligent nursing homes, to pharmaceutical companies, and insurance companies, without addressing insurance billing practices, does nothing to solve the problem for these doctors. And what is worse, the immunity for these other industries will be broader than any State tort reform law. It will do nothing to help the doctors; and in the end, it will serve to severely limit the rights of many millions of Americans. It undermines our health care system to penalize victims of medical negligence in the name of relieving doctors' burdensome malpractice premiums. The GAO found that over half, over half of the filed medical professional liability claims were by the opponents of this legislation are forgetting, I hope not ignoring, a study by the Harvard Medical Practice. What this study found is that over half, over half of the filed medical professional liability claims they studied were brought by plaintiffs who suffered either no injuries at all or, if they did, such injuries were not caused by their health care providers, but rather by the underlying disease itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrey).

Mr. Gingrey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my time, I hope sufficient time, to refute some of these statements that have been made in opposition. I want to start with the gentleman from Colorado who just spoke. It is absolutely wrong about the issue of Federal law superseding State law in cases where the State has already addressed the issue.

Let us say the issue of caps, my State of Georgia passed a law this year, and the caps are $350,000. That would be applicable State law would apply. It is only when States have not addressed the issue when the Federal law would speak.

I want to also address something the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. Herseth) State and every other State, this bill would supersede any other rate or caps they might have with the Federal law. That is wrong. I think we should abide by the States' rights and defeat this bill.

Smith of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what was just said was actually contradicted by the Government Accountability Office. The GAO found that rising litigation awards are responsible for skyrocketing medical professional liability premiums. The report stated that "GAO found that losses on medical malpractice claims, which make up the largest part of the insurers' costs, appear to be the primary driver of rate increases."

The GAO found that insurers are not telling the truth for skyrockets professional liability premiums. The GAO report states that insurers "profits are not increasing, indicating that insurers are not charging and profiting from excessively high premium rates."

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that the opponents of this legislation are forgetting, I hope not ignoring, a study by the Harvard Medical Practice. What this study found is that over half, over half of the filed medical professional liability claims they studied were brought by plaintiffs who suffered either no injuries at all or, if they did, such injuries were not caused by their health care providers, but rather by the underlying disease itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the American health care system is in crisis, in part, because of skyrocketing medical malpractice insurance rates. This crisis, however, is not the result of frivolous lawsuits, but of insurance industry practices. The so-called solution that we are debating today, carving out enormous new liability exemptions for health insurers, pharmaceutical companies, medical device manufacturers, and nursing homes would not lower doctors' malpractice insurance rates by one dollar. Too many doctors are struggling to keep their practices afloat under the burden of enormous insurance rates but, instead of helping them, what we are doing today is penalizing the severely injured patients and the families of those who die as a result of medical negligence without providing any relief to the doctors from high malpractice insurance rates.

A new study, and we have been talking about the rule, the gentleman from Colorado who just spoke. It is absolutely wrong about the issue of Federal law superseding State law in cases where the State has already addressed the issue.

One further note. Anyone reading this bill, in this bill, in this bill, in this bill, saying that the opponents of this legislation are forgetting, I hope not ignoring, a study by the Harvard Medical Practice. What this study found is that over half, over half of the filed medical professional liability claims they studied were brought by plaintiffs who suffered either no injuries at all or, if they did, such injuries were not caused by their health care providers, but rather by the underlying disease itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5½ minutes.
Where large damages are awarded, it is a jury that has found that the patient has been severely harmed, and, in fact, over the last 5 years, malpractice insurance payments to patients have actually gone down, and that while premiums continue to go up. Now, something must be done.

There is no evidence that capping the damages to an injured person because of malpractice is the way to solve this problem. It will not lower premiums. It will not even stabilize them. All this bill says is that unless these malpractice insurers collect outrageous premiums, they will be able to continue to pay out even less to the patients who have actually been harmed. This will penalize innocent victims of medical negligence.

Furthermore, the bill goes far beyond lawsuits against doctors. It would also protect drug companies and HMOs from lawsuits filed by people injured because of their policies.

In 3 years of considering this issue, the majority has not presented a shred of evidence that drug companies need these protections. They are making billions of dollars in profits. If this bill becomes law, the ability of injured patients or their families to hold drug companies accountable would be dramatically limited. We have all seen the recent stories about Cox-2 inhibitors, other medications. So many have tragic outcomes. They highlight the fact that drug companies need protections. These lawsuits expose how dangerous this bill can be. We should be helping doctors with malpractice insurance premiums. But this bill is not going to help doctors, and it will hurt patients.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. Let us look for real solutions to rising medical malpractice premiums.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues might be interested in some quotes.

One quote is from a former Democratic Senator, and the other quote is from a liberal Washington Post columnist. I would like to read those now.

Former Democratic Senator George McGovern has written that “legal fear drives doctors to prescribe medicines and order tests, even invasive procedures that they feel are necessary. Reputable studies estimate that this defensive medicine squanders $50 billion a year, enough to provide medical care to millions of uninsured Americans.”

Mr. Speaker, this is from a prominent liberal commentator, Michael Kinsley. He wrote in the Washington Post, “Limits on malpractice lawsuits ... is a good idea that Democrats are wrong and possibly foolish to oppose. Republicans are right about malpractice reform.”

Mr. Speaker, also we have a number of polls showing what the American people support, the HEALTH Act. Between two-thirds and three-quarters of the American people support exactly what we are trying to do. Just this week a poll conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health found the following: “More than 6 in 10, 63 percent, say they would favor legislation that would limit the amount of money that can be awarded as damages for pain and suffering to someone suing a doctor for malpractice.”

The same poll found that 69 percent of the people surveyed say a law limiting pain and suffering awards would help either a lot or some in reducing the overall cost of health care.

Finally, the results of a recent Gallup poll show that the American public strongly supports the HEALTH Act. The survey asked whether those surveyed would favor or oppose a limit on the amount patients can be awarded for their emotional pain and suffering. Mr. Speaker, 72 percent were in favor. That means three-quarters of the American people favor this HEALTH Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 5. Despite its name, this bill is a poor attempt to make health care more efficient, accessible, affordable or timely.

It is not even a serious attempt to lower malpractice insurance costs. I agree that Congress needs to comprehensively address medical malpractice issues. I understand and sympathize with doctors facing rising premiums. But this bill is not the answer.

Malpractice premiums are rising as costs in all segments of health care are rising. And doctors, according to this USA Today article, still pay less for malpractice insurance than they do for their rent. And as the headline says here, “Hype outpaces facts in medical malpractice debate.”

I am opposed to this legislation for many reasons. First, it has never been brought to the floor with any consideration by the Energy and Commerce Committee. No hearings were ever held. And there were no opportunities to amend this bill, to include provisions that might actually help solve the problem of premium increases.

The majority believes that the answer to lower medical malpractice premiums is to institute an arbitrary $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages in malpractice suits. However, large jury awards are not the cause of the problem. Only 1.9 percent of all claims result in judgments, and of the noneconomic caps hurt the children and the low-income wage-earners the most.
Do we really want to create a capped system where the makers of Vioxx, Accutane, Celebrex and any other drug are suddenly off the hook because of a weak FDA, and the only thing to keep them remotely honest is the trial system?

In addition, this legislation undermines the foundation of our court system, trial by jury of our peers. If we trust juries to determine whether a person is guilty or innocent and should die in a death penalty case, surely we can trust them to determine compensation for victims in medical malpractice. The fact is that juries are cautious, and patients only prevail in one of every five cases that ever go to trial.

Let me tell you what the bill fails to do. It fails to address the real driver of medical malpractice insurance costs, the insurance industry itself. The insurance industry investments tanked in the beginning of this decade because of the stock market, and now the industry is squeezing health care providers in an effort to protect their bottom line. Why are we not looking at the insurance industry, including the fact health insurers continue to exempt from antitrust legislation?

In addition, the bill does not address the rising health insurance costs. The Congressional Budget Office, our own CBO, found that even large reductions in medical malpractice costs will have little effect on health care costs.

Finally, the bill does nothing to address the two root causes of medical lawsuits, medical errors and bad actors in the health care system. It is a tragedy that medical errors account for almost 100,000 patient deaths each year, but Congress has done very little to address this issue.

The bill also does nothing to address the fact that 5 percent of all doctors are responsible for 54 percent of the malpractice claims paid. Why do we allow health care providers to practice if they have a long record of errors?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a little earlier today, we talked about the insurance industry and its role. But let us make it very clear. We need the structural reforms contained in the HEALTH Act, H.R. 5, in order to continue to provide access to quality care for our constituents and patients of the United States.

We also need to incent insurance companies to write policies in our States, which they will not do indefinitely in this current environment. And I remember a few years ago when people said, when the crisis was acute in Pennsylvania, they said the problem is the companies invested money foolishly in the stock market. Well, a lot of people lost money in the stock market a few years ago. At that time the insurance companies in my State had about 8 to 10 percent of their money in equities. Most of it was in investment-grade bonds, which did rather well. But that really was not the cause of the problem.

But let me tell you about the city of Philadelphia. In my State, many people want to get their cases heard in a Philadelphia courtroom. Why? Because the juries pay more. According to Jury Verdict Research, at that time the average jury verdict award in Philadelphia was $100 million jury verdict in a Philadelphia courtroom. In a Philadelphia courtroom, it was an outrageous decision. It was settled for something less than that. I will tell you that right now.

But it was an outrageous situation, considered a major institution that has been internationally recognized on many occasions for clinical excellence. That is one of my problems.

We have also heard, too, that this is not a Federal problem. Does the word Medicare mean anything to anyone around here? Medicare will save billions of dollars over 10 years if we enact the reforms contained in this legislation.

Furthermore, in many States again like mine in Pennsylvania, to amend the constitution to permit caps on non-economic damages literally is a 4- to 5-year process.

But we cannot wait 4 to 5 years to solve this problem. That is why we need the HEALTH Act now. We can do it much more quickly. It is absolutely critical. A Band-Aid will not stop the bleeding. Structural reforms are required.

As I mentioned a little earlier today, in my State, taxpayers, particularly cigarette smokers, that is who is paying, at over a million dollars per year in hospitals’ medical liability premiums, that is who is paying the bill because no one wants to write insurance, and the State-administered fund is broke. They will have to find hundreds of millions of dollars more come January 1 to fix this.

The point is, structural reform is needed. Taxpayer bail-outs and Band-Aids will not fix the problem. I commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) for his leadership on this issue. A former colleague, Jim Greenwood, I thank for his leadership in the last session; and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox) as well. I want to thank them for their leadership. I urge passage of H.R. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 11 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES). Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. DEGETTE) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. DEGETTE) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES). Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, let me share with my colleagues the result of three studies, including the fact health insurers continue to look at the insurance industry, investigating, looking at the insurance industry, including health insurers continuing to look at the insurance industry, assessing their bottom line. Why are we not looking at the insurance industry, including the fact health insurers continue to exempt from antitrust legislation?

In addition, the bill does not address the two root causes of medical lawsuits, medical errors and bad actors in the health care system. It is a tragedy that medical errors account for almost 100,000 patient deaths each year, but Congress has done very little to address this issue.

The bill also does nothing to address the fact that 5 percent of all doctors are responsible for 54 percent of the malpractice claims paid. Why do we allow health care providers to practice if they have a long record of errors?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

I yield myself 2 minutes.
and let me emphasize that these studies are not about hypothetical situations. They are not theoretical studies. They are studies of the actual experiences of States that have enacted reforms similar to the ones we have in this bill that we are talking about today.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, States with reasonable legal reforms including caps on noneconomic damages enjoy access to more physicians per capita: ‘We found that States with caps on noneconomic damages experienced about 12 percent more physicians per capita than the States without such a cap. Moreover, we found that States with relatively high caps were less likely to experience an increase in physician supply than States with lower caps.’

Mr. Speaker, also, research shows that California reforms, which the HEALTH Act is based on, have not resulted in unfair awards to deserving victims. A recent comprehensive study of California’s MICRA reforms by the RAND Corporation concluded that under MICRA, ‘awards generally remained quite large despite the imposition of the cap, and California’s reforms have not resulted in any disparate impact on women or the elderly.’

Mr. Speaker, in another study, researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health stated that ‘we found no evidence that women or the elderly were disparately impacted by the cap by noneconomic damages in California under MICRA.’

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we make sure that all our colleagues are clear on some of the issues that have been discussed here today. I know there has been some hyperbole, maybe on both sides of the issue, and I want to be very clear.

This bill protects our patients, first and foremost, and gives them the opportunity to have a stable health care and to the specialist that they need and when they need it. It also helps our physicians, our doctors be able to stay in practice when they have an opportunity to have a stable medical malpractice insurance premium that they have to pay.

Yes, there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that section 7 in regard to punitive damages, that is applicable to our doctors as well as companies that make medical equipment. It also is applicable to drug companies that provide us with life-saving drugs if they have done so in a fashion that is not negligent and not deliberately intended to harm a patient.

Here is an example, Mr. Speaker: things like time released infusion, chemotherapy, pump infusion pumps for diabetics, titanium hip replacements, artificial heart valves. If the makers of these life-saving devices were subject to punitive damages every time something otherwise went wrong, we would be in the situation that we were in a year and a half ago in regard to a lawsuit. Nobody wants to get involved in that business for the fear of a lawsuit. And with the government setting prices on flu vaccines, the profit margin to begin with was very limited.

So this section 7 is a very important provision in this bill, Mr. Speaker. So again, I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to understand that this is not a bad provision. This is a good provision.

Mr. Speaker, also one of the speakers in opposition, Mr. Gingrey, virtually several of the speakers in opposition, said that this bill has been brought to us, we have had no hearings, we have had no opportunity, we have had no voice. It is not true, Mr. Speaker.

This is the fourth time in 3 years that this exact same bill, H.R. 5, has been dealt with on the floor of this House. It is the exact same bill.

I joined that in 2003. We dealt with it in 2003. We dealt with it in 2004, and here we are with the exact same bill. Section 7 was in the bill, the section in regard to punitive damages. Nothing has changed. In fact, in the Committee on Energy and Commerce this February, a hearing was held on medical liability and some 15 witnesses were at that hearing, Mr. Speaker. So it is untrue to suggest that we have not had hearings and they have not had an opportunity. They know this bill.

It is a good bill. We have passed it. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are to refrain from referring to persons in the gallery.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleague who just spoke that our separation of powers provides that all aspects of the government are limited to some extent. If juries or judges give outrageous awards, like any other exercise of government power, they should be subject to reasonable checks and balances.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to remind my colleagues that unnecessary and frivolous litigation is threatening the very viability of the life-saving drug industry. To encourage the development of life-saving drugs, the HEALTH Act contains a safe harbor from punitive damages from a defendant whose drugs or medical product comply with rigorous rules or regulations. The provision is manifestly fair.

Why should a drug manufacturer be found guilty of malicious conduct when
all they did was sell a product approved as safe under the comprehensive regulations of the FDA? Claims for unlimited economic damages and reasonable noneconomic damages could still go forward under the HEALTH Act. The safe harbor does not apply if relevant information was misrepresented or withheld from the FDA.

Eight States have, in fact, provided an FDA regulatory compliance defense against damages just like this bill. Those States are Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, and Utah. Opposing this bill jeopardizes those State laws. And the Members who are from those States might want to remember that.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is overwhelming. Without legal reform, patients will continue to go without needed doctors: women will continue to deliver babies on the side of the road because the nearest OB/GYN is hundreds of miles away; parents will continue to be forced to watch as their child with brain injury suffers because lawsuits forced the nearest neurosurgeon to stop practicing.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has 3 1⁄2 minutes remaining—

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. Speaker, nobody disputes that malpractice premiums are heavily impacting many physicians. I think very few of us would dispute that there are frivolous claims filed. All of the justifications for this bill about losing physicians in high-risk practices are real concerns. So why is it that we are spending this time debating a bill that won’t address this problem? Repeatedly dramatizing the problem doesn’t make this bill a solution. This bill does nothing to prevent frivolous lawsuits. It doesn’t rein in the bad actors, in penalizes those who are the most grievously injured.

Experience shows that the link between awards or settlements and premiums is tenuous at best. An exhaustive study published this month showed that premiums have gone up 120 percent over the last 5 years while claims were flat. The GAO has found no evidence that caps on damages hold premiums down.

But even if this bill could work—it would not, Mr. Speaker, but even if it could—we are completely missing the real issue.

We are fighting about how or how not to compensate the victims of mistakes and hold negligent providers accountable. Shouldn’t we be talking instead about how to ensure fewer mistakes in the first place?

We are talking about closing the barn door but the horse is already galloping across the field.

Mr. Speaker, Sorrel King can teach us all a lesson. Several years ago, her 18-month-old daughter Josie suffered severe burns and was rushed to the ICU at Johns Hopkins Hospital. She got the world-class care you would expect and they saved her life. She was going home in just a few days. And then communications were botched, orders were lost, and Josie was administered a drug she was not supposed to get, over Sorrel’s objection. And even then, further warning signs were missed. Josie died in one of our Nation’s finest hospitals. Johns Hopkins settled with Sorrel and her family. And—here is where we can learn something—Sorrel turned around and gave the money back to Hopkins to create a new patient safety program.

Mr. Speaker, like Sorrel, we need to spend less effort apportioning blame and more effort making our system safer and better. Hundreds of thousands of our constituents die in hospitals every year not so much of the care they get, but because of it. These are mostly systems problems, not the result of individual negligence.

Last year I introduced the Josie King Act to begin transforming health care delivery so that the system itself is driving better quality at lower costs. It laid out a roadmap to bringing health care into the information age and promoted the development of uniform quality metrics so that providers, the public, and purchasers have a clearer picture of which providers get the wound out faster for patients.

Now we are finally beginning to see attention to these priorities, which, unlike the current debate, have bipartisan support. We won’t reach agreement about capping damages to patients who are hurt, but we can agree that the system should hurt fewer people.

We can pass strong health IT legislation this year, like the bill Mr. MURPHY from Pennsylvania and I introduced or the one that was reported out of committee in the other body. We can pass strong legislation this year to begin linking reimbursements to outcomes and quality. I know we have strong leadership on both sides of the aisle, in several committees and in the House leadership, for both of those things.

Until we begin aligning incentives in health care so that providers who go the extra mile to make their patients better or, even better, keep them healthy—people are going to keep getting hurt.

Until we begin aligning incentives in health care so that the tools of the information age can help make care more accurate and more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friends on the other side that physicians need lower malpractice rates. I also believe that the best way to get fewer lawsuits is to get fewer mistakes. Let’s keep our eyes on the ball and make our health care system better, safer, and more efficient and make everyone better off.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) for yielding me this time and for her leadership on issues that relate to the health and well-being of the American people.

I also want to salute the two distinguished ranking members, first the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONyers) of the Committee on the Judiciary for his leadership on this important legislation; and I especially want to acknowledge the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who this year celebrates his 50th anniversary in Congress, and every day of those 50 years he has worked to improve access to quality health care for all Americans. But particularly on this 40th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, it is worth noting the contributions of the gentleman from Michigan in providing health care security for millions of seniors. Instead, the fundamental principle that Democrats believe in: Health care is a right, not a privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican medical malpractice bill. Let me begin with this simple fact: Under President Bush, 5.2 million more Americans joined the ranks of the uninsured. Today, 45 million Americans have no health insurance. The bill before us does not, nor does any other Republican bill during this so-called Health Week, provide health insurance to one single American.

This bill is not about solving the urgent health insurance crisis that affects millions of American families, nor is it about improving our health care system, containing costs, or even lowering medical malpractice insurance premiums. Instead, the Republican medical malpractice bill, first and foremost, is a windfall to the big drug companies at the expense of those who are injured or killed by harmful and unsafe drugs. Once again, protecting the big drug companies is at the top of the Republican agenda.

The Republicans have attempted to hide the true purpose and the real reason for this bill. It contains a special liability waiver for drug companies for the types of injuries caused by drugs. Under this Republican bill, what if Americans are injured, or even killed, by drugs that have been negligently marketed, they will not be able to obtain justice and hold drug companies wholly accountable.

The Republican leadership, beholden to the pharmaceutical companies, refuses to allow amendments that would strike this unjust provision. As with the Medicare prescription drug bill, where Republicans prohibited the government from negotiating for low prices for seniors, and forbade Americans from purchasing lower-priced drugs from Canada, this is yet another example of the Republicans being the handmaidens of the pharmaceutical industry.
The Republican medical malpractice bill is an extreme bill that is an injustice to consumers, and it unconscionably rewards irresponsible drug companies. If we are to remain a nation that seeks justice, the special liability waiver for drug companies must be removed. Unfortunately, the Republicans refused to permit the consideration of the Emanuel-Berry amendment to remove this unjust and reprehensible provision.

Apart from pandering to drug companies, this bill utterly fails to achieve its stated purpose. It will not lower medical malpractice insurance premiums, nor does it address the real cause. The real cause of high medical malpractice premiums is not the payouts for malpractice claims. Former Missouri State Insurance Commissioner Jay Angoff issued a recent study showing the amount collected in premiums by major medical malpractice insurers has doubled, while the claims paid out have remained flat, resulting in excessive profits and excessive reserve surpluses.

The Angoff study found that insurance companies are charging far more for malpractice insurance than actual payments or estimated future payments warrant. This finding is also supported by numerous studies that document instances that have impacted caps or damage awards, they have not seen their premiums for malpractice insurance lowered.

By addressing insurance companies’ refusal to lower rates, the Republican bill instead interferes with the rights of injured Americans to be compensated for their injuries and have their claims heard by a jury of their peers. If enacted, the cap on damages would severely harm women, children, and the elderly who have been injured. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not seen their premiums for medical malpractice insurance lowered.

Rather than addressing insurance companies’ refusal to lower rates, the Republican bill instead interferes with the rights of injured Americans to be compensated for their injuries and have their claims heard by a jury of their peers. If enacted, the cap on damages would severely harm women, children, and the elderly who have been injured. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not seen their premiums for medical malpractice insurance lowered.

Raising insurance companies’ refusal to lower rates, the Republican bill instead interferes with the rights of injured Americans to be compensated for their injuries and have their claims heard by a jury of their peers. If enacted, the cap on damages would severely harm women, children, and the elderly who have been injured. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not seen their premiums for medical malpractice insurance lowered.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, as we are prepared to close on this side.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas says that this bill does not preempt State law. In fact, the bill includes a sweeping preemption of State law which is designed to override State laws that protect doctors and patients while keeping in place State laws that favor doctors, hospitals, nursing homes, HMOs, pharmaceuticals and medical device manufacturers, and other healthcare entities.

In fact, the only laws that this bill does not supersede are the ones that protect those groups, and that is at the greatest risk to patients.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of very important reasons to oppose this bill, but I want to focus on one of the most egregious parts of the legislation that has nothing to do with medical malpractice. Under this bill, a drug or medical device manufacturer sells a dangerous product that causes harm to a consumer, so long as that product received FDA approval prior to being marketed, a court would be prohibited from awarding punitive damages against that manufacturer. This marks a dramatic change in current law by transforming FDA product approval into a shield against liability.

Time and again we have seen that the FDA approval process cannot or does not guarantee the safety of drugs and other medical products. Every day our concerns increase about the adequacy of the FDA’s postmarket safety programs. And we have seen numerous instances in which despite receiving FDA approval, drugs and medical devices can cause severe harm to the market because of the emergence of severe dangers associated with their use.

Mr. Speaker, we have not given the FDA the tools necessary to approve a drug so that all the things they would happen after that approval will not occur, such as the failure of the company that manufactures it to make sure they follow their own safety standards; or that new risks that are not known at the time of the approval will never arise.

We have to rely on the civil justice system as a final layer of protection for American citizens. In court, consumers harmed by dangerous medical products are given the opportunity to hold the pharmaceutical companies accountable. According. Consumers, confronted with the looming threat of liability, pharmaceutical and medical device companies have every incentive to ensure that their products are safe before they are marketed, and that they continue to be safe once on the market.

We have seen mounting evidence that drug and device companies can withstand key data from physicians, fail to conduct needed safety studies, and carry out misleading advertisement campaigns even when they know of the risks of their products. Yet instead of safeguarding an individual’s right to hold a drug and device company accountable for this kind of conduct, this legislation offers sweeping protection for those companies.

A company might mislead doctors about the safety of its drug and continue to aggressively promote the use of a dangerous drug in spite of studies raising questions as to its safety. Under this legislation, such a company would have a shield from liability for punitive damages for this behavior. This is an issue that should be decided on the evidence and in court.

If we fail to preserve the right of Americans to hold manufacturers of dangerous medical products accountable, we will fail to uphold our responsibility to American consumers to protect against unsafe products and medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first let me say to my colleagues who are not usually concerned about States rights that if they will look at section 11 of the bill, they will find the bill respects the right of any State to set a cap of any amount, be it higher or lower, than the caps in the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, the HEALTH Act is the only proven legislative solution to the current medical liability insurance crisis. According to the Congressional Budget Office, under this bill, “Premiums for medical malpractice insurance ultimately would be an average of 25 percent to 30 percent below what they would be under current law.”

H.R. 5 allows unlimited awards of economic damages. These include past and future medical expenses, lost or present future earnings, the cost of obtaining domestic services, loss of employment, and loss of business or employment opportunities. Deserving victims can be awarded tens of millions of dollars in damages. We already see this in the States that have similar reforms to those contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Harvard Medical Practice Study found that over half of the filed medical professional liability claims they studied were brought by plaintiffs who suffered either no injuries at all or, if they did, such injuries were not caused by the health care providers, but rather by the underlying disease.

H.R. 5 is modeled on California’s legal reforms. Those reforms have resulted in California’s medical liability premiums increasing at a rate that is only one-third the rate of those of other States.

Mr. Speaker, we need to act, and we need to act now. The nonpartisan Annals of Medicine predicts that the current doctor shortage could get worse, and we risk losing 20 percent of needed doctors in the coming years. Let us protect patients everywhere. Let us pass the HEALTH Act.
Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my concern regarding the passage of H.R. 5, the Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2005 also known as the medical malpractice bill. Although some believe that “reforming” medical malpractice litigation will have a significant effect on skyrocketing healthcare premiums, it is my belief that this legislation is both misguided and harmful to the American people.

One of the most contentious provisions within H.R. 5 is a $250,000 cap on awards for non-economic damages. Placing such a cap allows corporations the opportunity to build into their bottom line a certain amount of liability. Currently, we have a judicial system that creates a fine balance between free corporate enterprise viability and consumer protection. The medical malpractice bill will disrupt this equilibrium in the name of reducing “frivolous” lawsuits without taking into account the implications for those making legitimate claims. This bill has the potential to reduce the incentive for corporations to remedy defective products, and to allow those entities to easily assume the loss incurred by ultimately accounting for the cost liability, a sum inordinately less than their sometimes lucrative profits.

I respect the efforts of all of my colleagues to address the concerns of their constituencies. However, I would be remiss in that duty if I did not oppose legislation that erodes consumer protection and the ability of the courts to determine appropriate punitive measures for negligent defendants.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support efforts to address the medical malpractice problem we have in this country today. There can be no doubt that doctors are paying exorbitantly high premiums and as a result, patients, and our medical system are suffering. However, I do not believe that H.R. 5 will do anything to solve this problem. As many of my colleagues have pointed out, this legislation will only lower expenses for the insurance industry and limit compensation for those victims who need it the most.

Later in this Congress, I will be introducing legislation to offer an alternative to the idea of caps on compensation. Instead of limiting victims’ awards, my proposal is to limit the involvement of the insurance industry in the medical malpractice system. Physicians will no longer have to worry about the cost of their medical malpractice insurance. The practice of defensive medicine and its toll on our medical system would be eliminated.

In addition, my proposal will ensure that the small number of doctors who are responsible for a large number of malpractice suits, will be critically examined. According to the National Practitioner Data Bank, 11% of physicians are responsible for half of all malpractice payments made between September 1, 1990 and December 31, 2001. Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed S. 544 an important first step in addressing one of the root causes to the situation we face today. The Patient Safety and Quality Improvement Act will create a voluntary reporting system for errors and “near misses.” This information can then be analyzed to determine better medical practices can be established.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to address the other root causes of rising medical malpractice premiums. Caps are an old and ineffective solution. My proposal will be a substantive and constructive reform for the entire system. I urge my colleagues to keep an open mind in trying to solve the medical malpractice problems we face today.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time in the 5 years I have been a member of the United States Congress, I will be opposing a flawed Republican bill which would limit damage awards to patients injured by medical malpractice. While Republicans claim their measure would reduce insurance costs for doctors by discouraging frivolous suits in which they blame for driving up insurance premiums and reducing access to health care for patients—the Republicans legislation completely ignores the rate-setting process followed by the insurance industry. Furthermore, a 2002 study by the Congressional Budget Office found that the effect of even a very large reduction in malpractice costs would have a small effect on individual health care premiums.

This bill broadly defines “medical malpractice action” to protect HMOs, insurance companies, nursing homes and drug and device manufacturers for a broad range of liabilities, including suits by physicians against those companies. Furthermore, the bill caps non-economic awards for pain and suffering of $250,000, and punitive damages at $250,000 or twice economic damages, whichever is greater.

This bill will broadly limit damage awards to $250,000. It ignores the rate-setting process followed by the insurance industry. Furthermore, a 2002 study by the Congressional Budget Office found that the effect of even a very large reduction in malpractice costs would have a small effect on individual health care premiums.

This bill broadly defines “medical malpractice action” to protect HMOs, insurance companies, nursing homes and drug and device manufacturers for a broad range of liabilities, including suits by physicians against those companies. Furthermore, the bill caps non-economic awards for pain and suffering of $250,000, and punitive damages at $250,000 or twice economic damages, whichever is greater.

All this measure really does is place legal obstacles on patients injured by wrongful conduct. Under this bill, individuals face time limits that would require an injured person to file health care lawsuits no later than three years after the date of the injury or one year after recovering the alleged malpractice, whichever occurs first. In addition, there are limits to attorney contingency fees, which would potentially force injured persons, faced with medical bills and lost wages, to finance lawsuits they otherwise cannot afford.

Support of tort reform say large million-dollar damage awards in medical liability suits are the reason that the cost of malpractice premiums has increased. It must be noted that premium increases represent only one part of the problem facing many doctors throughout the nation and these increases are not necessary linked to damage awards. Even some insurance industry insiders say that recent increases in malpractice premiums have nothing to do with lawsuits or jury awards, and that tort reform will not reduce premiums. Rather, increases have been driven by the insurance underwriting cycle and insurance companies’ bad investments.

Mr. Speaker, rather than truly deal with a crisis faced by medical doctors, this bill is simply crafted to benefit the insurance industry at the expense of victims of medical malpractice. Instead of fruitless passing this flawed bill for the 4th time in less than five years, we should be working hard to provide health care to the 17 million Americans who are uninsured today.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act of 2005. The medical liability crisis have been growing over the last decade and is rapidly developing into an insidious crisis as well. Frivolous lawsuits are overwhelming our legal system and wasting billions of dollars each year.

In 2004, more than 70 percent of medical liability claims did not result in payments to plaintiffs and only 1.1 percent of claims resulted in a plaintiff’s verdict.

In cases where the defendant prevailed at trial, the average defense costs were $87,720 illustrating the high cost of unfounded claims. Frivolous lawsuits further drive up costs by encouraging physicians to practice defensive medicine ordering additional tests that are not necessarily to provide quality care. Physicians are also less likely to try new and innovative medical treatments.

The resulting increase in medical malpractice premiums is threatening access to quality care by forcing physicians to move their practices, retire early, and limit services. The situation is particularly critical for ob-gyn.s. From 2003 to 2004, increases in rates for ob-gyns were as high as 66.9%. Illinois premiums rose from $138,031 to $230,428.

H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act, will increase patient access to health care services and provide improvised medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system place on the health care delivery system. This bill: Ensures that patients receive adequate compensation while limiting non-economic damages to $250,000. Sets a statute of limitations of three years after the date of manifestation of injury or one year after the claimant discovers the injury to ensure timely resolution; allows the introduction of collateral source benefits and the amount paid to secure such benefits as evidence; authorizes the award of punitive damages only where: (1) it is proven by clear and convincing evidence that a person or persons acted with malicious intent to injure the claimant or deliberately failed to avoid unnecessary injury the claimant was substantially certain to suffer, and (2) compensatory damages are awarded. Prescribed qualifications for expert witnesses.

States including Louisiana and California that have instituted their own liability reforms that include caps on non-economic damages have shown proven success and as a result, these states are not facing a medical liability crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support the HEALTH Act and ensure patient access to quality medical care.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5. Proponents of this legislation make numerous false claims.

They claim that “tort reform” will magically reduce doctors’ skyrocketing malpractice premiums.

But the truth is that even a spokesman for the American Insurance Association couldn’t prove price reductions with tort reform.

Supporters also claim that capping non-economic damages will make malpractice insurance more affordable for doctors.

But the truth is that the example set by my home state of California’s MICRA law proves this isn’t the case. Enacted in 1975, it wasn’t until after 1988 when California’s malpractice insurance reform under Proposition 103 that malpractice insurance rates began to stabilize.

Proponents even claim that this bill will protect patients’ rights.

But the truth is that H.R. 5 would strip away the protection of patients, especially women, seniors, children, and lower income families.

But Mr. Speaker, let’s give credit where credit is due. The bill does protect someone:
It protects HMOs, the insurance industry and the pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. Speaker, instead of false claims and gifts to HMOs, we need a bill like the Conyers-Dingell substitute that was not made in order.

Unlike H.R. 5, the Conyers-Dingell bill is balanced and eliminates frivolous lawsuits, increase competition, and reduce costs, without sacrificing crucial protections.

Let’s be real, Mr. Speaker. This bill is yet another example that shows where Republican priorities lie—with their contributors—HMOs and insurance companies.

Patients and people deserve more.

I urge my colleagues to reject the false claims and vote “no” on H.R. 5.

Mr. BLUMENTHAUER. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of dealing with the medical malpractice problem. One is to take the approach that the House Republican leadership has chosen for years; a narrowly drawn proposal that appeases their partisan supporters but doesn’t solve the problem. As I said last year, the rationale was weak and there was little evidence it would work. Instead, it may do more harm to the health care community and doctors. Most important, because it is so narrow and partisan, it’s very unlikely to become law. Pushing a political solution is the approach that has been tried repeatedly and is what Oregon voters rejected again at the polls last year.

The other approach is to work cooperatively, bringing people to the table to make progress. This is what appears to be happening in Oregon in the aftermath of the last defeat. In Oregon, doctors, hospitals, and other healthcare professionals are working with consumer advocates, trial lawyers, and people from government to fashion a solution that is acceptable; to make progress building on cooperation and trust.

Between the two approaches it’s clear that the narrow, partisan, and unbalanced approach is not only questionable on its merits, but is a political dead end. I see no reason to change my longstanding opposition to both the narrow solution and to the approach that created it. Given the nature of the crisis of healthcare in the United States, the problems will only get worse; politicizing them will only put off the day when real progress is achieved.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5. This legislation will not reduce medical liability premiums, and it unfairly and arbitrarily discriminates against those most severely injured by medical errors.

I have consistently heard from physicians in Central New Jersey that the rising cost of medical malpractice insurance represents a growing threat to their ability to practice medicine. As liability insurance premiums have spiraled, many physicians have left the state or leave medicine altogether. My wife is a general practice physician, so I fully appreciate the gravity of the situation facing many doctors. The rising cost of insurance poses obvious dangers for access to care, particularly for populations most in need.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor a bill that does not reduce premiums for physicians and imposes an arbitrary cap on damages for the most severely injured victims of malpractice or negligence.

Capping non-economic damages at $250,000 for patients who have won a medical malpractice tort will not result in lower insurance premiums for physicians. Just listen to what the insurance industry itself has said. “We have not promised price reductions with tort reform,” said Dennis Kelly, an American Insurance Association spokesman in the Chicago Tribune. In fact, over the past few years, payouts for medical malpractice cases have remained the same while premiums have continued to rise, in some cases doubling.

Because of insurance companies overcharging doctors for insurance, the fifteen largest insurers have accumulated a surplus that is double what they actually need to pay claims. Instead, they are using this surplus to most effectively rebate this surplus to the doctors, rather than looking for ways to reward them for the squeeze that they are executing on our healthcare system. The insurance industry is gouging medical doctors and is trying to use patients as a scapegoat.

Imposing a cap on damages inherently affects the patients most severely injured by malpractice or negligence. Setting the cap at $250,000 is an insult to all those who have suffered severely injured by medical errors. The figure is lifted directly from the 1975 California MICRA law. Adjusted for inflation, this amount would be close to $1 million in 2005 dollars. $250,000 does not come close to compensating for loss of life or permanent disability or disfigurement.

I am disturbed that a third time in three years, the Rules Committee has eliminated any opportunity to amend the legislation. I am particularly disappointed that the Rules Committee disallowed substitute legislation by Ranking Members John CONYERS and John Dingell. Their bill would weed out frivolous lawsuits, require insurance companies to pass savings on to health care providers, and provide targeted assistance to the physicians and communities who need it the most. That Congress is not permitted even to consider this legislation as an alternative demonstrates that the bill we have before us cannot survive on its own merits.

As liability insurance premiums continue to rise for physicians across the country, the Republican leadership continues to prescribe the same ineffective legislation. For good reason, this bill has not survived the legislative process for the past three years, yet we are once again debates whether to enrich insurance companies at the expense of victims of medical malpractice and negligence.

We need a comprehensive, fair, and effective approach to lowering insurance premiums for physicians. The legislation we have before us is none of the above. I encourage my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5.

Ms. DELAURCIO. Mr. Speaker, we can all agree on the need to control the rising cost of malpractice insurance impacts every doctor and, indeed, every American. But contrary to what this majority has repeated time and again, the reason for these soaring costs has nothing to do with frivolous lawsuits.

Indeed, a new report by the Center for Justice and Democracy found that in the last 4 years, the 15 largest malpractice insurers increased premiums by 120 percent—more than doubling premiums. And what about all those frivolous lawsuits supposedly driving those costs? The same report found that claims during that time only increased 7 percent.

In my State of Connecticut, the contrast between claims and rates is even starker, with premiums for our 3 largest malpractice insurers shooting up 213 percent over the last 4 years while claims have increased only 1.6 percent.

So, let’s call this situation what it is, Mr. Speaker—insurance companies gouging doctors. To inflate their own profits, insurance companies are putting doctors at risk, destabilizing our health care industry and driving up costs for everyone.

And what is this majority’s response? Granting authority to State insurance commissioners to order refunds for doctors when excessive rates are imposed? Republicans continue to insist on getting approval before rate increases?

Demanding that States set standards for actuaries to calculate rates?

No. Their response: “blame the patients.” Limit damages. Drive a wedge between the parties being hurt the most by rising malpractice costs—doctors and patients. At all costs, they seem they are saying, do not hold the insurance industry’s feet to the fire on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this debate ought to be about helping doctors—about doing something to make sure doctors can continue practicing medicine. Instead, this bill would insulate insurance companies from having to follow any kind of responsible guidelines regarding how malpractice insurance rates are set. And, as such, this bill will do nothing to actually drive those rates down—an admission the insurance industry itself has acknowledged.

None of this is to say that we do not need to crack down on frivolous lawsuits—indeed, last year I voted to penalize lawyers who file frivolous suits with a tough 3 strikes and you’re out rule. And today, Democrats want to offer a substitute, which would have taken a comprehensive approach to the malpractice insurance crisis. Our bill would have prevented frivolous lawsuits but also required insurance companies to pass some of their savings on to health care providers, as well as providing assistance to the physicians and communities who need it the most.

We had also hoped to strike a provision of this bill that would have protected manufacturers from being held liable for the makers of a drug found to be responsible for thousands of deaths either.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act.

Will County, Illinois, part of which I represent, no longer has any practicing neurosurgeons. A recent study found that 11 percent of OB/GYNs have no longer practice obstetrics in my home State of Illinois. And more than half of OB/GYNs in the State are considering dropping their obstetrics practice entirely in the next 2 years due to medical liability concerns. Obviously, this is an incredible crisis that the patient community and our communities who need it the most.

Mr. Speaker, the three ways of dealing with the malpractice crisis is irresponsible, plain and simple. I urge my colleagues to do right by doctors and families by opposing this bill.

Let’s come back and pass a bill that will actually address the malpractice insurance crisis.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5, the Republican medical malpractice bill, and the process by which it is being debated in this House. Today vote on H.R. 5, a bill to impose caps on damages that may be awarded for medical malpractice, defective products, and other health related wrongdoings. Like many Members of this House, I am concerned about the rising cost of medical malpractice insurance and its impact on physicians and their patients, but H.R. 5 is the wrong medicine for this national problem.

I oppose H.R. 5 because it will not reduce medical malpractice premiums. What’s more, it protects manufacturers of faulty pharmaceutical products and medical equipment from the product liability actions, and overturns North Carolina State law. H.R. 5 also limits the ability of injured persons to bring suits against pharmaceutical companies, HMOs, and nursing homes, thus setting a dangerous precedent for allowing entities to escape the law in even the most severe cases of neglect and abuse. Finally, H.R. 5 undermines North Carolina’s patient protection statutes, which are some of the strongest in the Nation.

My colleagues, Mr. DINGELL and Mr. CONYERS, have drafted an alternative amendment to H.R. 5. This alternative will help courts weed out frivolous lawsuits without restricting the rights of legitimate claims, repeal the Federal anti-trust exemption for medical malpractice insurance companies, thereby increasing competition and lowering premiums, and provide targeted assistance directly to physicians, hospitals, and communities in medical malpractice crisis areas. Finally, the alternative establishes an independent advisory commission to examine and recommend long-term solutions to this important issue. Unfortunately, the Republican Leadership has denied Representatives Dingell and Conyers the opportunity to offer this alternative.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of medical malpractice insurance is an important one. H.R. 5 will without a doubt harm America’s patients. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5 and to support the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I’m reluctantly voting against H.R. 5, which would limit medical malpractice awards.

I am opposed to considering legislation that would do something to respond to real problems. But I do not think this bill merits that description.

In fact, I think the vote today has more to do with politics than with policy—and if I had any doubts on that point, they ended when the Republican leadership refused to permit any amendments at all to be considered. Stifling debate is not the way to develop good policy.

As in the past, the bill’s supporters argue that unless the tort laws are changed, doctors will not be able to afford malpractice insurance and so will give up providing medical care. And, again, opponents say the bill would do nothing to affect insurance rates.

I think we’re beating a dead horse. Both sides have dug in and aren’t willing to compromise. In the meantime, we aren’t doing anything to reform our medical liability system and we aren’t doing anything to make health care more affordable and accessible for Americans—

Our system is inherently adversarial and we’ve continued this finger-pointing game and done nothing to improve patient safety and health care access, which is what we’re really talking about here.

I think our system that is non-punitive and encourages openness and improvements so that doctors can report medical errors without fear of being sued. This will help us understand medical errors and improve procedures and patient safety. Fewer medical errors will result in fewer medical malpractice suits, which in turn will help keep malpractice insurance rates and health care premiums down.

That’s why I have supported legislation to create a voluntary medical error reporting system under which patient safety organizations, on a confidential basis, would receive information on medical errors. They would then be expected to develop and disseminate evidence-based information to help providers implement changes in practice patterns that help to prevent future medical errors.

In addition to that, I think we should explore ideas like alternate dispute resolution, no-fault systems, and medical courts.

I also want to make it clear that I am not opposed in principle to capping damages. That has been done in Colorado and some other states, and I think there is evidence indicating that it can help keep health care costs down and keeps doctors accessible. However, I think this bill’s low and arbitrary limits on damages will hurt those at the bottom of the income scale the most. Also, I don’t think we should be shielding large and powerful HMOs and drug companies from liability. So, I cannot support the bill as it stands.

Mr. Speaker, ultimately this issue is about health care access and patient safety. If we aren’t going to compromise, I hope we’d start thinking about how we can end this logjam. I offer these ideas as a way to get there, because we aren’t going to get there from where we are today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5, the Medical Malpractice bill. H.R. 5 may have been conceived with good intentions, but it is a bad bill. It is a particularly bad bill for low income Americans.

If a patient is injured by a caregiver due to medical malpractice, and that patient sues, it might be the first time the jury—not the logjam, I offer these ideas as a way to get there, because we aren’t going to get there from where we are today.

Injured patients who don’t get their fair compensation will suffer. They will suffer in two ways. First of all, it’s hard to put a blanket price on damages resulting in life or limb. Secondly, if the system is not sufficient, what will happen to the disabled patient when the money runs out? Who, then, will pay for their long-term care, or for the children of someone permanently disabled or even killed? I’ll tell you who will pay for them: the American taxpayer. These children and disabled people will enroll in federal programs to help them exist day by day. American taxpayers pay for those programs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill won’t do anything to lower the cost of health care.

This legislation is good intentions that will have bad consequences. I ask my colleagues to consider very carefully who will end up paying at the end of the day.

American taxpayers—you and I, not the care providers at fault—will end up paying for the damages incurred from medical malpractice.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, legislation to limit non-economic damages that victims may seek when injured by medical malpractice. My primary objection to this bill stems from the Congress imposing its will on the states regarding an issue that rests squarely within State jurisdiction.

The states are responsible for licensing medical professionals and for regulating the insurance industry. In fact, the states have had jurisdiction over medical malpractice for more than 200 years, and it should continue to be that way. This legislation would unnecessarily preempt the laws of states that have taken measures to address this issue. At least 30 states have enacted laws with regard to non-economic damages, so it is unconscionable that anyone would argue that the medical malpractice issue is trapped in a regulatory vacuum.

In 2003, the State of Texas saw a need for action on medical malpractice and enacted a cap on non-economic damages. Having served in the Texas State Legislature, I know first-hand that state legislatures are best positioned to determine how and how to address the medical malpractice problem in their individual states. The State of Virginia enacted a different cap that best balances the needs of consumers, physicians and health care institutions in that particular state. The situation is different in each state, and a Washington-knows-best approach ignores the hard work and tough decisions that individual states have made.

On a substantive level, I oppose this legislation based on two provisions with significant flaws. First, the bill includes a firm $250,000 non-economic damages cap that would result in less incentive for inflation adjustment in future years. While that figure reflects California’s MICRA law, it is important to recognize that California’s cap has not been adjusted for inflation in approximately 30 years. Further, California’s law was crafted during a time when a $250,000 cap would have sufficed for all but the most egregious jury awards—which, I might add, the judge has the discretion to overturn. That is certainly not the case in the 21st century, and I object to the Congress primarily preempting the laws of states that have taken measures to address non-economic damages would create a one-size-fits-all figure for each and every case of medical malpractice. Members of Congress do not hear the details of each medical malpractice case. Members of juries, do which is why they are best equipped to determine the appropriate non-economic damages based on the facts of each case.

This legislation also contains a dangerous provision that would provide drug companies and device manufacturers with an affirmative defense against punitive damages as long as their products had FDA approval. This provision presupposes that FDA approval is an airtight process whose integrity need not—and legally cannot—be questioned. Considering
the FDA’s recent track record with regard to Vioxx and other pharmaceuticals that have been removed from the pharmacy shelves, it is clear that the integrity of the FDA approval process has been compromised. Until some serious reforms are implemented at the FDA, the FDA stamp of approval should not provide any comfort affirmative protection against punitive damages. Such a provision would only provide drug and device manufacturers with even less of an incentive to report known adverse events before their products go to market and ensure that their products are as safe as possible. Given these concerns, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and leave this issue to the states, which have clear jurisdiction, as well as the ability and willingness to handle this delicate issue.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of H.R. 5 and my interest in seeing that one significant concern is addressed, should this bill move through the Senate.

As a practicing physician I know how important this bill is to ensuring that Americans have access to good medical care. For too long too many limited resources have been misdirected away from patient care and have instead been spent to unnecessary malpractice awards and the practice of defensive medicine. Defensive medicine offers little in terms of better patient outcomes, but it adds billions of dollars to the cost of medical care. I know this not only because studies show this is the case, but I used to practice defensive medicine every day.

This bill makes sure that there is fair treatment for those individuals who do suffer serious adverse medical outcomes, while ensuring that our legal system is not overwhelmed with frivolous lawsuits.

A serious concern I have with the bill, and an issue I have raised with the chairman and others, is how it treats liability reform for vaccine manufacturers of drugs and vaccines. With respect to pharmaceuticals we are often unable to recognize all adverse reactions until we have post-marketing information. This post-marketing safety data, such as in cases like Vioxx, is provided to FDA on a voluntary basis by the manufacturers. I agree with the intent of the bill that while it is important that Americans have greater access to potentially live saving pharmaceuticals. However, it is equally important that we fully examine the implications of such provisions on safety and the willingness of manufacturers to come forward with adverse information.

I am also concerned that H.R. 5 offers significant liability protection for vaccine manufacturers, while failing to fix the broken vaccine injury compensation program (VICP). It is critically important that these two not be separated. The VICP is very broken and it would be wrong to cut off access to the courts without addressing the serious deficiencies that exist in the compensation program today. As it operates today, the VICP has essentially imported the tort system into the program. That was not how the program was designed to operate. If both the liability problem and the VICP deficiencies are not fixed, then the nation’s immunization program will suffer serious problems and parents could increasingly reject childhood immunizations for their children.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5. The Republican leaders of this House have denied us our right to offer an alternative to the over-broad and ill-conceived legislation that is before us today and have bypassed both committees of jurisdiction. Why are they so afraid?

Are they afraid the courts will demonstrate that their bill will create excessive litigation as opposed to reducing it? H.R. 5 is ambiguously drafted, leaving its readers to surmise what its provisions could possibly mean. Federal and State courts would take years trying to sort it all out.

Are they afraid we will discuss how their legislation shields HMOs, insurance companies, and drug manufacturers from all sorts of skullduggery? The proponents of this legislation offer no evidence that these privileged industries need additional protections, yet H.R. 5 grants them a special status under the law that is unprecedented.

Are they afraid we will show how this unprecedented immunity bath for their favorite industries will hurt the rights of injured patients? There is a human cost to this legislation that we must not forget.

Are they afraid we will tell how H.R. 5 would hurt women, seniors, and low-income families by limiting damages to $250,000? Because a large part of economic damages is an individual’s income, such a system would place a higher value on the lives of CEO’s. My friends, every human life is worth more than $250,000.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues are quite determined to move quickly and harshly. Their legislation reaches well beyond malpractice and offers no guarantees of assistance to providers and communities. Physicians and patients are asked to cross their fingers and hope that some of the benefits given to large corporations will trickle down to them. And women, seniors, and low-income families are left to pay the human cost of these corporate benefits. It is wrong.

But the rising cost of malpractice insurance is a real problem—requiring careful, balanced, and targeted legislation. Regrettably my colleagues will not have the opportunity to vote for the balanced measure that my friend from Michigan, Mr. CONyers, and I have crafted.

Perhaps their greatest fear is that you would prefer a bill that truly helps physicians, hospitals and nurses, while protecting the rights of patients and doctors over HMOs. I urge you to support the motion to recommit and oppose final passage of this bill.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that weapons of mass destruction required an invasion of Iraq, that ketchup is a vegetable, and that global warming is a vast, left-wing conspiracy. Now, the great minds of the Republican Party want us to believe that a competent doctor would receive only $250,000 to provide medical care, while affluent doctors would receive $500,000. The bill protects HMOs, nursing homes and manufacturers of drugs and devices. Furthermore, the President and other Republican proponents claim that this bill will halve skyrocketing medical costs. That’s hogwash. Even the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has found that this bill would have a negligible effect on health care spending, ultimately reducing insurance premiums by less than one-half of one percent.

Insensitive legislation is one thing, but this bill is legislative malpractice. It would mean that a catastrophic injury caused by an incompetent doctor would receive only $250,000 to be compensated for a lifetime of pain and the inability to lead a full life. If this bill were enacted, nursing homes that abuse our seniors, HMOs that deny critical care, and drug companies that market dangerous drugs like Vioxx can take your life for a guaranteed low price set by their friends in Congress.

The implication of limiting damages and attorneys’ fees is that greedy lawyers and their irresponsible clients are somehow faking medical errors or blaming natural medical problems on innocent doctors. Is this malpractice or medical errors are the eighth-leading cause of death in this country, exceeding car accidents, breast cancer, and AIDS, that suggestion is off base. Anyone who’s ever been at the bedside of someone in the hospital and received 12 different answers from 12 different care providers about treatment instructions knows the risk of a serious medical error.

This bill does nothing to reduce medical errors, and it won’t reduce malpractice premiums. Between 2000 and 2004, claims payments rose by less than 6% while insurers’ net premiums rose by 120%. The money isn’t going to lawyers—it is padding the pockets of wealthy insurance companies, and they have no intention of ending the windfall even if this bill passes.

I support the Democratic bill, which Republican leaders won’t allow to come up for a vote. That bill reforms the insurance industry—breaks up insurance monopolies and gives doctors the right to challenge premium increases—and has sensible tort reform without blocking compensation for injured patients. Unlike the Republican bill, any savings by insurance companies would be required to actually reduce malpractice insurance premiums and 50% of punitive damage payments would go to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality to reduce medical errors.

If high premiums and medical errors are the problem, the Democratic bill seems like a logical solution. So logical in fact, so tempting even to my Republican colleagues, that their leadership won’t even allow them to vote on the Democratic alternative. I urge my colleagues to reject this sham and force this House to consider real legislation to solve this national crisis.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the next step in the ongoing struggle to reform medical malpractice liability. Skyrocketing insurance premiums are debilitating our Nation’s health care
delivery system and liability insurers are either leaving the market or raising rates to exces-
sive levels. In turn, more physicians, hospitals, and other health care providers are severely
limiting their practices, moving to other states, or simply not providing care. Without a
change, the exodus of these providers from the practice of medicine will continue, and pa-
tients will find it increasingly difficult to obtain needed health care.

H.R. 5 would help to lower the costs associated
with health care coverage by encour-
aging the speedy resolution of claims, limiting jury awards, and imposing caps on non-economic
damages.

I urge the House to once again pass med-
cal malpractice reform to help lower the cost of quality health care and make it accessible to more Americans.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to
share my concerns about H.R. 5 and to urge my colleagues to support the Democratic Mo-
tion to Recommit.

I think we all agree that skyrocketing med-
cal malpractice premiums are spiraling out of control and demand our immediate attention.
As a former member of the California Legis-
lature, I voted to uphold MICRA on three sepa-
rate occasions and I think that doctors every-
where deserve the same protection. MICRA is
a model for federal reform because it has pro-
duced meaningful results for HMOs, pharmaceutical
manufacturers and medical device manufac-
turers.

Now is not the time to give greater protec-
tions to pharmaceutical companies that put
unsafe drugs like Vioxx on the market. Such protections have nothing to do with the liability
insurance crisis facing doctors and should be
stripped from this bill.

I am also concerned that the caps California
established in 1975 under MICRA were never intended to inflation: To provide the same level
of compensation in today Indexed to inflation: To provide the same level
established in 1975 under MICRA were never
protected. The Health Act places a $250,000 cap on pain-and-suffering awards in medical malpractice law-
suits. $250,000. Is that what a lifetime of pain and suffering at the hands of malpractice is worth?

Would you want your mother, grandfather or
child to be in that situation? As the bills pile
up, and the Republicans say, sorry, but we have sold out to the special interests?

The Health Effiecient, Accessible, Low-cost,
Timely Healthcare, HEALTH Act, of 2005 has
been described as a Federal version of MICRA. I respectfully disagree with this assertion. The
HEALTH Act places a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages for suits against physi-
cians, insurers, HMOs and nursing homes as
well as and medical device manufactur-
ers. MICRA limits that cap solely to physi-
cians. The Health Act also places a cap on punitive damages. MICRA does not.

One of the reasons MICRA has worked is be-
cause it's prescriptive in its scope. If we're to g"
that have already killed and maimed people with products that were prematurely released on the market.

Many of us are alarmed at the skyrocketing cost of medical care, including patients, who are the consumers. However, medical malpractice is not the reason for these increasing costs. It is medical mismanagement and corporate greed.

The Washington Post had an article this past weekend about the health care system for our seniors. The frightening truth? Some health care providers deliberately, or indifferently, provide bad medical care, so that they can increase the costs of treatment, while patients become even sicker. Wounds become infected, equipment is covered with dust, and sterile techniques are not used.

It sounds like the plot of a bad medical thriller, or medical practice in some remote corner of the globe, but it is happening, right here in America, to your father or mother, grandmother or grandfather.

So, I say, stop picking on the legal system, which fights for the rights of the poor, the sick, the elderly, and the injured.

Many of the negligence suits that consumers enjoy today are the result of path-breaking legal decisions and the lawyers who were willing to stand up and fight.

The Republicans would like to take us back to a darker time, when corporations ruled and the underserved had no rights. We must say, no; we must oppose this bad medicine.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest challenges facing our Nation’s health care system today is the medical malpractice insurance crisis. My State of Georgia is one of 18 States that have the highest, most significant medical malpractice insurance premium costs, and it is costing our Georgia and our entire country dearly. Because when our health care industry is in danger, we are all threatened.

Who among us is not a patient, who among us does not need and deserve quality medical care? At its heart, this crisis is a patient care issue. Every one of us wants ourselves and our loved ones to receive the highest quality health care available.

We have to address the issue of medical malpractice insurance and the extremely high cost of health care. In 2000, Georgia physicians paid more than $92 million to cover jury awards. That amount was the 11th highest in the United States.

Faced with the prospect of the State’s hospitals faced premium increases of 50 percent or more in 2002. St. Paul, the State’s second largest insurance carrier, stopped selling medical liability insurance last year. Remaining insurers have reportedly raised rates for some specialties by 70 percent or greater. Some emergency room physicians, OB–GYNs and radiologists have not yet found a new carrier.

Our health care system is suffering immensely, but some say that this moment in time will pass, that this crisis does not warrant taking serious action. But study after study proves them wrong.

Earlier this year, the Georgia Board for Physician Workforce released a study showing the effects of the medical liability crisis on access to health care for Georgia’s patients. For example, the study shows that 17.8 percent of physicians, more than 2,800 physicians in Georgia, are expected to limit the scope of their practices which is by far the largest effort of the medical liability insurance crisis on access to medical care.

These physicians are expected to stop providing high-risk procedures in their practices during the next year in order to limit their liability risk. Nearly 1 in 3 obstetrician/gynecologists and 1 in 5 family practitioners reported plans to stop providing high-risk procedures, indicating that access to obstetrical care may be significantly reduced during the next year as a result of the medical liability insurance crisis.

In addition, nearly 11 percent or 1,750 physicians reported that they have stopped or plan to stop providing emergency room services. Six hundred and thirty physicians plan to stop practicing medicine altogether or leave the state because of high medical malpractice insurance rates. Nearly 1 percent of doctors reported that they had difficulty finding malpractice insurance coverage.

In fact, at one particular Georgia hospital, the hospital could not give credentials to a surgeon and add that physician to its staff because the surgeon could not afford to buy medical malpractice insurance. In another instance, an obstetrician-gynecologist had to close his Georgia practice and work for a health care agency because he could not afford to buy medical malpractice insurance.

What happens to the patients that his hospital could have treated but now it cannot because it does not have the surgeons that it needs? What happens to the mothers who need a doctor to provide pre- and post-natal health care but cannot find one because doctors are leaving the profession due to the high cost of medical malpractice care?

In addition, Georgia is heavily dependent on other states to train physicians. Approximately 70 percent of participating physicians in Georgia completed training in another State. High costs of medical malpractice liability insurance may reduce the attractiveness of Georgia as a location for medical practice. High professional liability insurance costs are a significant financial problem for teaching hospitals, reducing the already limited funding available for faculty, residents, and other medical education costs.

Even more upsetting, the high cost of medical malpractice insurance for doctors and hospitals disproportionately affects seniors, minority and low-income patients. The physicians and hospitals who depend on Medicare reimbursements and who serve the over 44 million uninsured Americans every day cannot afford to pay higher insurance premiums. We need to ensure that these communities have access to quality health care and the best physicians. The health disparity that currently exists will continue to deepen and create a two-tier health care system.

But it is not only medical care in the present that is threatened, but also into the future. Many of the medical schools in our State are saying now that many of students are having second thoughts about even coming into the medical profession.

These statistics prove that Georgia’s doctors cannot wait. More and more each day, good, principled health care providers are confronting the possibility of being unable to treat their patients because of out-of-control medical malpractice insurance premiums. There is no question that Congress must act, and act immediately.

I support H.R. 5 because doctors, hospitals, and the health care industry are caught in the middle between insurance companies and lawyers. Doctors are being squeezed by their medical malpractice insurance premiums and by the high amounts being awarded to injured patients. Doctors need to see results; they need to know that if this bill becomes law that their insurance premiums will go down. The message must reach the insurance companies that premiums have to go down so that the medical profession can survive and access to health care is improved. The health care industry must have relief and this bill, although not the final answer, is the first step in addressing the problems that affect doctors and the health care industry.

We must help doctors, physicians and dentists, hospitals, other health care providers, and, ultimately, American patients who are suffering in untold ways. Immeasurable damage is occurring in our Nation’s health care delivery system because of the high cost of medical malpractice insurance. With the passage of this bill, the House of Representatives will send a clear and salient message to the insurance industry, and that message is: Bring down the cost of medical malpractice insurance for physicians and hospitals.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5, the so-called HEALTH Care Act of 2005. Quite simply, the problems that we should be addressing today are burdensome malpractice insurance rates, patient safety, and access to health care. This bill addresses none of these.

In another attempt to cede power from States to the Federal Government, this bill would impose nationwide limits on the compensation injured persons can receive in medical malpractice cases.

We have all heard the stories of doctors leaving their practices because they cannot afford their malpractice insurance rates. For the 6-year period from 1998 through 2003, medical malpractice insurance premiums in my State of Connecticut increased, depending on the insurance company, between 37 percent and 241 percent for internal medicine, 35 percent and 185 percent for general surgery, and 45 percent and 128 percent for obstetrics/gynecology.

During that same period of time, the consumer price index only rose 13 percent and the medical consumer price index rose 24 percent. I certainly cannot imagine running a business where one of my expenses was that out of line with the rest of my income and expenses. How can we expect doctors to do that when they provide such an important service
to us all? The end result is the loss of good doctors practicing and diminished access to health care. The bill we are debating today does not address the underlying problem and has many flaws.

First, it would remove authority to the issue of tort reform, where it has traditionally resided, and preempt various areas of State law, including important consumer protections. Each State has its own issues with regard to medical malpractice and tort law and a one-size-fits-all solution imposed by the Federal Government is not the answer.

Second, it restricts the ability of injured patients to be compensated for their injuries. An inflexible $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages would punish victims of malpractice and cause significant inequities in compensation for women, children, seniors, and lower-income workers. A woman who loses a pregnancy or her fertility is not judged to have high economic value, but juries can recognize the human value of her losses. A child with no job or income will obviously have a limited economic value, but juries can recognize the human value of his future. Even with the same injuries, a corporate CEO would receive a much larger economic damage award than a minimum-wage worker or a mother who stays at home to raise her kids, but a jury can recognize the human value of their pain and suffering.

My final objection to this legislation is the manner in which it was brought to the floor. It was never debated in committee and was reported to the floor with a closed rule. In fact, the Rules Committee has rejected 67 amendments to this legislation over the past 3 years. This is the third time the House has voted on this legislation in the past 3 years and the third time it has been the wrong answer for doctors and patients. This is just another example of the majority bringing the same legislation to the floor year after year knowing that it will go nowhere because it is the wrong answer for Americans. Legislation offered by the ranking members of the Judiciary Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. DINGELL, have been ignored as well as legislation offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. HERSETH. Americans deserve to have all of these bills debated side by each.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by urging my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5 and working on real solutions for reasonable malpractice rates, improved patient safety, and accessible health care.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5—the so-called HEALTH Act of 2005—is anything but healthy.

If there was even the remotest possibility that H.R. 5 could help get efficient, accessible, low-cost, timely health care to the American people, it would probably get 435 votes in this House.

However, H.R. 5 absolutely nothing to achieve the wholesome goals enshrined in its misleading name. It does absolutely nothing to address the specific problem it is purported to fix: skyrocketing medical malpractice insurance premiums.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am in complete agreement with this bill’s supposed and stated purpose. It is absolutely necessary to address the cost of health care. Affordable, accessible, low-cost, timely health care to all Americans. I agree that one of the obstacles to low-cost, accessible health care is outrageous medical malpractice liability insurance premiums charged to physicians and other health care providers throughout our Nation. I also agree that some litigation strategies contribute to the escalating costs of our Nation’s health care by encouraging providers to order tests, procedures and treatments that may not be medically necessary. 

However, the majority who support H.R. 5 that high malpractice insurance premiums charged by carriers have led some physicians to abandon high-risk specialties and patients.

I ask you, how to look at the legislation before us. H.R. 5 contains about 4,000 words. In those 4,000 words, the word "premium" appears only once; the word "insurance" appears only five times; and the word "cost" appears 14 times, the vast majority in the definitions and not the operative clauses of the bill. I ask you to consider whether H.R. 5 is really about skyrocketing medical malpractice insurance premiums as its proponents claim. I have looked very carefully at this bill, and, after much reflection, have reached the only reasonable conclusion: It is not.

I stand today because someone needs to stand up for American physicians. Someone needs to stand up for the American health care system.

The proponents of H.R. 5 tell us medical malpractice insurance premiums are skyrocketing out of control. There is no dispute that malpractice insurance premiums are increasing at an alarming rate. We agree on that.

There is no question that medical malpractice premiums are escalating across the country, particularly for physicians in high-risk specialties and certain geographic centers. In some cases, premiums have increased so dramatically that physicians have relocated their practices, reduced their services, or retired early. While there is little doubt that something must be done to alleviate this crisis, H.R. 5 is no solution.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle believe that if you limit the amount that insurance carriers have to pay for legitimate claims, then insurance rates will fall. But I ask you to consider the fact that the American Insurance Association—the American Insurance Association—has repeatedly and specifically denied that tort reform will result in premium savings. Sherman Joyce, the president of the American Tort Reform Association, has stated, "We wouldn’t tell you or anyone that the reason to pass tort reform would be to reduce insurance rates."

So, by the insurance industry’s own admission, H.R. 5 will not stem the tide of rising medical malpractice insurance rates. Nevertheless, I am certain you would have us believe that limiting the exposure of insurance carriers is a panacea. It is not.

H.R. 5 is a hoax. It is a sham, and our friends on the other side know it. It is a fraud. The American medical establishment by insurance carriers who want to limit their exposure but not pay for reductions in premiums. Some in excess of $200,000 per year. Florida has caps, and Florida is in crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, damage caps alone are not the solution to the problem.

Please read the bill. H.R. 5 has absolutely no provision requiring the reduction of medical malpractice premiums, despite the fact that our friends believe that it is these high premiums that are crippling the health care system. Nevertheless, there is not a single word in this bill that directly calls for reductions in premiums: zero, zilch, nada, nothing, and they know it. It is a scam. H.R. 5 is absolutely nothing more than a boon, a windfall for the insurance industry.

Our friends on the other side tell us that damage caps will solve the premium crisis. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you consider the fact that in States that have enacted caps, the medical malpractice insurance premiums are higher than in States that have no caps. The carriers do not want us to know that.

In fact, in California—the State the other side holds up as a shining example of the benefits of legislation like H.R. 5—the average premium is over $27,570, fully 8 percent higher than the average of all States that have no caps on noneconomic damages.

Recently, the American Medical Association issued a list of States that it concluded were in crisis due to escalating medical malpractice insurance rates. Five of those States have caps on noneconomic damages like the one proposed in H.R. 5. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they are still in crisis.

One of those States is Florida, where, despite having caps of just the kind proposed by H.R. 5, obstetricians and gynecologists pay medical malpractice insurance premiums, more than the average of all States that have no caps on noneconomic damages.

In the 12 years after California passed MICRA, medical malpractice premiums rose 190 percent. Only after California passed Proposition 103—actual insurance reform—did medical malpractice premiums stop rising. Even in Florida, California passed insurance reform—not medical malpractice reform—its medical malpractice premiums have been more stable than in most States.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson to be learned from California is that measures like H.R. 5 do not reduce medical malpractice insurance premiums. The facts simply do not bear it out.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side insists that one-size-fits-all approach of H.R. 5 is the last and best cure for the crisis of escalating malpractice insurance rates.

Some of our colleagues are, like me, very deeply concerned about rising malpractice insurance rates. Some of our colleagues have expressed an inclination to vote for this bill in order to get the ball rolling, in order to take a first step toward solving the premium crisis. But I want to be very clear: If H.R. 5 is our first step, as the saying goes, it’s a doozy. It is a step on the backs of doctors, hospitals and patients to help out greedy insurance carriers. Certainly, I don’t have any sort of inclination to join in the support of the malpractice reform—its medical malpractice reform—its medical malpractice premiums have been more stable than in most States.

Mr. Speaker, our friends on the other side insist that one-size-fits-all approach of H.R. 5 is the last and best cure for the crisis of escalating malpractice insurance rates.

Some of our colleagues are, like me, very deeply concerned about rising malpractice insurance rates. Some of our colleagues have expressed an inclination to vote for this bill in order to get the ball rolling, in order to take a first step toward solving the premium crisis. But I want to be very clear: If H.R. 5 is our first step, as the saying goes, it’s a doozy. It is a step on the backs of doctors, hospitals and patients to help out greedy insurance carriers. Certainly, I don’t have any sort of inclination to join in the support of H.R. 5—"as the best evidence proves—is an ill-conceived, ill-advised bill that will not—let me repeat—will not solve the problem. This bill helps insurance companies—period.

Recent articles in newspapers across the country show in clear and compelling ways that California crisis is as complacent state as serious. "Malpractice litigation is only part of the cause of the huge increases in insurance premiums. The insurance industry’s pricing and accounting practices... play [at least] as big a role.

The insurance company patrons of our friends on the other side want to hide behind what they consider out-of-control jury awards. Again, Mr. Speaker, the facts simply do not support this claim.
Over the past few years, many physicians have been hit with medical liability premium increases of 25 to 400 percent. Yet, according to The Journal of Health Affairs, during the past decade, malpractice payouts have grown approximately 6.2 percent per year. That’s almost exactly the rate of medical inflation: an average of 6.7 percent between 1990 and 2004.

Moreover, contrary to the claims of proponents of H.R. 5, juries are not overly sympathetic to plaintiffs, as evidenced by the rate at which physicians prevail in medical malpractice suits. Dr. Barry Manuel, chairman and CEO of ProMutual Group, one of the Nation’s leading medical malpractice insurers, reported in 2001 that “we continue to close 60 percent of all claims without payment, and of those cases we are forced to defend in court, we prevail in 90 percent.” In addition, many of the leading scholars studying the problem have concluded that despite conventional wisdom, juries in fact often favor physicians.

Neil Vldmar, a professor at Duke University School of Law and a leading scholar in the field, notes that “the assumption that juries decide cases out of sympathy for injured plaintiffs rather than the legal merits of the case... have been made about malpractice juries in the United States since at least the nineteenth century.” Yet, research shows that juries are much more likely to award plaintiffs when their cases are supported by experts, an argument that jurors make more than 90 percent of the time when they find an expert credible.

Mr. Speaker, one begins to wonder what has caused such extraordinary increases on medical malpractice insurance premiums during the past few years.

Well, investment losses, like those of average Americans, and a weak economy have made a greater dent in the bottom lines of insurance companies than malpractice payouts. The difference between insurance companies and average Americans is that most of us can’t give ourselves a raise to cover our losses. A medical malpractice insurance company can—and does. It alone controls the premium rates it charges our country’s doctors. I think you can guess what malpractice carriers have done in response to the general economic climate in the past few years.

The leading malpractice insurance carriers are asking doctors, hospitals and patients to pay for underperforming investments. It is as simple as that. They know it. We have asked the insurance carriers to commit to reducing premiums in this bill. They will not do it. They will not even talk about it. That is because they have absolutely no intention of reducing medical malpractice insurance premiums.

The bottom line is that H.R. 5 is a jackpot for insurance carriers, and it is the doctors, hospitals and patients that are going to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for just a minute about the cap on noneconomic damages. If H.R. 5 becomes law, we will be speaking with a loud and clear voice that the injuries victims of medical malpractice suffer are valued in direct relation to how much money those victims have. The unfortunate consequence of this legislation is that—regardless of the severity of your injury, regardless of how long you suffer, regardless of its effect on even the most basic functions of your life, the things we take for granted—regardless of whether you can ever play with your children again, regardless of whether you can ever hug your grandchildren again, regardless even whether you or your child or your wife or mother die due to medical malpractice—no one’s injury is ever worth more than $250,000.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle like to equate “noneconomic damages” with “pain and suffering.” But “pain and suffering” is a misleading euphemism for recovery for disability and disfigurement, among other things, not just “pain and suffering.” H.R. 5 lumps together everything that is not “economic” and calls it “noneconomic”—subject to a $250,000 cap that the bill does not even adjust for inflation.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle go to great lengths to emphasize that H.R. 5 in no way limits economic damages as long as they are objectively quantifiable monetary damages. In other words, if a surgeon loses his hand and is unable to perform surgery again, the injury he will suffer is greater than that suffered by a carpenter who loses his hand due to medical malpractice and is never again able to do his job. Why? Well, under H.R. 5 the answer is simple: The surgeon makes more money, so his economic damages are lower. Not to worry, they tell us; both of them can get up to $250,000 in addition to soothe their wounds.

The same is true in the case of an injury suffered by a working mother when compared to a mother working inside the home. Do our friends on the other side of the aisle believe that those women’s husbands or children will understand the difference?

At many jobs, the loss of a leg, for example, may not prevent a worker from earning a living. But it will make it difficult to enjoy “non-economic” pursuits like playing soccer with your kids, or basketball and volleyball with friends, or a multitude of other things that make life enjoyable.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 instructs that the value of life is capped at economic losses plus $250,000. That seems inconsistent with the administration’s recent characterization of the value of life as “immeasurable.” Remarkably, our friends on the other side of the aisle have taken out their calculators, and they have measured the immeasurable. Perhaps they should call the White House, and let them know.

While the proponents of H.R. 5 appear ready to have figured it all out, I want to ask them: How much is hugging your grandchildren worth? How much is kissing your husband or wife worth? How much is the ability to walk or to drive or to play a round of golf worth? How much is your ability to feed, bathe and clothe yourself worth? How much is seeing your children grow up worth? How much is your life worth?

I honestly don’t know, and I don’t think we should be answering those questions for every American either.

Whether it’s losing a limb, or an eye, or just the freedom to be able to go where you want and do what you want, how many of us would trade a lifetime of disability or disfigurement, not to mention pain, for $250,000?

The very real consequence of this legislation is that it punishes the most economically vulnerable members of our society to the benefit of greedy insurance companies. It discrimi- nates against children, against women, against older Americans, against ethnic minorities, against the poor. And for what, Mr. Speaker? History shows us the only winners emerging from H.R. 5 are the medical malpractice insurance carriers—not the doctors, hospitals and patients our friends on the other side of the aisle purportedly seek to help.

I urge you to vote against this ill-conceived and mean-spirited legislation.
fed through a tube, suffers seizures daily and is non-communicative. Shannon says, “My son has no future but pain and suffering. No politician in Washington has the right to decide...”

Many parents, Shannon may need to use new technologies, the damages awarded for medical care run out while the medical bills keep coming.

H. R. 5 eliminates joint and several liability. This measure contains no provision requiring insurers to lower their rates once these so-called reforms are in place. As a result, it would leave countless patients deprived of relief while failing completely to help our struggling health providers.

Like many of my colleagues, I am deeply troubled by the rising cost of malpractice insurance. Doctors across the country are being adversely affected by an increase in medical liability insurance premiums. These increases are reducing existing insurance coverage and pushing for malpractice, and rising insurance rates could eventually mean that patients no longer will have easy access to medical care. Doctors completing residencies in expensive areas are seeking better rates elsewhere, and physicians already in the market are leaving. I recognize that this is becoming a national crisis.

There is wide agreement that something must be done to ensure reasonable rates and protect access to health care. Unfortunately, the leadership has presented us with a package identical to the one debated on in two previous Congressional sessions. Nothing in this legislation would decrease premium costs or increase the availability of medical malpractice insurance. Instead, it would make detrimental changes to the health care liability system that would extend beyond malpractice and compromise the ability of patients and other health care consumers to hold pharmaceutical companies, HMOs and health care and medical products providers accountable.

Once again, we are presented with a bill that the leadership claims will lower costs of medical liability insurance for doctors, but fails to address the rate-setting process followed by the insurance industry. Insurance companies benefit from a federal exemption to antitrust...
laws, which allows them to collectively raise premiums without fear of prosecution. A recent study of the annual statements of the 15 largest medical malpractice insurers found that insurers substantially increased their premiums while both their claims payments and projected claims payments were decreasing. Other studies suggest that rate changes in premiums are closely tied to the fluctuations of the stock market—not the increases in claims from frivolous lawsuits.

Perhaps most troubling to me is that nothing in this bill stipulates that savings earned as a result of the "reforms" must be passed along to doctors, through a lowering of their own insurance costs. In light of the lack of transparency requirements of the insurance industry, there is no mechanism to hold them accountable to actually lower costs. I believe this must be the crux of any meaningful reform measure.

I recognize that the rapid increase in insurance premiums is having real effects on the health care industry. Not only does it drive up the cost of health care for consumers and doctors alike, thereby exacerbating the number of physicians practicing in Pennsylvania. I have encountered many situations all over the communities that make up the 9th district where doctors have moved to lower-liability states, have reduced the scope of their practices, or have chosen to retire in the face of this growing malpractice crisis. This must not be allowed to continue.

In my judgment, the medical malpractice system that brought significant changes at the state level, including reasonable caps on non-economic damages, was well received. It helped to hold down the cost of premiums and make our State's malpractice system a much fairer one. The problems in our Nation's medical liability system require a multi-faceted approach that includes addressing the causes of premium increases, reducing the number of frivolous lawsuits, and limiting the number of medical errors. I support enacting fair reforms that will continue to permit injured patients to hold wrongdoers accountable, and I am willing to support legislation that provides for reasonable caps on non-economic damages.

In recent years, I have seen so-called malpractice "reform" bills come to the floor of this House. Those bills provided an inequitable approach—limiting patients' access to the courts and imposing strict limits on compensation for medical errors, no matter the injury or how egregious the malpractice, while doing nothing to lower malpractice premiums. Fortunately, they were not enacted into law.

I had hoped that this year's legislation would be the product of careful deliberation at the committee level, including reasonable caps on non-economic damages and punitive damages for manufacturers of prescription drugs and medical devices, as long as they have been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. At one time, the FDA shield might have been less controversial. Second, H.R. 5 provides a shield against punitive damages for manufacturers of prescription drugs and medical devices, as long as they have been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. At one time, the FDA shield might have been less controversial. After all, the FDA has long been considered the gold standard for prescription drug quality and compliance, and for questions about the safety determinations made by the FDA.

In 2004, the Energy and Commerce Committee held hearings to examine safety issues resulting from pharmaceutical developments related to several other pharmaceuticals approved by the FDA, this provision was viewed by the American public as a guarantee that drugs were safe. But in light of developments related to several other pharmaceuticals approved by the FDA, this provision is truly baffling. Cases involving life-threatening complications from these drugs have raised fundamental questions about the safety determinations made by the FDA.
surrounding the prescribing of antidepressants to children. At that time, several members of the Committee criticized the FDA for failing to take prompt action to address these concerns. Last September, Vioxx was withdrawn from the market after a study showed it doubled the risk of heart attacks and strokes in patients taking the drug for more than 18 months. Since then, it has been reported that more than 130,000 persons have suffered heart attacks as a result of taking Vioxx. Richard Matthews of Thurmont, Maryland, was one of the first reported fatalities from Vioxx. According to an Associated Press account, Richard’s wife, Lisa, said her husband had no previous heart problems and died in 2002 at age 42 of a heart arrhythmia only a few days after he began taking Vioxx. Several Congressional committees have responded to these events by initiating investigations of drug safety issues, including the FDA’s procedures for evaluating the safety of prescription drugs.

Given the questions that have arisen about FDA’s effectiveness, it is truly astonishing that the leadership is here promoting a bill that prohibits the awarding of any punitive damages and limits non-economic damages for drugs and devices approved by the FDA. This bill, H.R. 5, was referred to the Energy and Commerce Committee, the same committee that acknowledged problems at the FDA. Did the committee members try to amend this bill to strike or tone down the FDA provision? There was no opportunity. H.R. 5 was introduced one week ago, July 21, referred to the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committees, which did not hold a hearing or mark-up, and their members now have the floor today. The FDA shield is an irresponsible provision that should have been stricken from this bill. We have no opportunity to strike it today, because an amendment that would have done so was not made in order by the Rules Committee. It may endanger the health and lives of thousands of Americans. It will certainly deny them the opportunity to receive fair compensation when they are injured.

Third, I firmly believe that we must reduce medical errors in our health care system if we are to reduce the number of preventable deaths. It has been nearly six years since the 1999 report of the Institute of Medicine, IOM, entitled “To Err Is Human: Building A Safer Health System.” That report focused a great deal of attention on the issue of medical errors and patient safety. IOM estimated that between 44,000 and 98,000 people die in hospitals each year as the result of medical errors. Even using the lower estimate, this would make medical errors the eighth leading cause of death in this country, higher than motor vehicle accidents, breast cancer, or AIDS. This House has just passed S. 544, legislation to reduce medical errors and improve patient safety. But its passage by a nearly unanimous vote of 428 to 3 is a clear indication that Congress knows there are VALID CASES WHERE VICTIMS deserve their day in court. The patient safety bill has not yet been signed into law. I hope it will be law soon, and that it will help improve patient safety. But each case is an individual case, and those who are harmed by medical errors deserve just compensation for their injuries.

Finally, I must question why the authors of this bill are not addressing malpractice insurance premium increases in this bill. The provisions of H.R. 5 would not reduce the rates that insurance companies charge providers. We have an alternative that would directly address the problems of frivolous lawsuits and insurance industry abuses. But once again this year, the base bill, H.R. 5, contains no provisions that will lower malpractice premiums.

Mr. Speaker, these malpractice premium increases are the reason that providers ask me to support medical malpractice reform. These are practitioners who truly love their professions, and they are troubled by dramatic increases in costs. I am truly disappointed that they must pay whether or not there have been any malpractice claims filed against them in the past year. They say that they want to continue practicing medicine next year, but they may not be able to afford to. When I ask if they would like to see provisions in the bill that limit their premium increases, they emphatically reply yes. So it is puzzling that this bill, which the authors say was written to help physicians stay in business, fails to address their central concern by even monitoring insurance companies’ rate hikes. In fact, there are no provisions anywhere in the bill that affect malpractice insurers.

In sum, H.R. 5 represents a missed opportunity for this House. We could have produced a bill that would truly make a difference, in lowering malpractice premiums, in placing real caps on non-economic damages. I am disappointed that we don’t have a better bill, a more responsible bill that we can vote on today. I urge my colleagues to reject this approach, which will do nothing to improve access to care, nothing to hold insurance companies accountable for premium increases, and nothing to make our nation’s medical liability system more fair.

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5, the Republican Medical Malpractice legislation. This flawed bill provides sweeping liability protections to pharmaceutical and insurance companies, provides inadequate protections for doctors, and will do nothing to lower health care costs.

Doctors are rightly frustrated over the significant increases in medical liability insurance premiums and I am truly concerned that additional costs make it more difficult for physicians to stay in practice. However, I do not believe that this legislation addresses the real problem, which lies with the insurance companies.

Republicans have for years claimed that the rising costs of malpractice insurance are due to a dramatic increase in malpractice lawsuits. However, a recent study of the 15 largest insurance companies shows that over the past 5 years, punitive damages doubled while claims payments have been reduced or remained static. This study proves that insurance companies are simply increasing their profits on the backs of our physicians.

Another totally outrageous provision of this bill is the sweeping liability protection for pharmaceutical companies. This bill states that if a product has gone through the Food and Drug Administration approval process, no punitive damages can be awarded against the manufacturer of the device or drug later. If this were to become law, the manufacturers of Vioxx would have been immune from lawsuits from the families of those harmed or killed by this faulty medication. It is unacceptable to put into law that pharmaceutical and insurance companies are without accountability when their products or decisions knowingly cause harm.

This Republican bill will hurt patients who are harmed by medical malpractice by arbitrarily capping damages and denying justice to injured patients and their families. This is not only unfair, but it is unnecessary. New information shows that there is no link between the existence of malpractice caps and insurance premiums. Finally, because medical malpractice accounts for less than one percent of national health care costs, this legislation would not be required to reduce health care premiums. Families across America are struggling to afford quality health care and the numbers of uninsured are on the rise. We need to address the real issues involved in the dramatic increase in health care costs, such as the cost of prescription drugs, provider shortages, uninsured, and the cost of new technologies.

This Congress must become serious about increasing access to quality health care. We need to put families, not pharmaceutical companies, first. I support the Democratic substitute which would have weeded out frivolous lawsuits but allowed justice for injured patients. Democrats were ready to take steps to really reduce insurance premiums by requiring insurance companies to give half of their savings in medical malpractice rates for doctors. Finally, this substitute would create a commission to evaluate the real causes of increases in premiums as well as insurance reform proposals. We all recognize that this is an important issue. This substitute will give us an opportunity to work together, with accurate information, to make real progress for patients and providers.

Mr. Smith of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit offered by Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONYERS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.
(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the “Medical Malpractice and Insurance Reform Act of 2005”.
(b) Table of Contents.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:
Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
TITLE I—LIMITING FRIVOLOUS MEDICAL MALPRACTICE LAWSUITS
Sec. 101. Statute of limitations.
SEC. 101. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) In General.—A medical malpractice action shall be barred unless the complaint is filed within 3 years after the right of action accrues.

(b) ACCRUAL.—A right of action referred to in subsection (a) accrues upon the last to occur of the following dates:

(1) The date of the injury.

(2) The date on which the claimant discovers, or through the use of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the injury.

(3) The date on which the claimant becomes 18 years of age.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any injury occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. HEALTH CARE SPECIALIST ADVISDavit.

(a) REQUIRED付き申告書との連携.—No medical malpractice action may be brought by any individual, unless, at the time the individual brings the action (except as provided in subsection (b)(1)), it is accompanied by the affidavit of a qualified specialist that includes the specialist’s statement of belief that, based on a review of the available medical record and other relevant material, there is a reasonable and meritorious cause for filing the action against the defendant.

(b) EXTENSION in CERTAIN INSTANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an individual who brings a medical malpractice action without submitting an affidavit described in subsection (a) if, after the initial action is brought, the individual has been unable to obtain adequate medical records or other information necessary to prepare the affidavit.

(2) DEADLINE for SUBMISSION where EXTENSION APPLIES.—(A) The deadline for submission of an affidavit under subsection (a) is 90 days after the initial filing of the action, unless the court finds that the individual has been unable to obtain adequate medical records or other information necessary to prepare the affidavit.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY of SPECIALIST.—Upon a showing of good cause by a defendant, the court may ascertain the identity of a specialist referred to in subsection (a) while preventing the disclosure of any information that may be protected under this section.

SEC. 103. SANCTIONS for FRIVOLOUS ACTIONS and PLEADINGS.

(a) SIGNATURES Required.—Every pleading, written motion, and other paper in any medical malpractice action shall be signed by at least 1 attorney of record in the attorney’s state—

(1) to be knowledgeable in the relevant specialist that includes the specialist’s state- of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MANDATORY SANCTIONS.

(1) A medical malpractice action shall be dismissed unless the attorney or unrepresented party presenting the complaint certifies that, to the best of the person’s knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonably adequate under the circumstances—

(A) it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation;

(B) the claims and other legal contents therein are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law; and

(C) the allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery.

(2) If, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, a court determines that subsection (b) has been violated, the court shall find such attorney or party in contempt of court and shall require the payment of costs and attorneys fees, and require such person to serve a monetary fine.

(3) THIRD VIOLATION.—If, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, a court determines that subsection (b) has been violated, the court shall find such attorney or party in contempt of court and shall require the payment of costs and attorneys fees, and require such person to serve a monetary fine.

(4) The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall, by regulation, develop requirements with respect to such mediation to ensure that it is carried out in a manner that:

(A) is affordable for the parties involved;

(B) encourages timely resolution of claims;

(C) encourages the consistent and fair resolution of claims; and

(D) provides for reasonably convenient access to dispute resolution.

(e) FURTHER REDRESS and ADMISSIBILITY.—Any party dissatisfied with a determination reached with respect to a medical malpractice claim as a result of an alternative dispute resolution method employed under this section shall not be bound by such determination. The results of the alternative dispute resolution method applied under this section, and all statements, offers, and communications made during the application of such method, shall be inadmissible for purposes of adjudicating the claim.

(b) densities for EACH INJURY.—Punitive damages may not be awarded in a medical malpractice action, except upon proof of——
(1) gross negligence;
(2) reckless indifference to life; or
(3) an intentional act, such as voluntary intoxication or impairment by a physician, sexual assault, assault and battery, or falsification of records.

(b) ALLOCATION.—In such a case, the award of punitive damages shall be allocated 50 percent to the patient and 50 percent to a trustee appointed by the court, to be used by such trustee in the manner specified in subsection (b)(3) of this section.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any action if the applicable State law provides (or has been construed to provide) for damages in such an action that are only punitive or exemplary in nature.

(d) TRUST FUND.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—This subsection applies to amounts allocated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services as trustee under subsection (b).

(2) AVAILABLE.—Such amounts shall be available for use by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under paragraph (3) and shall remain so available until expended.

(3) USE.—
(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, shall use the amounts to carry out programs and procedures for carrying amounts to which this subsection applies through the Director of the Agency for Health and Human Services as such trustee.

(B) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall invest the amounts to which this subsection applies to amounts to which this subsection applies through the Director of the Agency for Health and Human Services as such trustee.

(C) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall use the amounts to which this subsection applies through the Director of the Agency for Health and Human Services as such trustee under such section.

(4) IN GENERAL.—The term “medical malpractice liability insurance company” means an entity in the business of providing an insurance policy under which the entity makes payment in settlement (or partial settlement) of, or in satisfaction of a judgment in, a medical malpractice action or claim.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION METHOD.—The term “alternative dispute resolution method” means a method that provides for the resolution of medical malpractice claims in a manner other than through medical malpractice litigation.

(2) CLAIMANT.—The term “claimant” means any person who alleges a medical malpractice claim, and any person on whose behalf such a claim is alleged, including the decedent in the case of an action brought through or on behalf of an estate.

(3) HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term “healthcare professional” means any individual who provides health services in a State and who is required by the laws or regulations of the State to be licensed or certified by the State to provide such services in the State.

(4) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term “health care provider” means any organization or institution that is engaged in the delivery of health care services in a State and that is required by the laws or regulations of the State to be licensed or certified by the State to engage in the delivery of such services in the State.

(5) INJURY.—The term “injury” means any illness, disease, or other harm that is the subject of a medical malpractice action or claim.

(6) MANDATORY.—The term “mandatory” means required to be used by the parties to attempt to resolve a medical malpractice claim notwithstanding any other provision of an agreement, State law, or Federal law.

(7) MEDIATION.—The term “mediation” means a settlement process coordinated by a neutral third party and without the ultimate rendering of a formal opinion as to factual or legal disputes and in which the parties are to attempt to resolve a medical malpractice claim.

SEC. 108. APPLICABILITY

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 104, this title shall apply with respect to any medical malpractice action brought on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) FEDERAL COURTS JURISDICTION NOT ESTABLISHED ON FEDERAL QUESTION GROUNDS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to establish jurisdiction of the United States over medical malpractice actions on the basis of section 1331 or 1337 of title 28, United States Code.

TITLE II—INDEPENDENT ADVISORY COMMISSION ON MEDICAL MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The sudden rise in medical malpractice premiums in regions of the United States can threaten patient access to doctors and other health providers.

(2) Improving patient access to doctors and other health providers is a national priority.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a national commission to be known as the “Independent Advisory Commission on Medical Malpractice Insurance” (in this title referred to as the “Commission”).

SEC. 202. DUTIES

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall evaluate the causes and scope of the recent and dramatic increases in medical malpractice insurance premiums and make recommendations to avoid any dramatic increase in medical malpractice premiums in the future, in light of proposals for tort reform regarding medical malpractice.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In formulating proposals under this section, the Commission shall, at a minimum, consider the following:

(1) Alternatives to the current medical malpractice tort system that would ensure adequate compensation for patients, preserve access to providers, and improve health care safety and quality.

(2) Modifications of, and alternatives to, the existing State and Federal regulations and oversight that affect, or could affect, medical malpractice lines of insurance.

(3) State and Federal reforms that would distribute the risk of medical malpractice more equitably among health care providers.

(4) State and Federal reforms that would more evenly distribute the risk of medical malpractice across various categories of providers.


(6) The effect of a Federal medical malpractice reinsurance program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(7) Programs that would reduce medical errors and increase patient safety, including new innovations in technology and management.
after until the Commission terminates.

The membership of the Commission shall include individuals with national recognition for their expertise in health finance and economics, actuarial science, medical malpractice insurance, insurance regulation, health law, health care policy, health care access, allopathic and osteopathic physicians, other providers of health care services, patient advocacy, and other related fields, who provide a mix of professional, broad geographic representations, and a balance between urban and rural representatives.

The membership of the Commission shall include: (A) any health care professional licensed by the State having standing in any State administrative proceeding to challenge a proposed rate increase in medical malpractice insurance; and (B) a provider of medical malpractice insurance who may not initiate or propose a rate increase in such insurance unless the provider, at minimum, first submits to the appropriate State and a description of the rate increase and a substantial justification for the rate increase.

The effect of reforming antitrust law to prohibit anticompetitive activities by medical malpractice insurers.

(5) provide transportation and subsistence for persons serving without compensation; and

(11) The effect of providing Federal grants for geographic areas that have a shortage of one or more types of health providers as a result of the providers making the decision to cease or curtail providing health services in the geographic area because of the costs of maintaining malpractice insurance.

SEC. 203. REPORT.

(b) CONTENTS. — Each report transmitted under this section shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, including proposals for addressing the current dramatic increases in medical malpractice insurance rates and recommendations for avoiding any such dramatic increases in the future.

The Commission shall be compensated in accordance with the following:

(2) A report made less than one year thereafter until the Commission terminates.

(c) TERMS. — The terms of the members of the Commission shall be for 3 years except that the Comptroller General of the United States shall designate staggered terms for the members of the Commission.

(5) MEETINGS. — The Comptroller General of the United States shall establish a system for public disclosure by members of the Commission of financial or other potential conflicts of interest relating to such members.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall designate the following:

(2) prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary to enable it to carry out its duties (without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, the Commission shall be subject to periodic audit by the Comptroller General of the United States. Amendment to the motion to recommit as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall have unrestricted access to all deliberations, records, and nonproprietary data of the Commission, immediately upon request.

SEC. 205. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

Subject to such review as the Comptroller General of the United States deems necessary to assure the efficient administration of the Commission, the Comptroller General may:

(1) adopt procedures allowing any interested party to submit information for the Commission’s use in making reports and recommendations.

(2) prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary to enable it to carry out its duties (without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, the Commission shall be subject to periodic audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to limit frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits, to reform the medical malpractice insurance system in order to reduce the cost of medical malpractice insurance, to enhance patient access to medical care, and for other purposes.”

Mr. CONGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring a motion to recommit that goes to the heart of the medical malpractice crisis. Rather than limiting the rights of legitimate malpractice victims, as the underlying bill actually does, our motion would directly address the problem of frivolous lawsuits and insurance industry abuses.

Title I of the substitute addresses the problem of frivolous lawsuits. Among other things, it would require all four—both an attorney and health care specialist to submit an affidavit that the claim is warranted before a malpractice action...
can be brought, and imposes strict sanctions for attorneys who make any frivolous pleadings.

Unlike the majority’s bill, our amendment is limited to licensed physicians and health care professionals for malpractice cases only. It does not include lawsuits against HMOs, insurance companies, nursing homes, and drug and device manufacturers. And it sure does not insulate the manufacturer of Vioxx from liability.

Title II establishes a national commission to evaluate the rising insurance premiums and to review whether the McCarran-Ferguson antitrust exemption for medical malpractice insurers should be repealed.

This is a good motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, the last 2½ minutes, to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DeGette).

Ms. DeGette. Mr. Speaker, Congress is faced with an irony today. We have a problem, and the problem is that doctors are going out of business because of their high medical malpractice insurance premiums. So what are we going to do? We are going to pass a bill that caps damages. What are we going to do? We are going to pass a bill that caps damages for victims injured by medical malpractice, but we are going to do nothing to reduce the premiums for these doctors.

So doctors get no relief, and victims of malpractice get less. But wait, there is more. There is so much more to this bill. We have not heard one word today about the pressing problems the pharmaceutical industry has and how we need to give them immunity so they will keep making drugs. But yet that is what this bill does.

We have not heard one word today about how all of the nursing homes are going out of business because of the lawsuits against them, but we are giving them immunity today.

We have not heard a thing about the medical device manufacturers and how they will not make the titanium hip replacements or the insulin pumps, but yet we are giving them immunity today.

This bill goes further than any law any-damnation for medical malpractice insurance premiums. So what are we going to do? We are going to pass a bill that caps damages for victims injured by medical malpractice, but we are going to do nothing to reduce the premiums for these doctors.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Shaw). Is the gentleman opposed to the motion?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Smith) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit must be defeated because it contains zero legal protections for doctors beyond current law, and in some cases it actually makes the current law worse.

The Democratic alternative would require that before a health care lawsuit is filed, the claimant file an affidavit declaring that a qualified specialist has been consulted and has issued a written report that says the filing is meritorious.

Mr. Speaker, the definition is so broad it is meaningless. The Democratic alternative also imposes another wasteful layer of bureaucracy on the health care system, mandatory mediation, which simply has no binding effect.

The motion to recommit even makes the situation of OB/GYNs worse than it is today by allowing someone as old as 21 to file a lawsuit claiming the doctor who delivered them caused their injury 21 years before. The motion to recommit would subject OB/GYNs to even more nuisance suits and drive even more of them out of business.

So the Conyers-Dingell substitute contains zero legal reforms and would make the current litigation crisis even worse; yet legal reforms are needed to solve the current crisis in medical liability insurance and increase access to health care.

H.R. 5 is the only proven legislative solution. According to the Congressional Budget Office under the HEALTH Act, “premiums for medical malpractice insurance ultimately would be an average of 25 to 30 percent below what they would be under current law.”

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of health care providers and the people who need them, let us keep doctors practicing their profession and defeat this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Green), who is an expert on this subject.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it all boils down to this: we cannot get a handle on health care costs unless we first get a handle on the least productive part of health care costs. Excessive liability costs are unproductive. They do not increase the quality of care. They do not increase the accessibility to care, and they certainly do not increase affordability of care.

Here is what excessive liability costs do. They drive up insurance costs for doctors. They drive physicians out of high-risk specialties and fields, and they drive them out of high-cost areas. In some cases, they drive them out of practice altogether; and in those cases we all lose.

The great thing about the bill before us is we know it will work. It is not speculative. We know it works. We know that reforms which permit injured parties to recover every last dollar of economic damages, but place a modest cap on noneconomic damages, loss of society, loss of companionship, we know these reforms can help solve the medical liability crisis. It worked in California. It once worked in Wisconsin. And it can work all across America if we pass the HEALTH Act. If we defeat this motion to recommit, we can solve the medical liability crisis. This is what we must do.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yes” on the HEALTH Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sweeney). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 234, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No: 448</th>
<th>YEAS—193</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abercrumbie</td>
<td>Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>Butterfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Capps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baca</td>
<td>Capua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird</td>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bechler</td>
<td>Cardona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Capuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeler</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
<td>Clapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra</td>
<td>Cleaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>Corden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>Clyburn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. McHUGH, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. OBAMA changed their vote from “aye” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHUYLER) made a point of order.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONyers, Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 230, noes 194, answered “present” 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Nay 234]

[Aye 230]

[Roll No. 449]
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 392, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies appropriations act, 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today we bring before the House the conference agreement, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, today we bring before the House the conference agreement on H.R. 2361, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006. I would like to thank all of the members of the Subcommittee for their support and guidance this year. I want to extend special thanks to the subcommittee vice chairman, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking member and my good friend, for their assistance in shaping the bill. We are under last year, and we are under the allocation.

The conference report balances many competitive and diverse needs. It provides funding for programs in the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, the Indian Health Agency, the Smithsonian Institution, and several other environmental and cultural agencies and commissions.

With the ongoing war on terrorism and a sizable Federal debt, the American taxpayer demands fiscal prudence, yet entrusts us to continue the conservation and care of our Nation's natural resources, the protection of the environment, and critical programs for native Americans and other programs. The needs far outweigh the funds available, but I believe this bill addresses the most critical needs.

The conference report is the product of a balanced, bipartisan, bicameral effort that resolves over 2,000 differences between the House and the Senate bills. Moreover, it addresses many of the key issues raised on the House floor in May and stays true to the fundamental issues that helped the bill pass overwhelmingly in the House. Here are a few of the highlights:

Payments in Lieu of Taxes are $9 million over the enacted level. The arts and humanities are $5 million each over the enacted level. Funding for operations of the national parks has increased by $61 million. Restrictions remain in the bill for pesticide testing on human subjects. Funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Act is $900 million, which is $50 million above the House level and $170 million above the budget request.

The Forest Health Program, which is critical to reducing this Nation's risk of catastrophic wildfires, is restored to the enacted level.

Finally, I am proud to say that this conference agreement contains $1.5 billion in critically needed funds for veterans medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the priorities of the American people are reflected in the conference agreement, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I would like to thank staff on both sides of the aisle because, without their hard work, we would not be able to bring this bill forward at this time.

At this time, I will include a table detailing the various accounts in the bill for insertion in the Record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of lands and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildland fire management:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire suppression operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range improvements (indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional appropriations (Title IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central hazardous materials fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission of balances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon and California grant lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service charges, deposits, &amp; forfeitures (indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Bureau of Land Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner incentive program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private stewardship grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative endangered species conservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National wildlife refuge fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American wetlands conservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neotropical migratory birds conservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinational species conservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State wildlife grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Park Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of the national park system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Park Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National recreation and preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic preservation fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and water conservation (rescission of contract authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition and state assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, National Park Service (net)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Geological Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys, investigations, and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, United States Geological Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals Management Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty and offshore minerals management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil spill research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Minerals Management Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) Legislative proposal</td>
<td>188,205</td>
<td>188,014</td>
<td>188,014</td>
<td>188,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>188,205</td>
<td>248,014</td>
<td>188,014</td>
<td>188,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</td>
<td>296,573</td>
<td>356,549</td>
<td>298,549</td>
<td>298,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

| | | | | |
| Operation of Indian programs | 1,928,091 | 1,924,230 | 1,992,737 | 1,971,132 | 1,991,490 |
| Construction | 319,129 | 232,137 | 264,137 | 267,137 | 275,037 |
| Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians | 44,150 | 24,754 | 34,754 | 24,754 | 34,754 |
| Indian guaranteed loan program account | 5,332 | 9,348 | 6,348 | 6,348 | 6,348 |
| | | | | | |
| Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs | 2,295,702 | 2,187,469 | 2,317,976 | 2,269,371 | 2,308,220 |

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

| | | | | |
| Insular Affairs: Assistance to Territories | 47,861 | 46,543 | 48,843 | 48,963 | 49,183 |
| Northern Mariannas | 27,720 | 27,720 | 27,720 | 27,720 | 27,720 |
| | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 75,581 | 74,283 | 76,563 | 76,683 | 76,863 |
| Compact of Free Association | 3,450 | 2,862 | 3,362 | 2,862 | 3,362 |
| Mandatory payments | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| | | | | | |
| Subtotal | 5,450 | 4,862 | 5,362 | 4,862 | 5,362 |
| Total, Insular Affairs | 81,031 | 79,125 | 81,925 | 81,545 | 82,245 |

### Departmental Offices

| | | | | |
| Departmental management | 95,821 | 120,155 | 97,755 | 104,627 | 127,183 |
| Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13) | 3,000 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Subtotal, Departmental management | 98,821 | 120,155 | 97,755 | 104,627 | 127,183 |
| Working Capital fund | | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Central hazardous materials fund | | | | | |
| Office of the Solicitor | 51,656 | 55,752 | 55,340 | 55,852 | 55,440 |
| Office of Special Trustee for American Indians | | | | | |
| Federal trust programs | 193,540 | 269,397 | 191,593 | 191,593 | 191,593 |
| Indian land consolidation | 34,514 | 34,514 | 34,514 | 34,514 | 34,514 |
| | | | | | |
| Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians | 228,054 | 303,911 | 226,107 | 226,107 | 226,107 |
| Natural resource damage assessment fund | 5,737 | 6,106 | 6,106 | 6,106 | 6,106 |
| | | | | | |
| Total, Departmental Offices | 729,379 | 815,903 | 758,854 | 780,563 | 782,052 |

### A-T-B reduction to administrative costs | | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total, title I, Department of the Interior: New budget (obligational) authority (net) Appropriations | 9,955,228 | 9,792,069 | 9,799,893 | 9,867,741 | 9,926,107 |
| Recession | (9,881,774) | (9,822,069) | (9,829,893) | (9,897,741) | (9,936,107) |
| | | | | | |
| Total, Department of the Interior: New budget (obligational) authority (net) | -30,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 |

### TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

| | | | | |
| Science and technology | 744,961 | 780,840 | 785,340 | 730,795 | 741,722 |
| (By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund) | (35,808) | (30,808) | (30,808) | (30,808) | (30,808) |
| Environmental programs and management | 2,204,902 | 2,353,764 | 2,389,491 | 2,333,416 | 2,381,752 |
| Pesticide fees (legislative proposal) | | | | | |
| Office of Inspector General | 37,896 | 36,955 | 37,955 | 36,955 | 37,455 |
| (By transfer from Hazardous substance superfund) | (12,896) | (13,536) | (13,536) | (13,536) | (13,536) |
| Buildings and facilities | 38,888 | 40,218 | 40,218 | 40,218 | 40,218 |
| Hazardous substance superfund | 1,247,477 | 1,279,333 | 1,258,333 | 1,256,165 | 1,280,621 |
| Transfer to Office of Inspector General | (-12,896) | (-13,536) | (-13,536) | (-13,536) | (-13,536) |
| Transfer to Science and Technology | | | | | |
| Leaking underground storage tank program | 69,440 | 73,027 | 73,027 | 73,027 | 73,027 |
| Oil spill response | 15,872 | 15,863 | 15,863 | 15,863 | 15,863 |
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### (Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide registration fund...</td>
<td>19,245</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide registration fees...</td>
<td>-19,245</td>
<td>-12,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and tribal assistance grants...</td>
<td>2,438,758</td>
<td>1,779,500</td>
<td>2,078,500</td>
<td>2,331,000</td>
<td>2,132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical grants...</td>
<td>1,138,591</td>
<td>1,181,300</td>
<td>1,151,300</td>
<td>1,122,550</td>
<td>1,129,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions (various EPA accounts)...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
<td>-59,000</td>
<td>-58,000</td>
<td>-80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, State and tribal assistance grants...</td>
<td>3,575,349</td>
<td>2,980,800</td>
<td>3,127,800</td>
<td>3,395,550</td>
<td>3,181,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title II, Environmental Protection Agency...</td>
<td>8,026,485</td>
<td>7,520,600</td>
<td>7,708,027</td>
<td>7,891,989</td>
<td>7,732,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority...</td>
<td>(8,023,485)</td>
<td>(7,520,600)</td>
<td>(7,808,027)</td>
<td>(7,939,989)</td>
<td>(7,812,354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations...</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions...</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(-100,000)</td>
<td>(-58,000)</td>
<td>(-80,000)</td>
<td>(-80,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)...</td>
<td>(48,704)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(48,704)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

**Forest Service**

- Forest and rangeland research... 276,384 285,400 285,000 280,892 283,094
- State and private forestry... 292,506 253,387 254,875 254,615 283,577
- Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)... 49,100 49,100 49,100 49,100 49,100
- National forest system... 1,380,806 1,851,357 1,417,920 1,377,856 1,424,348
- Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)... 12,153 12,153 12,153 12,153 12,153

**Wildland fire management**

- Preparedness... 676,470 676,014 691,014 676,014 676,014
- Fire suppression operations... 649,859 700,492 700,492 700,492 700,492
- Additional appropriations (Title IV)... 394,443 394,443 394,443 394,443 394,443
- Other operations... 377,887 67,761 399,000 369,025 402,899
- Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)... 1,028 1,028 1,028 1,028 1,028
- Funded in Defense Bill (P.L. 108-287) (sec. 8088)... (30,000) (30,000) (30,000) (30,000) (30,000)

**Subtotal**... 2,096,487 1,444,267 1,790,506 1,745,531 1,779,395

**Capital improvement and maintenance**

- 514,701 380,792 468,260 409,751 441,178

**Land acquisition**

- 61,007 40,000 15,000 44,925 42,500

**Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses**

- 5,879 5,467 5,467 5,067 5,067

**Total, Forest Service**... 2,746,285 2,086,000 2,086,000 2,086,000 2,086,000

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

**Indian Health Service**

**Indian health services**

- Non-contract services... 2,098,424 2,207,277 2,207,277 2,207,302 2,207,277
- Contract care... 480,319 507,021 507,021 507,021 507,021
- Catastrophic health emergency fund... 17,750 18,000 18,000 18,000 18,000

**Total, Indian health services**... 2,596,492 2,732,298 2,732,298 2,732,323 2,732,298

**Indian health facilities**

- 388,574 315,968 370,774 335,843 358,485

**Total, Indian Health Service**... 2,985,066 3,047,966 3,103,072 3,076,966 3,090,783

**National Institute of Health**

- National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences... 79,842 80,289 80,289 80,289 80,289
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(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry</td>
<td>76,041</td>
<td>76,024</td>
<td>76,024</td>
<td>76,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic substances and environmental public health</td>
<td>3,140,949</td>
<td>3,204,279</td>
<td>3,259,385</td>
<td>3,224,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>3,217,985</td>
<td>3,280,293</td>
<td>3,335,409</td>
<td>3,348,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RELATED AGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office of the President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency fund</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Chemical Safety and Hazard</td>
<td>9,424</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>8,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Institute</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>490,035</td>
<td>524,135</td>
<td>524,381</td>
<td>524,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities capital</td>
<td>126,123</td>
<td>90,900</td>
<td>100,900</td>
<td>100,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td>615,158</td>
<td>615,035</td>
<td>615,281</td>
<td>614,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Gallery of Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>91,708</td>
<td>97,100</td>
<td>97,100</td>
<td>96,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings</td>
<td>10,946</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Gallery of Art</td>
<td>102,654</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>113,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and maintenance</td>
<td>16,914</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>16,107</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>33,021</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>8,863</td>
<td>9,201</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>9,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>121,264</td>
<td>121,264</td>
<td>131,284</td>
<td>128,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and administration</td>
<td>122,156</td>
<td>122,805</td>
<td>127,805</td>
<td>127,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching grants</td>
<td>15,898</td>
<td>15,449</td>
<td>15,449</td>
<td>15,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td>138,054</td>
<td>138,054</td>
<td>143,254</td>
<td>143,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</td>
<td>259,318</td>
<td>259,318</td>
<td>274,318</td>
<td>269,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>6,902</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars is a separate organization from the National Endowment for the Humanities.*
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2006 (H.R. 2381)
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>4,988</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>4,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Planning Commission</td>
<td>7,888</td>
<td>8,344</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>8,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Holocaust Memorial Museum</td>
<td>40,858</td>
<td>43,233</td>
<td>41,880</td>
<td>43,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio Trust</td>
<td>19,722</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>19,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title III, related agencies:</td>
<td>9,036,011</td>
<td>8,411,659</td>
<td>8,851,405</td>
<td>8,506,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority (net)</td>
<td>(8,898,525)</td>
<td>(8,411,659)</td>
<td>(8,851,405)</td>
<td>(8,506,895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(137,486)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TITTE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Across-the-board cut (.47%) (rescission) (Sec. 437) | --- | --- | --- | --- | -126,000 |

TITTE VI - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Veteran’s Health (Sec. 439) (emergency appropriation) | --- | --- | --- | 1,500,000 | --- |

Grand total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year 2005</th>
<th>27,017,724</th>
<th>25,724,328</th>
<th>26,159,125</th>
<th>27,756,625</th>
<th>27,701,541</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year 2006</td>
<td>27,017,724</td>
<td>25,724,328</td>
<td>26,159,125</td>
<td>26,256,625</td>
<td>26,201,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority (net)</td>
<td>(26,803,784)</td>
<td>(25,754,328)</td>
<td>(26,289,125)</td>
<td>(26,344,825)</td>
<td>(26,311,541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(243,940)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,500,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-30,000)</td>
<td>(-30,000)</td>
<td>(-130,000)</td>
<td>(-88,000)</td>
<td>(-110,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer out)</td>
<td>(-48,704)</td>
<td>(-44,141)</td>
<td>(-44,142)</td>
<td>(-44,142)</td>
<td>(-44,142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(48,704)</td>
<td>(44,141)</td>
<td>(44,142)</td>
<td>(44,142)</td>
<td>(44,142)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support this conference report on the fiscal year 2006 Interior and Environmental Appropriations bill and urge my colleagues to vote for it, in just a few minutes, I hope. With the addition of $1.5 billion in spending for veterans health care attached to this bill, I believe that this conference report will get widespread support in both the House and the Senate.

After we made a decision to add this $1.5 billion, I contacted back in the State of Washington the veterans hospital in Seattle and the one at Amer-

ican Lake to find out what the backlog was, and I was shocked to find out that there is a backlog of some 2,000 veterans who are waiting to get an initial appointment at those hospitals. So this money clearly is needed, and I am pleased that the other body selected the Interior Appropriations to add this $1.5 billion to and that we were able to present it here today to the House.

There are several areas of this bill that I believe are underfunded; however, I believe these funding decisions were also based on inadequate justification. Although the majority cannot escape responsibility for this allocation, I believe that we here in the minority have been treated fairly during the process of developing the 2006 Interior Appropriations.

First of all, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), for the decision to provide the Park Service operating budget another year of healthy increases. Over the last 2 years, we have provided more than $100 million in increases for the parks operating budget, and I am very proud of that accomplishment. We really were seeing a decline in some of the parks because they were not able to cover their fixed costs on an annual basis and had to lay off people and were unable to provide the American people with the services that they needed.

However, I am disappointed with the overall amount for the Clean Water Act State Revolving Fund. I had hoped that the conference report would end up closer to the Senate mark of $1.1 billion, rather than at $900 million, which is only $50 million above the House mark. Over the last 2 years, this fund has increased 23 percent. I am also disappointed that we could not retain the full $10 million increase for the National Endowment for the Arts, which was approved on the House floor in an overwhelming vote, but I am gratified that we could agree to some increase for both the NEA and the NEH.

I am glad to see this conference report contains increases over the House mark for both land acquisition and the State arts program. Although these programs are cut from last year, I agree with the decision to restore some of the funding, and I am sympathetic to the argument that, during a year with such a low allocation, it is most important to protect core programs and make land acquisition a more secondary goal.

I am deeply appreciative of everyone’s effort on the issue concerning the use of humans during pesticide testing. I think the conference report reflects the will of both the House and Senate to stop such tests until the EPA develops regulations reflecting the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences, which follows the Nuremberg protocols. In addition, these regulations will prohibit such testing on pregnant women, infants, and children.

I also want to praise the compromise contained in this conference report on the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial to be built on the National Mall. The conference report contains $10 million that must be matched by private donations. This matching requirement will spur generous donations and reflects the thinking of the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who felt very strongly that we should try to raise as much money for the memorial from the private sector.

Again, I want to say that the chair-

man has been very fair and his staff, led by Debbie Weatherly, has done an outstanding job in putting together this bill. I want to congratulate Mike Stewart and Pete Modoff of my staff for the exceptional work they did on this bill. I think this is, in a very difficult year, I think this is a bill that deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I do want to say, though, that I do not believe that it is an unusual act to say that this is a close call on this bill as far as I am concerned; but weighing all of the conflicting pressures, I come down on the side of recommending a vote for the bill, primarily because of what it does to finally provide sufficient funding for veterans health care.

With respect to that item, I would simply say to our friends on the majority side of the aisle, welcome aboard. We tried for the last year and a half to convince this committee and to convince the majority that the veterans health accounts were under-funded. Finally, the administration admitted that that was true; and, in fact, the amount being added to this bill today for veterans health care is exactly the amount that we had been asking be added to that program for that purpose for a long period of time.

I want to make clear, the shortfall for veterans’ health care is not the responsibility of the chairman of this subcommittee. This problem is supposed to be taken care of by another subcommittee; but, in fact, after running away from the problem for months and months, the majority party has finally decided that they did not want to go home in August and have to face the folks at the Legion hall or the VFW hall without finally doing something to fix the problem. So I am glad that they did.

I do believe that we are going to vote for this bill because of what it does for veterans, I think we need to understand that in a number of other areas, this bill is far from where it ought to be if we are to meet the responsibilities we have to this country’s future. Overall, funding for the EPA declines by $291 million in this bill. The Clean Water State Revolving Fund has now been cut by 33 percent over 2 years. Grants to States for conservation and recreation are reduced by two-thirds from fiscal year 2005. Every State suffers a 66 percent cut.

In the year 2001, land acquisition funds in this bill were $442 million. Today, they are $124 million. That is the lowest appropriation for this item in the last 20 years. Funding for national parks and refuges and forests has been reduced by about 10 percent from last year. The funding for Forest Service buildings, roads, and trails has been cut from $514 million to $441 million, a reduction of 14 percent. BIA school construction is funded at a level $53 million below last year. Health facilities construction for Indian health services is funded at $38 million, a reduction of $50 million. I do not believe those numbers are numbers that we would be proud to take home.

So we are stuck with a choice. We can cast a protest vote against the cuts in this bill, which many of us have already done; or we can recognize the fact that in a time of war we have an obligation to meet the health care needs of those who have risked everything for this country; and I think we, in the end, have no real choice but to come down in favor of voting for that increased veterans funding.

But I hope that the general public will understand that the cuts in this bill do not reflect the Nation’s priorities. We are shortchanging our country’s future. We are not meeting our stewardship responsibilities, and we will pay a long-term price for that, I regret to say.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing. I do want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee chairman for the fairness with which he has dealt with this bill. I may not agree with the priorities that the majority party budget resolution imposed on the subcommittee, but I do want to say that I think the chairman has been most fair in his dealing with the minority; and we appreciate that.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRAT), who is one of the leaders in this House on budget matters.
Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the $1.5 billion in veterans health care funding for 2005, which was added on to this conference report. I am pleased that this is the result of the hard work by the other side and the Republicans have finally come around to our position on veterans funding and now acknowledge that their budgets have not funded this priority accurately or adequately.

This shortfall has not occurred for lack of notice or foresight. Over warnings from veterans groups and our own strenuous objections, the budgets passed by this House have consistently, consistently, understated the cost of veterans health care.

This is the Veterans Administration borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, delaying or deferring service until a supplement finally comes through. And then when the supplement comes through, it busts the spending caps imposed in the budget and adds to the deficit.

This is no way to budget for veterans health care, and it is no way to budget generally. The White House just 2 weeks ago issued a midsession review of the budget, which we received with some skepticism. We observed that their projections of the deficit seemed better, partly because they omit the full cost of various policies like veterans health care, the ongoing cost of operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and fixing the alternative minimum tax, extending other tax credits.

In the short run, these omissions make the deficit look better, sure, but in the long run the true costs emerge, and the actual deficits turn out to be worse than projected.

Here is an example of what happened to veterans health care in the fiscal 2005 budget cycle. When we brought forth our budget resolutions on the Democratic side for 2005, we argued that the discretionary spending levels in the Republican resolution were too tight, not realistic, and would short-change essential priorities like veterans health care.

We were not alone. The chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee argued that more funding for veterans health care was badly needed, but our concerns went unheeded. Now we have to face the truth. The funding provided for veterans health care in the 2005 budget was, in fact, not sufficient.

And since an accurate funding level was not built into the budget, today's bill will move discretionary spending for 2005 over the allocation included in the Republican budget. This misestimate, like others, was left out of the deficit projections that OMB announced just a couple of weeks ago.

For me personally, I pointed out that the Democrats put forth a responsible budget for 2005. Our budget brought us to balance by the year 2012, yet we funded veterans health care priorities and other priorities adequately.

Our budget provided $1.3 billion more for veterans health care in 2005, and $1.5 billion more over a 5-year period of time. Unfortunately the same story is playing out, unfolding again in 2006. And so it worries me that we warned the budget provided too little for veterans health care, and once again it was to no avail.

Our resolution provided $1.5 billion more for veterans health care in 2006, $16.4 billion more over 5 years, and a budget, mind you, that balanced by 2012. Just 3 months later, 3 months later, we are told that the VA appropriations bill for 2006 will have to exceed its budget allocation to accommodate the administration's amended request for veterans health care. And, of course, the deficit estimates for 2006 will have to be revised upward accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I would gladly vote to raise veterans health care to the level it should have been to start with, but I urge that we learn a lesson from this experience and be forthright in the future about the cost of veterans health care. And in that connection, I would note the 30 years, 2007, 2008 and onward, the official estimates of the Republican budget still grossly underfund veterans health care, they underestimate the deficit, and they definitely will have to do this all over again until the numbers are finally done right.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), who has been a real leader on the issue of dealing with pesticides and their effect on humans.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be in the Interior-Environment appropriations bill. I want to especially thank the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OSBORN), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the ranking, for their work on this legislation.

I am particularly proud of the steps that Congress has taken today to require approval of stringent ethical and scientific safeguards of intentional human dosing studies, and to stop the testing of pesticides on pregnant women and children. And I would like to thank all of your staff for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SOLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman on her leadership. I remember when we had the amendment on the floor. It was adopted here in the House unanimously. And I think your work and the work of your colleague from California in the other body on this matter, where they also won a vote there, too, was very impressive.

And, you know, this is the first year our committee has had jurisdiction over the Environmental Protection Agency, so I am very pleased about these issues. I want to congratulate you on your real leadership. And I think what you did will be something that will protect children and pregnant mothers and will bring better standards at EPA and a better budget on this issue. I congratulate you on this effort.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to also submit that our staffs have worked very hard, and the outside organizations that worked in tandem with us, religious organizations, the scientific, environmental community, as well as activists. In fact, the United Farm Workers also submitted a letter of support.

This should never have happened. It should never have taken place, the testing of pesticides on humans, and particularly children.

So I know that I stand here before you in the Congress to say that this is a good moment for us in this particular time. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, as co-sponsor of this amendment, I rise today to support the application of stringent ethical and scientific safeguards to intentional human dosing studies of toxic chemicals and applaud the inclusion of this language in the Interior Appropriations Act of World War II. I am submitting copies of the NAS report and the Nuremberg Code into the RECORD.

In particular, this amendment prohibits intentional human dosing on pregnant women, infants or children, and requires the creation of a review board to evaluate the ethical and scientific propriety of intentional human dosing studies before they can be conducted, considered, or relied on. In 2002, the National Academy of Sciences convened a panel to examine the issue of intentionally dosing human subjects with pesticides and other toxic substances.

The report of the NAS, published in February 2004, recognized that these experiments can be “troubling” and in some cases “repugnant in the Interior-Appropriations Act” included a provision that to be “ethically justified,” a human pesticide experiment must pass “rigorous scrutiny on both scientific and ethical grounds.”

All of the studies currently pending before EPA are scientifically and ethically suspect and fall short of the stringent criteria for EPA consideration obtained by the NAS and the Nuremberg Code, and required in this amendment. EPA provided Congress with a list of all human intentional dosing tests under consideration by the agency. An extensive evaluation of these tests shows that they are ethically suspect and do not approach the standard for acceptability.

Representative WAXMAN and Senator BOXER evaluated the serious flaws in these studies in
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Mr. OBEY, for his cooperating with me one more time to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for his cooperating with me as we have gone through this initial conference process, but most importantly to congratulate both my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), and my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), for the fabulous job on this conference report that we expect to send to the President’s desk.

It is very early in the process, but the Interior bill will be on the President’s desk, and I am very certain he will appreciate it. So congratulations to each of you for your work.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important moment today that we are passing this conference report before the August recess. And I want to congratulate the chairman and ranking member from the Senate and the Senate staff tirelessly to work with the chairman to get these bills enacted.

But I think there is absolutely no excuse not to try to do this and try to pass the rest of the bills in September as we are expected to do. And I think that we can get the job done before the start of the fiscal year.

And I think every time we have a new chairman, we do better in this regard. The previous chairman, of course, had to deal with other problems. But I think the chairman has made this a big priority. I think it is important that we do this, and I want to congratulate him for his leadership as the new chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me further say that none of this would have been done as effectively and with the high quality reflected in the conference report without the great help of our staff and the one thing that we have done a tremendous job. They are breaking records here. It is because of the cooperation of the entire committee, the Members and the staff working together.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise in opposition to this conference report. Let me explain. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It guts some of our most important environmental programs. It seems that the Republican majority realized what a bad bill they were dealing with. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have the dubious honor of providing the lowest appropriation for land and conservation programs in 20 years.

Funding for construction at our National Parks, Refuges and Forests was cut by ten percent and funding for Forest Service buildings, roads and trails by 14 percent. Stateside grants for conservation and recreation got an amazing two-thirds cut, from $90 million last year to $30 million.

So, you see the conundrum before us. It is with a heavy heart that I feel that I must stand against not only a bad bill, but also against the process. It is unconscionable that my friends on the other side of the aisle would link this critically important and much needed funding for our Nation’s heroes to a bad bill.

Mr. THORPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this conference report.

I am very reluctant to support this bill because it contains provisions I strongly oppose. Specifically, this bill contains harmful cuts to important interior and environmental priorities. It cuts $800 million from last year’s funding level for natural resources and the Environmental Protection Agency. Environmental and management and science and technology accounts are severely cut in this bill. The bill contains $1 million for water and sewer construction STAG grants, cuts $200 million from SRF clean water funds, and cuts $30 million from stateside grants to states for conservation and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a solemn obligation to protect our Nation’s water, air and land resources for public health and safety. We must practice responsible stewardship of our natural resources and pass on to future generations a physical environment as bountiful as the one we have enjoyed. This bill fails that test miserably.

I will vote for this bill because it contains desperately needed funding for veterans’ healthcare. Specifically, the conference report on H.R. 2631 contains $1.5 billion in veterans' budget for primarily veterans’ health programs is funded $13.5 billion below the amount needed to maintain services at current levels.

I am pleased that my Republican colleagues have finally seen the light and realized that we cannot ask our men and women in uniform to make the ultimate sacrifice only to come home and have the promise of quality and timely healthcare broken. However, I am angry as hell that they attached this much needed funding to a particularly appalling bill.

You are probably saying, “Dingell, how appalling could it be when we are finally getting this funding for our veterans?”

Well, let me tell you. EPA has estimated that there is a $388 billion shortfall between needed clean water and drinking water investments and the current level of spending. What do my Republican colleagues do to address that shortfall, Mr. Speaker? They cut the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund by $200 million from the FY 05 enacted level! That is a 33 percent cut over the past two years. Moreover, the bill cuts water and sewer construction grants by more than 30 percent—a reduction of $107 million from last year. This hardly seems like a reasonable response.

Conservation and land acquisition got a $41 million reduction. This is 25 percent below last year and 50 percent below the enacted level.

It is also clear that EPA has estimated that there is a $388 billion shortfall between needed clean water and drinking water investments and the current level of spending. What do my Republican colleagues do to address that shortfall, Mr. Speaker? They cut the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund by $200 million from the FY 05 enacted level! That is a 33 percent cut over the past two years. Moreover, the bill cuts water and sewer construction grants by more than 30 percent—a reduction of $107 million from last year. This hardly seems like a reasonable response.

Conservation and land acquisition got a $41 million reduction. This is 25 percent below last year and 50 percent below the enacted level.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a pragmatist. I realize that pesticide experiments are done as effectively and with the high quality reflected in the conference report without the great help of our staff and the one thing that we have done a tremendous job. They are breaking records here. It is because of the cooperation of the entire committee, the Members and the staff working together.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise in opposition to this conference report. Let me explain. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It guts some of our most important environmental programs. It seems that the Republican majority realized what a bad bill it was and in order to win support for it, they put forth in much needed funds for veterans’ healthcare.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am a pragmatist. I realize that there is no perfect bill. Sometimes we have to settle for some good and some bad. The bill before us, however, is a close call.

The problem is a simple one. You see, for years my Republican colleagues have been shortchanging our veterans. The number of veterans treated at VA facilities increased from 2.7 million to 4.7 million from 1995 to 2004. The Department expects to treat 5.2 million veterans in 2006. Currently, more than 50,000 veterans wait at least 6 months for health services from the VA. Medical costs are increasing at nearly double the rate of inflation. Yet, over five years, the Republican budget for primarily veterans’ health programs is funded $13.5 billion below the amount needed to maintain services at current levels.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a solemn obligation to protect our Nation’s water, air and land resources for public health and safety. We must practice responsible stewardship of our natural resources and pass on to future generations a physical environment as bountiful as the one we have enjoyed. This bill fails that test miserably.

I will vote for this bill because it contains desperately needed funding for veterans’ healthcare. Specifically, the conference report on H.R. 2631 contains $1.5 billion in veterans’ budget for primarily veterans’ health programs is funded $13.5 billion below the amount needed to maintain services at current levels.

It is also clear that EPA’s draft regulation regarding human testing similarly fails to meet the minimum criteria required in this amendment. EPA, internally and among the agency’s various offices on June 20, 2005, EPA’s draft rule, slated for proposal next month, would have allowed the systematic testing of pesticides on humans. The draft rule does not comply with the recommendations of the NAS and the Nuremberg Code, and it contains multiple loopholes that invite abuse.

The EPA draft is inconsistent with the standards we require in this amendment. EPA originally commenced its rulemaking in response to a wave of industry pressure to permit intentional dosing of human test subjects with toxic chemicals.

The pesticide industry has mounted a campaign to expand testing of pesticides on humans in order to weaken health standards. Because of the stricter requirements imposed by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, the pesticide industry has been under growing pressure to reduce the risks that pesticides pose to infants and children. The industry has adopted a strategy to evade these requirements by testing pesticides on a small number of adult volunteers instead of using these tests to argue that the chemicals are safe.

EPA’s proposed rule encourages this strategy and is contrary to the recommendations of the NAS and the ethical guidelines of the Nuremberg Code that we require in this amendment. EPA is submitting for the record a June 2005 report titled Flash Report: New EPA Proposal Encourages Human Pesticide Experiments.

As outlined in more detail in this report, EPA’s proposed rule violates the ethical and scientific safeguards now required by this amendment, by failing to establish a national review panel to prevent abusive experiments, and by failing to provide full protections for children and other vulnerable populations.

Furthermore, the EPA draft rule does not clearly require that pesticide experiments comply with even its sub par standards. To the contrary, EPA proposed to accept all experiments as long as they “substantially” comply. This provision overtly undercuts the protections in the rule. The vague standard of substantial compliance wrongly sends the signal that EPA will not demand strict adherence to ethical standards in human pesticide experiments.

Intentional human toxicity testing has a troubling history that includes manipulation and abuse of vulnerable members of society. The amendment that I am supporting today will ensure that EPA may not consider the ethical standards in human test subjects with toxic chemicals.

The pesticide industry has mounted a campaign to expand testing of pesticides on humans in order to weaken health standards. Because of the stricter requirements imposed by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, the pesticide industry has been under growing pressure to reduce the risks that pesticides pose to infants and children. The industry has adopted a strategy to evade these requirements by testing pesticides on a small number of adult volunteers instead of using these tests to argue that the chemicals are safe.

EPA’s proposed rule encourages this strategy and is contrary to the recommendations of the NAS and the ethical guidelines of the Nuremberg Code that we require in this amendment. EPA is submitting for the record a June 2005 report titled Flash Report: New EPA Proposal Encourages Human Pesticide Experiments.

As outlined in more detail in this report, EPA’s proposed rule violates the ethical and scientific safeguards now required by this amendment, by failing to establish a national review panel to prevent abusive experiments, and by failing to provide full protections for children and other vulnerable populations.

Furthermore, the EPA draft rule does not clearly require that pesticide experiments comply with even its sub par standards. To the contrary, EPA proposed to accept all experiments as long as they “substantially” comply. This provision overtly undercuts the protections in the rule. The vague standard of substantial compliance wrongly sends the signal that EPA will not demand strict adherence to ethical standards in human pesticide experiments.

Intentional human toxicity testing has a troubling history that includes manipulation and abuse of vulnerable members of society. The amendment that I am supporting today will ensure that EPA may not consider the ethical standards in human test subjects with toxic chemicals.
health care funds to make up for the Adminis-
tration’s bogus budget proposals. Democrats in this House have been arguing for months that the Administration is shortchanging VA health care, and we should restore that funding in the proper legislation under regular order. A nation at war must take care of its veterans. For that reason, I am encouraged that this critical funding for veterans health care.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment with the Interior Appropriations bill that we are considering today. Although I will reluctantly vote for this legislation, I am disappointed that this program only received $30 million, which is one-third of what it received last year.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been instrumental in assisting local and State governments preserve vital open spaces. This program was established in 1965 to address the growing interest by increasing the number of high quality recreation areas and facilities and by increasing the local involvement in land preservation. To achieve this goal, the fund was separated into two components, one portion of the fund serves as an account from which the Federal government draws from to acquire land and the other portion is distributed to states in a matching grant program.

New Jersey has been active in seeking grants from this program and has received funds that were used to procure treasures such as the Pinelands National Reserve and the Delaware National Scenic River. In addition, LWCF has provided more that $111 million in state and local grants to build softball fields, rehabilitate playgrounds and to expand state parks.

Urban and highly developed regions, such as the region that I represent, will suffer the most as the elimination of the LWCF state grant program. The LWCF matching-grant program has proven to be a successful way to enhance development by increasing the number of high quality recreation areas and facilities and by increasing the local involvement in land preservation. To achieve this goal, the fund was separated into two components, one portion of the fund serves as an account from which the Federal government draws from to acquire land and the other portion is distributed to states in a matching grant program.

Even though I strongly oppose cuts to certain programs in this appropriations bill, I will vote in favor of this legislation. I hope in the future we can provide sufficient funding to these programs that enhance our communities, provide the Nation with clean water, and protect our environment.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report to provide funding for the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency for fiscal year 2006. Despite a tight allocation, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Interior subcommittee performed an admirable task in providing the necessary funding for the continued management of federal lands and the operation of our country’s environmental programs. I was disappointed to learn, however, that the bill does not provide much needed funding for a project I requested for the City of Houston and the University of Texas, Houston to conduct a risk assessment of air toxics in the Greater Houston area.

The Houston Chronicle recently completed a five-part series titled “In Harm’s Way” that investigated air toxics in the Greater Houston area. The series reported that folks residing in some of these neighborhoods experience higher levels of potentially carcinogenic compounds than other areas.

For many years, residents have had concerns and questions about the quality of the air in Houston’s East End, the potential relationship to local industry, and the potential health effects on their families. The City of Houston, partnering with the University of Texas School of Public Health, is already working to characterize the science and weigh the evidence on health effects. Federal funding for this bill will allow us to partner with the environmentalists and to expand our efforts to ensure that we include the full range of risk assessment activities in our effort to improve the air in Houston.

While I remain disappointed that the Appropriations Committee did not include a line-item approach for this project, I am pleased that my colleague from Washington, the Interior Subcommittee Ranking Member, recognized the need for this air toxics assessment and has agreed to work with me to encourage the EPA to include this assessment as part of its fiscal year 2006 operations.

I thank my friend, Mr. DICKS, for his willingness to work with me on this effort. The folks in these fence-line communities—my constituents—are often the workers who produce many of the essential energy and petrochemical products we all use everyday, and they deserve accurate information about their environment.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that “You can put a dress on a pig, but it’s still a pig.” While I am happy that the FY06 Interior Appropriations Conference Report includes $1.5 billion to make up for the funding shortfall for the Veterans’ Administration, VA, it does not mask the horrible choices that were made in the rest of this bill. It is still a pig.

This legislation includes cuts to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, decreases in the number of STAG grants, and completely eliminates many conservation grants.

Ensuring that the VA has the funding it needs is one of my highest priorities, which is why I am so disappointed that this money was included in a bill that undermines our environment. It is sad that veterans’ have been shortchanged by President Bush who was all too eager to send troops off to war, but failed to adequately fund the cost of their care after they had dutifully served their country. Under-estimation by the White House of $1.5 billion for this year is only the tip of the iceberg with the shortfall for next year already projected to be $2.6 billion. Unfortunately, the shortightedness of the Republican majority failed to include this spending where it should be, in the Military Quality of Life Appropriations bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the shortcomings for the environment, I will vote for this bill to support our troops.

Mr. AZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the conference report on H.R. 2361, the Interior Appropriations bill. This important piece of legislation provides $1.5 billion to remedy the shortfall in veterans’ health care for this year. Earlier this month I stood here urging this body to step up to the plate when it came time for us to ensure that our veterans must be our number one priority. By passing this measure, we take the first step in fulfilling our obligation to the men and women who have served our country with honor and dignity.

The passage of this bill is a necessity—I will never turn my back to our Nation’s veterans. However, I do want to take this opportunity to discuss my concerns with the larger measure
and its failure to address the land and water conservation and management needs of our nation. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been a valuable program for my district. This has been a fund to assist communities in helping preserve open space to protect and conserve unique landscapes. The cut in funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a cut in land conservation for Colorado.

For those who know, the 3rd Congressional District is comprised of rural communities containing millions of acres of public lands. These public lands are managed by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. These agencies and public lands provide many benefits for the local communities in my district. I am disappointed with the decrease in funding to these agencies in this year’s Interior Appropriations Conference Report. These agencies have to maintain a difficult balance of managing our nation’s public lands with budget constraints. By cutting funding to these agencies it makes it very difficult for them to maintain their current management practices and leaves our nation’s public lands in jeopardy.

With that being said, this report does have some positive aspects. The funding of $5.6 billion for Indian programs is beneficial for school and hospital construction, education grants, human services programs, and law enforcement needs. These programs are essential for the Native American reservations within my district.

More often than not, in the West, the Federal Government is not just your neighbor, it is the entire neighborhood. Since most of my district cannot raise taxes, Payment in Lieu of Funding is vital. These counties with public lands within their boundaries need this funding for schools, roads, and other infrastructure needs. This program has never been fully funded, yet my counties are dependent upon this program. I hope to see this program fully funded next year.

I also want to see continued funding for the National Fire Plan and the forest health initiatives. These programs need to see increased funding due to the continued drought periods in the West and the current pine beetle epidemic. If the beetle infestations are not addressed, we will continue to see our forests decimated. These insects will continue to cause fire hazards in our nation’s forests if we do not get them under control.

I urge Congress next year to fully fund these agency budgets. This is critical to the Western States and our existence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representatives Obey and Dicks for their assistance in securing $100,000 for Montrose’s City Hall Renovation Project. The City Hall building of Montrose was built in 1926 and has been well preserved throughout the years. However, as the City and County continues to grow, so too must the building in order to accommodate the needs of the people. Preparing and expanding the City Hall building in Montrose will allow us to keep a part of history alive for future generations of Colorado. Mr. Speaker once again I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation. We need to sure up our VA budget so we can continue to provide critical health care services to our nation’s veterans. In the future we need to restore the Land and Water Conservation funding and fully fund our agencies budgets.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Without objection the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2985.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2985, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2985), making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume. I do not expect that we will use very much of our time, Mr. Speaker.

The conference report I bring forth today to fund the legislative branch involves those activities providing some $3 billion, 800 million, an increase of 4.5 percent over the year 2005.

Mr. Speaker, the adjustments upward almost entirely represent increased expenditures for our police services and security around the Capitol campus, and, beyond that, expenses that are directly related to the development of the Congressional Visitors Center.

Otherwise the bill is absolutely flat in terms of spending over 2005-2006. It is a very, very lean bill. I urge the Members to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:
### TITLE I - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

#### SENATE

**Expense allowances:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Pro Tempore of the Senate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Leader of the Senate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Leader of the Senate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Whip of the Senate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Whip of the Senate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of the Majority Policy Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of the Minority Policy Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, expense allowances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders**

- **Majority Leader**
  - Office of the Majority Leader: 3,808
  - Office of the Majority Policy Committee: 2,586
- **Minority Leader**
  - Office of the Vice President: 3,048
  - Office of the Majority and Minority Whips: 2,644

**Committee on Appropriations**

- 13,301
- 13,758

**Conference committees**

- 2,826
- 2,940

**Salaries, Officers and Employees**

- Office of the Vice President: 2,108
- Office of the President Pro Tempore: 561
- Office of the President Pro Tempore Emeritus: 163
- Office of the Majority and Minority Leaders: 3,808
- Office of the Majority and Minority Whips: 2,556
- Committee on Appropriations: 13,301
- Conference committees: 2,826

**Total, Expense allowances and representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salaries, Officers and Employees**

- Office of the Secretary: 702
- Office of the Chaplain: 341
- Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: 50,635
- Offices of the Senators for the Majority and Minority: 1,528
- Outlays: 33,779

**Total, Salaries, officers and employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate**

- Salaries and expenses: 5,152
- Office of Senate Legal Counsel: 1,265

**Expense Allowances of the Secretary, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate: Expenses allowances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contingent Expenses of the Senate**

- Inquiries and Investigations: 110,000
- Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: 520
- Secretary of the Senate: 1,700
- Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate: 127,192
- Miscellaneous Items: 18,326
- Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account: 320,660

**Official Mail Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Contingent expenses of the Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>578,689</td>
<td>667,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>720,194</td>
<td>823,048</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>+52,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>720,194</td>
<td>823,048</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>+65,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

#### Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress (emergency) (P.L. 109-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005 Request</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Salaries and Expenses

##### House Leadership Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Description</th>
<th>FY 2005 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2006 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Speaker</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>+80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Majority Floor Leader</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>+62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Minority Floor Leader</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>+88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Majority Whip</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>+56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Minority Whip</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>+42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker’s Office for Legislative Floor Activities</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Steering Committee</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Conference</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>+48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Policy Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>+307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Steering and Policy Committee</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>+356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Caucus</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine minority employees</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>+36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Training and Program Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Cloakroom Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Subtotal, House Leadership Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,678</td>
<td>19,844</td>
<td>19,844</td>
<td>19,844</td>
<td>19,844</td>
<td>+1,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Members' Representational Allowances

- Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>525,195</td>
<td>564,536</td>
<td>538,109</td>
<td>538,109</td>
<td>542,109</td>
<td>+16,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Committee Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee, Special and Select</th>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113,499</td>
<td>117,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee, Appropriations (including studies and...</th>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24,726</td>
<td>25,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Subtotal, Committee employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138,225</td>
<td>143,581</td>
<td>143,581</td>
<td>143,581</td>
<td>143,581</td>
<td>+5,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Salaries, Officers and Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Description</th>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Clerk</td>
<td>20,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Sergeant at Arms</td>
<td>5,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>143,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
<td>3,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Emergency Planning, Preparedness and...</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of General Counsel</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chaplain</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Parliamentarian</td>
<td>1,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Historian</td>
<td>(1,459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives</td>
<td>(214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House</td>
<td>6,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Interparliamentary Affairs</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other authorized employees</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Historian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Subtotal, Salaries, officers and employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187,744</td>
<td>170,177</td>
<td>167,749</td>
<td>167,749</td>
<td>172,249</td>
<td>-15,495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>-171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Government contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in thousands</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203,900</td>
<td>214,422</td>
<td>214,422</td>
<td>214,422</td>
<td>214,422</td>
<td>+10,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT - FY 2006 (H.R. 2985)</strong> (Amounts in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Items</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Visitor Center</td>
<td>-209,350</td>
<td>229,679</td>
<td>223,124</td>
<td>223,124</td>
<td>223,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Allowances and expenses</strong></td>
<td>209,350</td>
<td>229,679</td>
<td>223,124</td>
<td>223,124</td>
<td>223,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,079,192</td>
<td>1,127,817</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,100,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, House of Representatives</strong></td>
<td>1,079,354</td>
<td>1,127,817</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,100,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JDTO ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Economic Committee</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Committee on Taxation</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>8,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Attending Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances.</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>2,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>4,098</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>4,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of Appropriations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Joint items</strong></td>
<td>18,887</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>19,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITOL POLICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>201,812</td>
<td>230,191</td>
<td>210,350</td>
<td>222,600</td>
<td>217,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General expenses</strong></td>
<td>39,657</td>
<td>59,948</td>
<td>29,345</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Capitol Police</strong></td>
<td>241,469</td>
<td>290,139</td>
<td>239,695</td>
<td>264,600</td>
<td>249,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>34,640</td>
<td>35,853</td>
<td>35,450</td>
<td>35,853</td>
<td>35,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administration</td>
<td>79,704</td>
<td>76,982</td>
<td>77,002</td>
<td>76,522</td>
<td>76,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol building</td>
<td>28,626</td>
<td>27,105</td>
<td>22,097</td>
<td>25,386</td>
<td>23,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitol grounds</strong></td>
<td>15,118</td>
<td>7,801</td>
<td>7,723</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate office buildings</td>
<td>61,586</td>
<td>65,564</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>67,004</td>
<td>67,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House office buildings</td>
<td>64,830</td>
<td>68,698</td>
<td>59,616</td>
<td>59,616</td>
<td>59,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitol Power Plant</strong></td>
<td>65,744</td>
<td>65,755</td>
<td>65,185</td>
<td>65,317</td>
<td>65,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offsetting collections</strong></td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>-6,500</td>
<td>-6,600</td>
<td>-6,500</td>
<td>-6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant</strong></td>
<td>56,479</td>
<td>59,255</td>
<td>58,516</td>
<td>58,917</td>
<td>58,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library buildings and grounds</td>
<td>39,776</td>
<td>83,318</td>
<td>31,318</td>
<td>70,948</td>
<td>68,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol police buildings and grounds</td>
<td>9,906</td>
<td>34,956</td>
<td>16,830</td>
<td>10,031</td>
<td>14,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Botanic garden</strong></td>
<td>6,275</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td>7,633</td>
<td>7,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitol Visitor Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC Project (cost-to-complete)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>41,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC Operations</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>35,265</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Capitol Visitor Center</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>72,185</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Architect of the Capitol</strong></td>
<td>362,200</td>
<td>506,480</td>
<td>317,282</td>
<td>427,212</td>
<td>428,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARY OF CONGRESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>381,593</td>
<td>409,079</td>
<td>388,144</td>
<td>397,285</td>
<td>395,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to spend receipts</td>
<td>-6,299</td>
<td>-6,350</td>
<td>-6,350</td>
<td>-6,350</td>
<td>-6,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>375,294</td>
<td>402,729</td>
<td>381,794</td>
<td>390,935</td>
<td>389,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 Enacted</td>
<td>FY 2006 Request</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference vs. Enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.</td>
<td>53,182</td>
<td>58,191</td>
<td>58,601</td>
<td>57,322</td>
<td>58,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to spend receipts.</td>
<td>-33,209</td>
<td>-30,657</td>
<td>-35,946</td>
<td>-34,622</td>
<td>-35,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Copyright Office.</td>
<td>19,973</td>
<td>27,534</td>
<td>22,655</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>22,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Research Service, salaries and expenses.</td>
<td>96,118</td>
<td>105,289</td>
<td>99,952</td>
<td>101,755</td>
<td>100,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for the blind and physically handicapped.</td>
<td>53,977</td>
<td>55,243</td>
<td>54,049</td>
<td>64,172</td>
<td>54,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Library of Congress.</td>
<td>545,382</td>
<td>590,795</td>
<td>558,450</td>
<td>579,562</td>
<td>567,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission, Chapter 9, Division A, Misc. Appropriations Act. 2001.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-15,500</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-6,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Library of Congress.</td>
<td>545,382</td>
<td>590,795</td>
<td>542,950</td>
<td>579,562</td>
<td>560,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

| Salaries and expenses. | 88,090 | 92,283 | 82,690 | 88,090 | 88,090 | --- |
| Government Printing Office Revolving Fund. | --- | 5,000 | 1,200 | 5,000 | 2,000 | +2,000 |
| Total, Government Printing Office. | 119,787 | 131,120 | 117,227 | 126,927 | 123,427 | +3,640 |

### GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

| Salaries and expenses. | 474,565 | 493,548 | 489,560 | 491,548 | 489,560 | +14,985 |
| Offsetting collections. | -7,360 | -7,165 | -7,165 | -7,165 | -7,165 | +195 |
| Total, Government Accountability Office. | 467,205 | 486,383 | 482,395 | 484,383 | 482,395 | +15,190 |

### OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

| Payment to the Open World Leadership Center Trust Fund. | 13,392 | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | +608 |

### STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

| Stennis Center for Public Service. | --- | --- | --- | 430 | 430 | +430 |

| Sec. 6050 - U.S. Senate (emergency) P.L. 109-13. | 35,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | -35,000 |

<p>| Grand total. | 3,639,892 | 4,028,477 | 2,864,418 | 3,833,765 | 3,803,500 | +163,608 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>House vs. Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>720,194</td>
<td>823,048</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>785,549</td>
<td>+65,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
<td>1,079,354</td>
<td>1,127,817</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,092,407</td>
<td>1,100,907</td>
<td>+21,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Items</td>
<td>18,887</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>+843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Police</td>
<td>241,469</td>
<td>290,139</td>
<td>239,895</td>
<td>264,600</td>
<td>249,456</td>
<td>+7,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Compliance</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>+710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Budget Office</td>
<td>34,640</td>
<td>35,853</td>
<td>35,450</td>
<td>35,853</td>
<td>35,450</td>
<td>+810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect of the Capitol</td>
<td>382,200</td>
<td>506,480</td>
<td>317,282</td>
<td>427,212</td>
<td>428,478</td>
<td>+66,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
<td>545,362</td>
<td>590,795</td>
<td>542,950</td>
<td>579,562</td>
<td>560,566</td>
<td>+15,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Printing Office</td>
<td>119,787</td>
<td>131,120</td>
<td>117,227</td>
<td>126,927</td>
<td>123,427</td>
<td>+3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
<td>467,205</td>
<td>486,383</td>
<td>482,395</td>
<td>484,383</td>
<td>482,395</td>
<td>+15,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open World Leadership Center</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>+608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stennis Center for Public Service</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>+430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6050 - U.S. Senate (emergency) P.L. 109-13</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>3,639,892</td>
<td>4,028,477</td>
<td>2,864,418</td>
<td>3,833,765</td>
<td>3,803,500</td>
<td>+163,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.
Mr. Speaker, at the risk of beating a dead horse, I would once again like to express my profound misgivings about supporting this bill this afternoon.

Obviously this Chamber has basic expenses, and they have to be paid for, but I want to suggest that I think that the visitor center, which is now being constructed on the east side of the Capitol, is a project which, while it might be desirable, has been managed in such an outlandish fashion that I think before it is done, it is going to bring great embarrassment to this institution.

The fact is that that center started out costing around $90 million. Before it is finished, it is now going to cost a good $600 million. It was supposed to be open by 2005. We are going to be lucky if it will be open and fully operational, if we ignore the nice word games that we have been presented by the Architect’s office; in fact, we will be lucky if this is fully operational by the year 2007.

In my view, this project has been mismanaged as badly as the entire Federal budget has been mismanaged. That hole that we used to have out here, I think is the hole in logic that has dominated the administration of this entire project.

I have two principal objections to that visitors center. Number one, I think it is far too expensive. And, secondly, it object to the misallocation of space in that project.

Now, I have seen three different stories that have purportedly reported on my objections to the center. And each of those stories leaves the impression that my major concern is simply that Congress did not have enough room. That is not my point at all.

My point is that when you have such a huge addition of space to the Capitol, that space should be allocated in an intelligent way, in a way which makes Congress more efficient, in a way which gives Congress more working space as opposed to propaganda space.

We are going to have a lot of money lavished on a media center. We are going to have all of the creature comforts that you can imagine for any of the reporters who cover Members of Congress in that media center. But there will be very little done to make this an office space to the Congress.

So I think a tremendous amount of space has been wasted. And I think a tremendous amount of taxpayers’ dollars are being wasted. And the reason I am voting against this is because I think this is the last chance that any of us will have to ask the leadership of this House and the Architect’s office to at least review the way space is being allocated by everyone from the taxpay dollar is being expended.

We are going to have, when this project is over, we will have a project which is cosmically beautiful, no question about that. There will be lots of Taj Mahal marble show space, but there will be very little working space that will be added.

I think that if we are not getting the biggest bang from the buck we ought to be getting out of a project like this. I do believe that not only is the cost of this project out of control, I think the heating center project which is also going is also going to wind up embarrassing this institution significantly.

So I intend to vote “no.” I am not going to particularly try to ask anyone to vote any which way, but I intend to vote “no” because I think this visitor center represents a missed opportunity and a spectacular case of mismanagement and wasting of taxpayer funds.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is by way of suggesting to my colleagues in the body that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), is raising serious questions regarding the visitor center, and because he has not spent a lot of time today talking about the fundaments of this bill that relate to supporting the institution, the work of the legislative branch, an effort which is fundamental to our being successful as a branch.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I share together great concern about making sure that work goes forward and goes forward successfully. We are partners. In connection with this, I, frankly, today would like to predict at least that somewhere out there before we leave the Congress, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I together will walk with our brides through this visitors centers and have different kinds of observations. I do not think any of the Taj, but in the meantime it will be a fabulous addition to the Congress, the largest addition that has been made in our lifetime at any rate, my public affairs lifetime.

I am very proud of the work of this subcommittee, the work they have done to carry forward the effort of the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would not mind, I would like to take just a minute to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), to kind of introduce your piece of that because the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and he share similar interests regarding the real work of the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this is a good bill. It is a bill that every Member should support.

It is a bill that takes care of all the things that get done around here. Every day there is a record printed of every word that is spoken in the House. Every day there are clerks that show up here that help the Members. Every day there are people here that take care of the security of the Capitol. Every day there are people here who make sure that we can come and do our work and this bill takes care of all of that.

That is why it is a bill that is absolutely critical to every Member of this institution. It is a bill that I think highlights some of the important things that have gone on and will go on around here in terms of opportunities to enhance the facilities, one of the most beautiful, magnificent buildings in the world, and the one across the street, the Library of Congress, is also accounted for, and the staff that work there and provide the kind of resources, the people that do the research that help we write the bills around here and all of that.

There is also in this bill the opportunity not only to enhance a visitors center, which may not be perfect but one that is sorely needed, but there are also provisions in this bill to account for what happens if a national calamity would fall upon the United States Capitol, the idea of continuity and how we should succeed ourselves around here. I think that is an important part of it.

This is the bill that says to all of the people that make this institution work, we are grateful to you. This is the bill that says to all the people who help us get our jobs done, we thank you for everything you do. And this is a bill that deserves the support of every Member of the Chamber.

I encourage all Members to vote “aye” on the legislative branch bill so that we can continue to keep the operations of the United States Capitol, the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and all the workings of this great institution going.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) for reminding me that I forgot to mention the continuity issue as well. Again, I find myself in the minority.

This is a very important question. What we are talking about here is very simply, what would happen if a large number of Members of Congress were obliterated in some kind of terrorist attack and we were left in a crisis situation? And we have very simply a choice that needs to be made. We have a choice, as a Congress, which would allow the executive branch to essentially operate almost any way it sees fits with perhaps only a handful of
surviving Members for a 45-day period until we can have special elections to replace Members of Congress who might have been killed in such an attack; or we could follow a different model under which we would have this Congress populated for a temporary period by people who are appointed under a previously prescribed procedure until we could have a special election so that we would again have elected representatives for each of the 435 districts in this House.

If we pursue the latter, I do not think it is a good idea, as this bill does, to, in effect, create a situation in which we would have one-man rule for 45 days. We could have literally only a handful of Members of Congress who had survived an attack, and I do not think under those circumstances that we want to be ruled by a President without any kind of checks and balances whatsoever.

So there is an honest, intellectual difference of opinion on this question. And I think we are going down the wrong road. I think that by choosing the model that was chosen, what is happening is that we are in fact choosing form over substance. It is indeed important that Members of Congress who represent each of our districts be elected representatives. But if the Member from an individual district is blown away in a terrorist attack, it is in my judgment, better that that district be represented on a temporary basis by an appointed person rather than having them represented by no one at all for that period.

So that is why I think that this House in its haste to find a solution is going down the wrong road.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the Members of Congress who had survived an attack, and I do not think under those circumstances that we want to be ruled by a President without any kind of checks and balances whatsoever.

So there is an honest, intellectual difference of opinion on this question. And I think we are going down the wrong road. I think that by choosing the model that was chosen, what is happening is that we are in fact choosing form over substance. It is indeed important that Members of Congress who represent each of our districts be elected representatives. But if the Member from an individual district is blown away in a terrorist attack, it is in my judgment, better that that district be represented on a temporary basis by an appointed person rather than having them represented by no one at all for that period.

So that is why I think that this House in its haste to find a solution is going down the wrong road.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) would, since I gave him a friendly reminder, would be willing to vote for the bill now as a result from the fact now that you could now expound on this for another 5 minutes?

Mr. OBEY. No, I do not think so. I think there is always room in this House for protest votes, and this is one occasion when I intend to exercise it; but I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LaHood).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this. We did have a very spirited debate on this issue of continuity. We really did. I do not know if there were 5 or 6 or 7 hours, but the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Baird) had his chance to present his bill and have a vote on it. And, frankly, not very many Members voted for it. And I think we had a good debate about it, but I think ultimately the Speaker decided that we have to get on with this issue and this was the place to put it.

It may not be the best place, but it is in this bill because I think the Speaker felt an obligation that we have to deal with this issue at some point. It may not be perfect, but we did have a very good debate about it, and I think that is why it is included in the bill.

I think the Chairman for allowing me to explain that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.
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Mr. HEFLY. He changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." Messrs. BUTTERFIELD, MACK, BLUMENAUER, and STARK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2985, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report. Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 122, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie  Altmire  Baca  Baker
Ackerman  Alexander  Bachus  Brou
Aderholt  Allen  Baker  Basche

NAYS—122

Wilson (NM)  Wilson (NC)  Wolf  Young (AK)

Not VOTING—7

Andrews  Carson  Clay  Renzi

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on vote No. 450 regarding adoption of the Conference Report on H.R. 2985, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006, I was unavoidably detained and missed the House of Representatives’ vote on the adoption of the Conference Report on H.R. 2361, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2361.

Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450, Interior Appropriations bill, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2985, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2985, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report. Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 122, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]
recesses or adjourns on any day from Friday, July 29, 2005, through Friday, August 5, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 6, 2005, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 16, not voting 3, as follows:

---

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, July 28, 2005, I was unavoidably detained and missed House votes to vote on an Adjournment Resolution. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the resolution.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COPROMITTER OF H.R. 1946

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a co sponsor of H.R. 1946.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach completion of our work here before the summer break, I think it is important for us to note that when we return, a very familiar face will no longer be greeting us here when we regular committees come under the House floor. I am referring, of course, to Susan Hanback, who has worked on Capitol Hill since 1967.

[The list of names is not visible in the image.]

That is a long, long period of time. And after that long tenure, she has chosen to retire. And I would like to take just a minute because I learned some things about her, in the fact that she is headed to retirement, that I did not know, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier in her career, during a very challenging time in our Nation's history, she worked hard and reported on the hearings for the confirmation of Nelson Rockefeller to become Vice President of the United States and Gerald Ford to become President of the United States.

In 1976 she joined the House as a House official committee reporter. And in 1979 she became a stenotype reporter to come to the floor. Since 1980 Susan has been Chief of the combined committee/floor reporter offices.

And I would like to say that she has gotten a number of outside interests as well. Not everyone knows that she and
former Senator John Breaux actually won a mixed doubles tournament at the Capitol Hill Tennis Club.

She is a very, very familiar face to us, and one that we will miss greatly. And I would like all of us, Mr. Speaker, to join in expressing our appreciation to the Susan Hanback.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been here for some period of time quickly learn that those who serve this House, this institution, who may not speak in the well, who may not introduce legislation, who may not participate in debates, nevertheless are absolutely critical to the legislative process. As a group they bring a degree of love of country, love of the House of Representatives, and commitment to their work that surely if paralleled somewhere, it is only in a few places.

I have had the privilege of working with the desk officers, the reporters, the parliamentarians for now over a quarter of a century, less time than Susan Hanback has served this House. She was here when I came here in 1981.

Her decision to retire as Chief of the Office of Official Reporters is, of course, welcomed by many in her office and her family. We had an opportunity to discuss it on the floor just the other evening about how she is going to enjoy her Virginia residence, perhaps much more peaceful, less hassled, but from time to time perhaps a little less interesting as well, but certainly more restful. And she deserves the rest because her service has been extraordinary.

As has been said by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), she has worked in the House since the late 1960s. She witnessed during that time some of the most important events that have occurred on the House floor, including debates on legislation affecting every aspect of Americans’ lives as she transcribed innumerable speeches and statements of hundreds of Members of Congress.

Those who transcribe history are critically important because future generations will be able to read the historic record that they have set down, and the accuracy of that reporting is critically important not only to the deliberations of this body today, but it will be critically important to the precedents of tomorrow.

Mrs. Hanback has dedicated her career to serving the American people just as surely as every one of us who serves here in elected office. Those who serve as reporters and at the desk and as the parliamentarians and in every other role in which this House runs correctly serve America, serve America’s citizens, serve America’s freedom. By accurately reporting for and helping oversee the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Susan has helped ensure that there is a government accessible to the people and is, therefore, a government for the people, of the people, and by the people.

Susan was critical, as so many of you who have served this House know, in a number of ways. She is not absolutely essential to our democracy. Susan was critical, as so many of you are whose names are not known to the public and, indeed, whose names may not be known to many who serve here by your sides every day. But because your names are not known, it does not mean that the service you perform is not absolutely essential to our democracy.

Susan Hanback was offered a job, Mr. Speaker, as a Senate official reporter in 1987. As testimony to the love of this House, she turned that offer down and chose to stay in the House because she thought it was more interesting, and the people said, Amen.

We are all, of course, very grateful, Susan, that you made that decision. We have all been advantaged not only by the skill with which you performed your job, but by the warmth of your personality and the grace that you have served this body.

I would like to wish you all the very best. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), minority leader, and the leadership on this side joins with the Speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip, and all the officers, including the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), on that side of the aisle to say in a nonpartisan, bipartisan, unanimous way, Susan, you have served us well. You have served your country well. We wish you the very greatest of happiness as you now retire from this body to serve so well your family as you have done for so long, but now will do so much more present with them, and we wish you the very best.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for his very thoughtful comments.

And as he was talking about Susan’s history here, and as I look at the gathered employees here of the House of Representatives, I was thinking during the remarks that the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished minority whip offered, of the new assignment that we have taken on here in this institution when we established under the direction of the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), minority leader, this new commission, the House Democracy Assistance Commission. And we have over the past several months, and are continuing at this time, to proceed with assessments of different countries around the world, and we are working with those Parliaments that are looking to model their work after much of what we do here. Obviously, there are some things that we might do a little differently.

But, clearly, the example that Susan has set is one that is a model not just for the future in the United States of America, but, Mr. Speaker, it should be known that her example is one that can be set for these emerging Parliaments, and there are so many of them around the world, because of the great reverence that is held for this institution. And as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said very well, the appreciation that exists for all who work at this institution is something that is held by all of us who are privileged to serve as elected representatives of this House.

And we do wish you well in your retirement. And we want you to know, of course, from the Speaker and all of the leadership team, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, on both sides of the aisle, that you are welcome back to visit us at any time at all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:35 p.m.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:35 p.m.

□ 1840

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) at 6 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1859

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) at 6 o’clock and 59 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3, SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes:

[The Conference Report will be printed in Book II.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.
Accordingly (at 7 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2245

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Bass) at 10 o’clock and 45 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 28, 2005 at 8:45 pm: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3045.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,
JEFF TRANSDHAL, Clerk of the House.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2005, PART VI

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3512) to provide an extension of administrative expenses for highway, railway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, is this the legislation extending time for the transportation bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is.

Mr. SHAYS. Then, Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple extension which is necessary once we pass H.R. 3 to give time for an enrollment and delivering the package to the Senate, which we hope to do tonight, and then after being enrolled get the President, and that will take some time.

If we do not do this, the Federal Government and the transportation system will be shut down. This has been requested by the administration and by the other body.

Mr. SHAYS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would love to have a dialogue with the gentleman bringing out the bill, but first will express my reservation of objection.

In the full bill that we will be considering, there is a section 1942 entitled Opening of Airfield at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, but it does not open the airport until later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, (1) open the Air Field At Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana; and (2) enable flying operations for all fixed-wing aircraft at that base.

My objection is that I understand this resolution extension will only go until August 14. That means that the President is forced to sign the bill, the ultimate bill that we pass, even if he has objections. I have deep concern that we are basically forcing the President to agree to an act that will reopen a base closed under BRAC without any options.

And if the President does the right thing, which would be to veto this bill so that stuff like this is not made into law, then our government transportation shuts down. My reservation is that the extension is not long enough.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. May I remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that this was asked for by the administration. This was the length that they wanted to have it, 14 days. To in fact have this extension any longer has not been requested by the administration, and I believe this can do the job. The President has to make the decision. If he wishes to veto the bill, he does so.

But this has been a request by the administration. This is the eleventh extension we have had on this legislation, and I will be right up front with everybody that I think it is the last one we should be doing. This is very important to the States themselves.

The President will make that decision on the merits of the gentleman’s argument, and I understand those merits. I will not disagree with what he said. I am suggesting respectfully that this is action for the bill itself and for the rule. But for the extension, this has been a request made by the administration, by the other body, and of course the leadership of this House.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to ask the gentleman, and will yield to him for a response to this question: Does the President know that in this transportation bill there is legislation language that will undo a BRAC closing? Is he aware that this language is in this?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am confident that the President of the Senate has communicated with the White House. All through this process they have been very much involved in the process of passage of this legislation. I have not asked his opinion on that part of the legislation. I know that this is a request, and I am trying to fulfill that request.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this item which the gentleman has raised was an item requested by Senate conferees on which Senate conferees voted and asked us to consider. We were not aware at the time that it was a BRAC item. We learned about it subsequently.

Our review of the matter reveals that one runway at the Air Force base was closed; the other runway is active and operating as a military facility. This language would simply keep the other one runway operating for a variety of purposes, multiuse purposes, at the airport.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to confess with my colleague that I am told that this is language that will basically reopen a base that was closed under BRAC, and that while the gentleman is under the interpretation he is under, there are many of us who believe it is quite different. While I greatly respect the gentleman, it seems to me this House of Representatives has to someday stand up to the Senate when they do this kind of stuff, sir.

What we are seeing here is absolutely outrageous, and what would have been a preferred extension, in my judgment, with all due respect to my colleagues, would be to have allowed the President such time that he could have had an extension until he signed this legislation, and if he did not sign this legislation, we could have come back and corrected this.

I am hopeful that before the night is out that we are going to delete section 1942. I do not know how it is going to happen, but, Lord knows, if it does not, we have basically done something that I think is shameful to the process and reflects badly not just on the Senate, but on the House that we would allow them.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I concur in the gentleman’s feelings about this matter. It should not have been an item in a conference report on a transportation bill of this magnitude, but as we all know, these things make their way in. We did not have full information.

Our information subsequently is that the base was not closed, but that one runway was shut down, and this language was to open that one runway. This will be a further opportunity in a technical correction to address to the concerns of the gentleman from Connecticut, and I am confident that the
chairman will further consult on the matter.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the concept of a BRAC, the Base Realignment Commission, is to remove the political process from the closure of bases in order to get us to the type of military that we need to meet today’s demands to fight terrorism around the globe.

And if we insert our will from another body, the Senate, into this bill, it will jeopardize that process. I do not think any of us want that here on the floor.

If we cannot relieve that dissection among our ranks on this bill, it will not pass on the floor tonight. We all would like to see this happen, because as the gentleman from Alaska has expressed, we need this bill. We need this to occur within each of our States. We need to go back to good roads. We need the infrastructure for our economy. But if this provision is inserted, it will go beyond the concept of BRAC and take the political process out of getting the proper size and scope of our military.

So I urge my colleagues whatever provision we have within this rule will alleviate these provisions, because if they are not, the bill will not pass. I think there will be enough dissent on both sides of this great institution, on the floor, in the House, the Republicans and the Democrats, to keep this from passing.

So I hope we can correct this measure within the rule, because if not, I think we will have a failed bill. And that will not be good for this country or for the efforts that we have here tonight.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would like to try to put this in perspective. I agree with the gentleman it is egregious this is in the bill. We had a very difficult negotiation with the Senate. This was snuck in. It is not like we are reopening a base, repositioning forces and equipment. We are talking about a runway.

The question is, will they, in the next month, until we can have a technical correction bill, have to run out and pull the weeds and repaint the lines on the runway? This is not exactly a major part of the BRAC process.

To forestall the passage of a bill which is almost 2 years overdue, which invests $286.4 billion in America’s infrastructure, because there might be some weeds pulled on a runway in the interim, I agree it is offensive, but we can fix it and challenge the Senate at a later date. But to hold up the entire bill and forestall the investment, there are States who are waiting today and who will spend money under this bill and construct Kansas under this bill this construction season, putting thousands of people to work and making needed investments in America.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a case well beyond this issue.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and would be happy to yield to him to respond. It was my understanding that this provision of 60 days had been shorter, and somehow people felt that by extending to 60 days, they had solved the objection to this bill. Is it true that when this bill came out of conference, it was less than 60 days?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am not sure what provision the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. SHAYS. Does the gentleman know the provision I am talking about? It says, “Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall open the air field at Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana.” Open it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Right. It would reopen a runway.

Mr. SHAYS. “And enable flying operations for all fixed-wing aircraft at that base,” or for the efforts that we have here to fight terrorism around the globe.

The question is, will they, in the next conference, it was less than 60 days?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I am prepared to make a closing comment, and if I am not allowed to, I would object. And my closing comment is this. This is to open a base that was closed. This 60 days was added as a sop to the House, in my judgment, with all due respect, to somehow allow everybody to save face. We are not in session for all 60 days.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request at this time to consult with the Senate and see if we cannot resolve this problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is not required. The request is withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. According to the 10 o’clock and 58 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Bass) at 12 o’clock and 15 minutes a.m.

CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3, SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) providing for a correction to the enrollment of H.R. 3, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

RESOLVED by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: Strike section 492 and the item relating to such section in the table of contents.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of communicating to the Members the situation we are in, I want to first say that I greatly appreciate the cooperation of all colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I appreciate the cooperation and work of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBSTSTAR) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

We greatly appreciate the institution standing together and trying to make corrections that need to be made in this bill. I appreciate the hour and everybody coming together and working together for the purpose of fixing this bill.

We will not be able to fix the bill tonight. We hope to come back at 9 a.m. in the morning and continue work on this very important highway bill. We hope to finish it as early as we can tomorrow. My message to the Members is go home, get a good night’s sleep, and we will be back in the morning to finish the work of the House.

Mr. OBSTSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBSTSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for the kind words of the majority leader and to assure Members the issue before us is not a matter of division within the committee or between the parties of the House, but a difference or interpretation of a provision in the conference report in language that was included by a Member of the other body.

Our expectation is we will be able to resolve that matter of a limited scope and pass the broader bill which is of great importance to the whole Nation. I appreciate the support, cooperation, and participation of the majority leader, and the support of the Parliamentarian’s Office in helping us bring this to a resolution.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s words.
COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:


DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 28, 2005 at 11:41 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 792; that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 225; that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 226; that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 227; that the Senate passed without amendment H.J. Res. 59.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,
JEFF TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

☐ 0107

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Sessions) at 1 o’clock and 7 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3, SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-212) on the resolution (H. Res. 389) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-211) on the resolution (H. Res. 390) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3514, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2005, PART VI

Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-214) on the resolution (H. Res. 401) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3514) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today after 4:00 p.m. and the balance of the week.

Ms. SCHRAGE (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today before 4:00 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 302. An act to make improvements in the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 477. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 555. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the National Foundation for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 792. An act to establish a National sex offender registration database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act to permit Women’s Business Centers to re-compete for sustainability grants; to the Committee on Small Business.

S. 190. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to medical advice user fees.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 45. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to lift the patient limitation on prescribing drug addiction treatments by medical practitioners in group practices, and for other purposes.

S. 571. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1951 Fulton Street in Brooklyn, New York, as the “Congresswoman Shirley A. Chisholm Post Office Building”.

S. 775. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 W. 7th Street in Holdenville, Oklahoma, as the “Boone Pickens Post Office”.

S. 904. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1560 Union Valley Road in West Milford, New Jersey, as the “Brian P. Parrello Post Office Building”.

S. 1396. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to provide authority for the Attorney General to authorize the export of controlled substances from the United States to another country for subsequent export from the country to a second country, if certain conditions and safeguards are satisfied.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, July 29, 2005, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

3362. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Guidelines for Designating Pistachios Grown in California; Establishment of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV05-983-1 FR] received July 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3363. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Growing [Docket No. PY-05-001] (RIN: 0581-AC49) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3364. A letter from the Acting Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Pistachios Grown in California; Establishment of Procedures for Exempting Handlers from Minimum Quality Testing [Docket No. FV05-983-4 FR] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3365. A letter from the Director, Office of Energy Policy and New Uses, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement [Docket No. 05-035 AA20] received January 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3366. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Food
Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Glycerol Ester of Gum Rosin [Docket No. 2003-F-071] received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3367. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agencys final rule — Toxicity Tests; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0016; FRL-7724-5] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3368. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fusarium Oxysporum; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0174; FRL-7725-5] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3369. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Ibotenic Acid; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0075; FRL-7714-5] received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Enrofloxacin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0091; FRL-7714-4] received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3371. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fenpropathrin; Re-Establishment of Tolerance for Emergency [OPP-2005-0192; FRL-7723-2] received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3372. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Dimethoate; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0256; FRL-7717-3] received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3373. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pymetrozine; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0106; FRL-7724-5] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3374. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Lignosulfonates; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0171; FRL-7720-3] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3375. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0196; FRL-7727-1] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3376. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Fenpiclonil; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2005-0184; FRL-7722-5] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3377. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Lignosulfonates; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0171; FRL-7720-3] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3378. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Lignosulfonates; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2005-0171; FRL-7720-3] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3430. A letter from the Director, Division of Policy, Planning and Program Development, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors; Compliance Evaluation; Federal Acquisition Regulations System, Office of the Federal Register, OMB, received May 4, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3431. A letter from the Acting Director, SHRFD, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule — Changes in Pay Administration Rules for General Schedule Employees (RIN: 3206-AK88) received June 13, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.


3433. A letter from the Acting Director, SHRFD, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule — Retirement Coverage of Air Traffic Controllers (RIN: 3206-AK73) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.


3436. A letter from the Acting Director, IP, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Acquisition Regulations: Large Provider Agreements, Subcontracts, and Miscellaneous Changes (RIN: 3206-A320) received June 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.


3440. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior; transmitting the Department’s final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Amendment of Lower St. Johns River Manatee Refuge in Florida (RIN: 1215-AB23) received June 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3442. A letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; transmitting the Department’s final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Moderna Tenisoni (Boulenger’s Darter and Spotfin Chub) in Shoal Creek, Tennessee and Alabama (RIN: 1018-AH4) received May 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3443. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior; transmitting the Department’s final rule — Rights-of-way, Principles and Procedures; Rights-of-way Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Mineral Leasing Act (WO 350 05 1430 PN) (RIN: 1004-AC74) received April 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3444. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, PTO, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Changes to the Practice of Handling Patent Applications Filed Without the Appropriate Fees [Docket No. 2005-P-055] (RIN: 0651-AB87) received May 26, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3445. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, PTO, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Requirements to Receive a Reduced Fee for Filing an Application Through the Trademark Electronic Application System [Docket No. 2005-T-066] (RIN: 0651-AB88) received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3446. A letter from the Rules Administrator, BOP, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s Final Rule — infectious Disease Management: Voluntary and Involuntary Testing [Docket No. 2005-093] (RIN: 1120-AB03) received June 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3447. A letter from the Federal Register (Pertaining to Order FAMS-2004-168), PMS, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Salary Offset (RIN: 1510-AA70) received April 27, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3448. A letter from the Executive Director, Air Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Regulations for Air Transportation Stabilization Board Under Section 101(a)(1) of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act — received March 15, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3449. A letter from the Federal Register (Pertaining to Order FAMS-2004-168), PMS, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA (CGD 11-05-009) (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3450. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA (CGD 11-05-013) (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3451. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Kent Island, Maryland (CGD05-05-019) (RIN: 1625-AB88) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3452. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Kent Island Narrows, Kent Island, MD (CGD05-05-019) (RIN: 1625-AB88) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3453. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA (CGD 11-05-013) (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3454. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Safety and Security Zone; Tampa Bay, FL (COTP Tampa 05-079) (RIN: 1625-AB88) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3455. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Safety and Security Zone; Monterey Bay, CA (CGD13-05-026) (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
3468. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations for Chesapeake Bay, MD (Docket No. FEMA-P-7644) received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3469. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determination — New York Bay, NY (Docket No. FEMA-D-7573) received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3470. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations for Anchorage Grounds and Seward Channel, AK (Docket No. FEMA-D-7575) (RIN: 1625-AA00) (RIN: 1625-AA01) received July 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3471. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Anchorage Grounds and Seward Channel, AK (Docket No. FEMA-D-7575) (RIN: 1625-AA00) (RIN: 1625-AA01) received July 25, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3472. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Service for Interstate Liquefied Petroleum Gas Pipeline Licenses and Related Services — 2005 Update received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3473. A letter from the Ombudsman, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Consumer Protection Regulations: Final Rule (Docket No. FMCSA-97-2979) (RIN: 2126-AA32) received July 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3474. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations: Annual Offshore Super Series Boat Race, Fort Myers Beach, FL (CGD01-05-017) (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3475. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Special Local Regulations: Partners, KS (Docket No. FAA-2005-20570) (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 21, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.


3477. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-P-7644] received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3478. A letter from the General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Modifying Class E Airspace; Monett, MO (Docket No. FAA-2005-20065; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-7) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3479. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Mountain Grove, MO (Docket No. FAA-2005-20064; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-6) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3480. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Macon, MO (Docket No. FAA-2005-20067; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-8) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3481. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Revising of Jet Route 94 [Docket No. FAA-2004-19052; Airspace Docket No. 04-ANM-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3482. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Revising of Jet Route 95 [Docket No. FAA-2005-20063; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3483. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E2 Airspace; Estab- lishment of Class E2 Airspace; Kansas City, KS [Docket No. FAA-2005-20066; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-25] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3484. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E2 Airspace; Rickards, FL (Docket No. FAA-2005-20069; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-5) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3485. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Anchorage, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20065; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-10] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3486. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Anchorage, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20067; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-6] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3487. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Anchorage, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20067; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-6] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3490. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sutton, WV [Docket No. FAA-2005-20931; Airspace Docket No. 05-AEA-08] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3491. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bob Barker [Docket No. FAA-2005-20752; Airspace Docket No. 05-ACE-15] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3492. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Chalkyitsik, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-04] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3493. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Coldfoot, AK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-11] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3494. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Golden, CO [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-11] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3495. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Oklahoma City, OK [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-11] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3496. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Bozeman, MT [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3497. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Entry, NE [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3498. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Grand Forks, ND [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3499. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Hope, AR [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3500. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Mifflintown, PA [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3501. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Missoula, MT [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3502. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Quantico, VA [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3503. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Rome, NY [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3504. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; York, SC [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3505. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Urbana, IL [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3506. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; San Antonio, TX [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3507. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Columbus, NE [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3508. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Muskegon, MI [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AGL-01] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3509. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; V-2, V-347, and V-348 [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3510. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3511. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3512. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transporting the Department’s final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; [Docket No. FAA-2005-20568; Airspace Docket No. 05-AAL-02] received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB-WERKE Modl G120A Airplanes (Docket No. FAA-05-19473; Directorate Identifier 2004-CE-35-AD; Amendment 39-14146; AD 2005-13-09) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, ORPM, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Loan Guaranty: Hybrid Adjustable Rate Mortgages (RIN: 2900-AL54) received May 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
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To the Senate:

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our mighty rock, You have promised to supply all our needs. Today, give our lawmakers wisdom that they may know what to do. Give them courage to accomplish Your will. Give them skill to navigate through life’s inevitable challenges. Give them perseverance to not become weary in doing well. Give them strength to resist all the temptations which would lure them from Your plan. Help each of us to begin to continue and to end all things in You.

Thank You for answering our prayers, for You are our strong shield, and we place our trust in You. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable John E. Sununu led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Stevens).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 28, 2005.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable John E. Sununu, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TOD STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. Sununu thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore. Mr. Frist. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, this morning we will begin with a period of morning business for 60 minutes. Following that time, we will resume consideration of S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms legislation. Senator Kyl has an amendment pending related to trigger locks, and there will be an hour of debate on that amendment prior to the vote. That vote should begin before noon, in the next 2½ hours. The managers will continue to work through the day to see what additional amendments are ready for votes. The cloture vote could be as early as 1 a.m. Friday morning. We haven’t set the vote for that time. I mention that early hour only to highlight the fact that we have so much work to do.

We have conference reports, the gun liability bill, nominations, all of which we need to accomplish before we leave for the recess. We have the Interior appropriations conference report that has the veterans health money in it that we have addressed before. We have the energy conference report, which I believe is very close; the highway conference report, which has not been filed yet but which will be hopefully later today. We have the Legislative appropriations conference report. Once we address the pending bill, we can hopefully expedite completion of all of the remaining measures prior to the August break. I will be working with the Democratic leader to schedule these important items over the next couple of days.

Mr. Kennedy. Will the leader be good enough to yield for a question?

Mr. Frist. I am happy to yield.

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. President, several of us have amendments directly related to the underlying legislation. We understand the time goes to 1 o’clock this evening. I have two amendments dealing with the ability of terrorists to purchase weapons. I know both Senators from New Jersey have amendments. We are more than willing to enter into short time agreements. We want to cooperate on the conference reports, but we understand the process and the procedure that is going on is that the majority is making a judgment decision about which amendments we are going to consider and which ones we are not.

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, in response to our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, there have been several filed amendments. I mentioned 1 o’clock today because then we will have the whole universe of filed amendments. We are going to proceed and have a roll call vote on the trigger lock amendment before noon today, and then we need to look at each of the amendments. Including the amendments mentioned, Senator Levin has an amendment, Senator Lautenberg, and the Senator from Massachusetts has filed two amendments. We will be looking at those amendments over the course of the day.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader controls the time. Does the leader yield for a question? The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The only point is that, as the leader just said, we are following a procedure where the leadership is going to look at the amendments and then make their judgment as to whether the Senate will get a chance to consider these issues. I must say, that is an unusual procedure to follow, when many of us are trying to cooperate with the leadership. We are more than glad to enter into short time agreements and then to let the Senate work its will. I thank the Chair.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 810 AND S. 1317

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to the distinguished majority leader leaving the floor, I have a short statement I would like him to listen to. Then I will propound a unanimous consent request.

Two months ago, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act. Two months later, today, it may not seem like a lot of time. But in the lives of people who are sick or who have loved ones who are sick, it can be an eternity. The bill that passed the House was a rare victory of bipartisanship. I sincerely hoped, after having read that it had passed, that we would embrace the same spirit of bipartisanship in the Senate and pass this legislation that offers hope to millions of Americans who suffer from deadly disease, and their families.

In May, I spoke with my friend, the distinguished majority leader, about the need to take up this crucial legislation as soon as possible. I was assured that Senator Frist would work with Members of both sides of the aisle so that we could consider the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act before we broke for our August recess.

The month of July, of course, is almost to be able to complete things in the next day or two or three. But this legislation, in the lives of the people I mentioned, can’t go on forever. We believe this legislation could produce and will produce stunning medical breakthroughs to some of the dread diseases that affect mankind.

What we have been asking is simple. We propose that the Senate take up two bills: the stem cell bill, which is H.R. 810, and a blood cord bill, which is S. 1317, just like the House bill. Instead of the situation that we are going to consider six bills, and now we read seven bills. We haven’t seen the language of all seven.

It doesn’t have to be that complicated, I don’t think. The House dealt with the issue very simply, and we should do the same.

A bipartisan majority supported the stem cell bill in the House. I believe there are several Senators who will also support this legislation. Every day we delay consideration of this bill is another day we deny hope to millions of Americans and people throughout the world with Parkinson’s disease, Alzheimer’s, spinal cord injuries, heart disease, and diabetes, to name only a few.

These patients, as I have said, don’t have the luxury of time like some of us do. Let’s have an up-or-down vote on these bills and send them to the President as quickly as possible—like today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 119, H.R. 810 bill, that the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 156, S. 1317, the cord blood and bone marrow transplant bill; that the committee substitute be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. The issue of support for stem cell research is one that I believe deserves examination by this body. Stem cell research itself is very promising. I ran a very large multidisciplinary transplant center, and part of that was a transplant arm that transplanted literally hundreds of people with cord blood—or with bone marrow transplants, which is very similar to using cord blood, which one of the bills addresses. Passage of that bill extends that therapy—which is with adult stem cells—with the variance of cord blood. I agree that passage of that bill would help hundreds of people by establishing registries that could be easily accessed.

H.R. 810, Calendar No. 119, the stem cell research bill—the bill the Democratic leader mentioned—is also a bill that I believe should be addressed in this body. It is a bill that has passed the House of Representatives in a bipartisan way.

In trying to address those two bills, I have extended to both sides of the aisle the opportunity to have clean up-or-down votes on those bills, as well as a fascinating new arena of research—very promising. Alternative not to the Castle bill or the H.R. 810 bill, but an alternative where you don’t have to destroy embryos at all, with the opportunity to develop what are called pluripotent stem cells, or embryonic stem cells, which also should be addressed.

Thus, my proposal has been to address the cord blood bill, H.R. 810, the alternative new research, where embryos do not have to be destroyed; a cloning bill, Senator BROWNBACK’s bill; and a bone marrow bill. I have been unsuccessful in trying to bring that to the Senate floor. There are concerns on our side of the aisle about that approach—having clean votes on these bills.

I am not going to give up on the stem cell issue because the research is hugely promising. I think, although each of us has individual thoughts about the potential of stem cells and the moral and ethical issues around stem cells, it deserves our body politic addressing the issue. So with that, I will continue to address the issue. I hope that after we come back over the recess, we will be able to address the issue.

I do object to the unanimous consent request, as we finish over the last 48 hours with our business on the floor of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for 1 hour, with the first half of the time under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, and the second half of the time under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

STEM CELL LEGISLATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before leaving the floor, if I can have the attention of our minority leader. Is it the understanding of the leader in proposing this request that the measures proposed in the request had bipartisan support in the House of Representatives, and he believes as I believe—and I see my colleague, the Senator from Iowa, who is a great leader, who believes as well—that there is very strong bipartisan support for the legislation, and we could, in a reasonable period of time—really in a matter of hours—pass the legislation and still not exclude the possibility of continued debate and discussion on the other measures relating to stem cells; and that this would permit us to act before August 9, which would be the fourth year since we had the limitation and restriction on stem cell research, the kind of research that 80 Nobel laureates in a letter to President Bush said offers the greatest opportunity for progress in the areas of Parkinson’s disease, juvenile diabetes, cancer, and

July 28, 2005
Mr. HARKIN. I thank the majority leader, Mr. Frist, for the opportunity to address the Senate. As the Senator from Iowa, I have the honor of being the Majority Whip and the President pro tempore of the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to the important issues that we face in this Senate.

As we approach the end of this legislative session, we face several key issues that require our attention. One of the most pressing issues is the need to address the cloning and stem cell research legislation. My colleagues and I believe that this legislation is critical to the advancement of medical research and the potential to find cures for diseases that affect millions of Americans.

Mr. Frist, you have mentioned the importance of the cloning bill. As majority leader, I have a commitment to ensuring that we have a bipartisan approach to addressing this issue. The cloning bill is an important step in the process of addressing the ethical and moral issues surrounding stem cell research.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the stem cell research bill. As a member of the Senate Democratic leadership, I support the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the issues surrounding stem cell research. We must ensure that we have a responsible and ethical approach to this issue.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the need for a bipartisan approach to addressing the cloning and stem cell research legislation. As majority leader, I believe that it is important to work collaboratively with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we have a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the need for a bipartisan approach to addressing the cloning and stem cell research legislation. As majority leader, I believe that it is important to work collaboratively with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we have a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the majority leader, Mr. Frist, for the opportunity to address the Senate. As the Senator from Iowa, I have the honor of being the Majority Whip and the President pro tempore of the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to the important issues that we face in this Senate.

As we approach the end of this legislative session, we face several key issues that require our attention. One of the most pressing issues is the need to address the cloning and stem cell research legislation. My colleagues and I believe that this legislation is critical to the advancement of medical research and the potential to find cures for diseases that affect millions of Americans.

Mr. Frist, you have mentioned the importance of the cloning bill. As majority leader, I have a commitment to ensuring that we have a bipartisan approach to addressing this issue. The cloning bill is an important step in the process of addressing the ethical and moral issues surrounding stem cell research.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the stem cell research bill. As a member of the Senate Democratic leadership, I support the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the issues surrounding stem cell research. We must ensure that we have a responsible and ethical approach to this issue.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the need for a bipartisan approach to addressing the cloning and stem cell research legislation. As majority leader, I believe that it is important to work collaboratively with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we have a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the majority leader, Mr. Frist, for the opportunity to address the Senate. As the Senator from Iowa, I have the honor of being the Majority Whip and the President pro tempore of the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to the important issues that we face in this Senate.

As we approach the end of this legislative session, we face several key issues that require our attention. One of the most pressing issues is the need to address the cloning and stem cell research legislation. My colleagues and I believe that this legislation is critical to the advancement of medical research and the potential to find cures for diseases that affect millions of Americans.

Mr. Frist, you have mentioned the importance of the cloning bill. As majority leader, I have a commitment to ensuring that we have a bipartisan approach to addressing this issue. The cloning bill is an important step in the process of addressing the ethical and moral issues surrounding stem cell research.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the stem cell research bill. As a member of the Senate Democratic leadership, I support the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the issues surrounding stem cell research. We must ensure that we have a responsible and ethical approach to this issue.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the need for a bipartisan approach to addressing the cloning and stem cell research legislation. As majority leader, I believe that it is important to work collaboratively with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we have a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the majority leader, Mr. Frist, for the opportunity to address the Senate. As the Senator from Iowa, I have the honor of being the Majority Whip and the President pro tempore of the Senate. I want to express my gratitude to my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to the important issues that we face in this Senate.

As we approach the end of this legislative session, we face several key issues that require our attention. One of the most pressing issues is the need to address the cloning and stem cell research legislation. My colleagues and I believe that this legislation is critical to the advancement of medical research and the potential to find cures for diseases that affect millions of Americans.

Mr. Frist, you have mentioned the importance of the cloning bill. As majority leader, I have a commitment to ensuring that we have a bipartisan approach to addressing this issue. The cloning bill is an important step in the process of addressing the ethical and moral issues surrounding stem cell research.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the stem cell research bill. As a member of the Senate Democratic leadership, I support the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the issues surrounding stem cell research. We must ensure that we have a responsible and ethical approach to this issue.

Mr. Frist, you have also mentioned the need for a bipartisan approach to addressing the cloning and stem cell research legislation. As majority leader, I believe that it is important to work collaboratively with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that we have a comprehensive approach to addressing this issue.
with a bipartisan majority, it has bipartisan support here; we all know it has enough votes to pass probably more than even 60 votes, I would venture to guess—why can't we take that up, pass it, get it to the President, and then when we come back in September, can we take up these other bills?

I do not have any problem with these other bills coming up. Some I may support when they come up. To bring them all up together clouds and confuses the issues, so I just bring up the House bill, simple, straightforward, have a limited debate on it, and vote it up or down as they did in the House, ask my leader?

The Acting President pro tempore. Without objection, the majority leader is recognized.

Mr. Frist. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the question. It gives me the opportunity to show the work and the challenge it is to address an issue that has issues at the science and ethical concerns.

My approach has been to include what I think the Senator from Iowa wants, and that is a clean up-or-down vote on this bill. I have real concerns with the written language, and I will give several examples of why it bothers me a bit the way it is written and passing as a clean bill. But I am willing to do that if I can take into consideration the moral concerns and scientific concerns of others in this body and give them the same opportunity that the Senator from Iowa is asking for, and, thus, put together a group, a defined group, but not an unlimited group—we will be voting up or down on all sorts of votes—but see where everybody is on alternative ways: You do not have to destroy embryos to get the same cells you get from embryos, the cord blood bill, H.R. 810, and the cloning bill. It is a separate issue but involves the creation of embryos and ultimately the destruction of embryos.

That is what we are talking about. That is my attempt. It is going to take a while on the floor of the Senate because of the fact of it not having gone through the committee process and the fact everyone does stand in little different positions, from an ethical standpoint, on any of the bills.

On H.R. 810, the consent process is inadequate, from my standpoint. There is not an ideal ethical construct. It says informed consent, but it does not specifically talk about the potential for financial incentives between, say, a physician and an in vitro fertilization clinic. That is not addressed specifically in the bill. Instead of voting up or down, I would like to at least discuss these issues.

Another issue—there is informed consent and the financial incentives—would be if we pass it, it is passed forever; there is no opportunity to come back and look at it on a periodic basis, say, every 4 or 5 years. I mention those concerns because I am willing to step back and give a clean vote on that if we can take into consideration other people's issues or their particular bills. I am a little surprised my colleagues have not taken me up on that opportunity, but since they have not, we will have to come back and figure the best way to address it within the recess.

Mr. Harkin. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his response. I know Senator Kennedy wants the opportunity to make a speech. On the stem cell bill, I say to my friend from Maine, the distinguished leader, the clock is ticking. It does have a lot of support. There may be a lot of ideas out there. No bill that ever passes here has 100-percent approval by everybody of every, as they say, "jot and title" in the bill. If I were to rewrite H.R. 810, I might want to write it differently myself.

The fact is a lot of thought was given to it. The disease groups that represent the very ill people in this country—the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, Spinal Cord Injury Foundation, and a whole host of other groups—have put their stamp of approval on this bill. They want it passed.

It just seems to me that the more we dawdle around here—I understand we have had a long budget. We have not been here all of July. This bill, H.R. 810, has been sitting here. We could have taken it up at any time. It is this Senator's observation that all of a sudden all these other bills are popping up on cloning, stem cells, and others, which I am not saying are not important issues, but they are separate and aside from this issue.

If the distinguished majority leader wants to bring those up at some other time for debate and amendments and bring them up for a straight up-or-down vote, that is fine, I don't have a problem with that, but don't tie them in with a bill that has strong majority support on both sides of the aisle, strong and strong, which was shown in the House, and one which, if passed, could be sent to the President right away for his signature and which could really open the door so our scientists could get to work on embryonic stem cell research.

It seems—I am not accusing anyone of this, but it is the process we go through sometimes—there is a lot of smoke and mirrors going on, and a lot of bills are popping up to confuse the issue and take all the people away from support of H.R. 810.

Again, I say to my friend from Tennessee, I hope that we can have some assurance from the leader that when we get back in September that we will take up H.R. 810 and, I say to the Senator from Tennessee, if they want to bring up these other bills at some other time, in some other context, I can assure him this Senator would not object. I would have no objection to it. But right now there are objections to bringing them up at the same time, not just on this side of the aisle, but I also understand on the other side of the aisle.

It seems to me the clearest way is to bring up H.R. 810 and the cord blood bill and get them out of the way and deal with the others. I hope the majority leader will assure us we will do that when we come back in September.

Mr. Frist. To complete this, from my standpoint, it is very clear, to be understood that the majority leader of the Senate has offered to his colleagues to bring up six bills. The statement is made this is going to have an overwhelming bipartisan support. It is in the House. All I am saying is, let's, in a short period of time—what has been offered to both sides, is spend a day debating these six bills which do, if you look at the six bills, take the range of ethical considerations and moral considerations of this body and do look at the science—alternative ways of developing embryonic stem cells—and let's take them to the floor and allow each one to get a vote, and let's see where the votes are.

There is the opportunity by any distinguished colleague from Iowa will get a majority vote or a supermajority vote, but so may the cord blood bill. I hope it does. I think it will save lives. The alternative bill, let's see what it is. It may be, but what the distinguished leader will assure us is to have a clean bill. But I am willing to do that if I can take into consideration the moral concerns and scientific concerns of others in this body and give them the same opportunity that the Senator from Iowa is asking for, and, thus, put together a group, a defined group, but not an unlimited group—we will be voting up or down on all sorts of votes—but see where everybody is on alternative ways: You do not have to destroy embryos to get the same cells you get from embryos, the cord blood bill, H.R. 810, and the cloning bill. It is a separate issue but involves the creation of embryos and ultimately the destruction of embryos.

That is what we are talking about. That is my attempt. It is going to take a while on the floor of the Senate because of the fact of it not having gone through the committee process and the fact everyone does stand in little different positions, from an ethical standpoint, on any of the bills.

On H.R. 810, the consent process is inadequate, from my standpoint. There is not an ideal ethical construct. It says informed consent, but it does not specifically talk about the potential for financial incentives between, say, a physician and an in vitro fertilization clinic. That is not addressed specifically in the bill. Instead of voting up or down, I would like to at least discuss these issues.

Another issue—there is informed consent and the financial incentives—would be if we pass it, it is passed forever; there is no opportunity to come back and look at it on a periodic basis, say, every 4 or 5 years. I mention those concerns because I am willing to step back and give a clean vote on that if we can take into consideration other people's issues or their particular bills. I am a little surprised my colleagues have not taken me up on that opportunity, but since they have not, we will have to come back and figure the best way to address it within the recess.

Mr. Harkin. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his response. I know Senator Kennedy wants time to make a speech. On the stem cell bill, I say to my friend from Maine, the distinguished leader, the clock is ticking. It does have a lot of support. There may be a lot of ideas out there. No bill that ever passes here has 100-percent approval by everybody of every, as they say, "jot and title" in the bill. If I were to rewrite H.R. 810, I might want to write it differently myself.

The fact is a lot of thought was given to it. The disease groups that represent the very ill people in this country—the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, Spinal Cord Injury Foundation, and a whole host of other groups—have put their stamp of approval on this bill. They want it passed.

It just seems to me that the more we dawdle around here—I understand we have had a long budget. We have not been here all of July. This bill, H.R. 810, has been sitting here. We could have taken it up at any time. It is this Senator's observation that all of a sudden all these other bills are popping up on cloning, stem cells, and others, which I am not saying are not important issues, but they are separate and aside from this issue.

If the distinguished majority leader wants to bring those up at some other time for debate and amendments and bring them up for a straight up-or-down vote, that is fine, I don't have a problem with that, but don't tie them in with a bill that has strong majority support on both sides of the aisle, strong and strong, which was shown in the House, and one which, if passed, could be sent to the President right away for his signature and which could really open the door so our scientists could get to work on embryonic stem cell research.

It seems—I am not accusing anyone of this, but it is the process we go through sometimes—there is a lot of smoke and mirrors going on, and a lot of bills are popping up to confuse the issue and take all the people away from support of H.R. 810.

Again, I say to my friend from Tennessee, I hope that we can have some assurance from the leader that when we get back in September that we will take up H.R. 810 and, I say to the Senator from Tennessee, if they want to bring up these other bills at some other time, in some other context, I can assure him this Senator would not object. I would have no objection to it. But right now there are objections to bringing them up at the same time, not just on this side of the aisle, but I also understand on the other side of the aisle.

It seems to me the clearest way is to bring up H.R. 810 and the cord blood bill and get them out of the way and deal with the others. I hope the majority leader will assure us we will do that when we come back in September.
moters of lethal assault weapons—but no time for lifesaving cures.

The bill is right there, Mr. President, right there on that desk in front of you. At any time, the majority leader could walk over, pick it up and have a vote on it. But what would bring new hope to millions of Americans?

For years, patients and their families waited for a medical breakthrough to provide new hope for serious illnesses like Parkinson’s disease, spinal injury, and Alzheimer’s disease.

The medicated scientists made that breakthrough. They discovered stem cells, which can repair the injuries that cause untold suffering and shorten lives.

The cruel irony is that just as medicine was gaining patients new hope, the Bush administration snatched it away through needless restrictions on stem cell research.

In a few days, on August 9, patients across America will mark the fourth tragic anniversary of that cruel decision.

We in the United States Senate had the opportunity—no, we had the responsibility—to see that August 9 of this year did not mark 4 years of failure and 4 years of missed opportunity. But the Republican leadership would not let us meet that responsibility. They let the first week of July slip by, and then the second, and now the last—all with no action on this urgently needed legislation.

Every day that we delay is another day of falling behind in the race to cure diabetes, cancer, Parkinson’s disease, and many other serious illnesses.

It is another day for America to lose ground to Korea, Singapore, Britain, and other nations in the competition for global leadership in biotechnology.

Most of all, it is another day of shattered hopes for millions of patients and their families across America.

Some respond to the failure of the current policy by saying we should explore the development of embryonic stem cells. I agree. Let’s explore the potential of new discoveries in genetics and cell science to improve the ways we can tap the potential of stem cells. But let’s not restrict essential research while scientists explore speculative and preliminary theories.

Some say we should encourage research on stem cells from the blood in umbilical cords or on adult stem cells from bone marrow and other tissues. Again, I agree. We should seek help for patients wherever it may be found. But it makes no sense to limit medical research to one narrow channel when the Nation’s leading scientists agree that these alternatives have a more limited potential than embryonic stem cells.

As a matter of fact, 8 Nobles laureates in February 2001 stated:

Current evidence suggests that adult stem cells have markedly restricted differentiation potential. Therefore, for disorders that prove intractable with adult stem cells, impeding human pluripotent stem cell research risks unnecessary delay for millions of patients who may die or endure needless suffering while the effectiveness of adult stem cells is evaluated.

The conclusion of an NIH report in June 2001 is clear:

Stem cells in adult tissues do not appear to have the same capacity to differentiate as do embryonic stem cells. It would be cruel to base the hopes of millions of patients on an ideological conclusion that these experts are wrong. By all means, let’s pursue vigorous research in adult cells, but let’s not deceive the American public into thinking it’s an adequate substitute for embryonic stem cell research.

Legislation should be an expression of our values, and our legislation says loud and clear that we value patients and their families—not rigid ideology.

It is a travesty that no action has been taken on this lifesaving measure.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the unanimous consent request offered today by Senator Reid. The Senator has asked unanimous consent for the Senate to take up H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, and S. 1317, the Bone Marrow and Cord Blood Therapy and Research Act.

Both of these bills have been passed by the House and are sitting at the desk waiting to be passed by the Senate and sent to the President for his signature.

The month of July has come and is nearly gone. Yet these two House-passed bills, with strong bipartisan support, sit and wait at the desk.

The Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act has 41 sponsors—Republicans and Democrats alike. This legislation is the result of many years of bipartisan cooperation in both the House and Senate. I am pleased to join my colleagues, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, Tom HARKIN, Orrin HATCH, Ted KENNEDY, and Gordon Smith, who have worked tirelessly on behalf of patients and their families across this Nation to see that embryonic stem cell research moves forward.

This legislation is proof positive that Senators from many different points of view, be they liberal or conservative, pro-life or pro-choice, can work together on legislation that will help speed the pace of cures and treatments for more than 110 million Americans.

Identical legislation passed the House on May 24 by a vote of 238 to 194. Congressman Mike Castle, Republican, Delaware, and DIANA DeGETTE, Democrat, Colorado, are to be commended for their tireless work in getting this bill passed in the House.

It is essential that the Senate move quickly to pass this bill. The clock is ticking. August 9 marks the fourth anniversary of President Bush’s policy limiting Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research. At the time it was passed, it did not mean that every line in the bill was available to researchers, today that number is 22. And all 22 of the lines available are contaminated by mouse feeder cells and not usable for research in humans.

So why has the Senate still not acted? The simple unanimous consent request put forth by Senator Reid would allow the Senate to vote on this bill as early as today. We should send it to the President for his signature tonight.

What is going on here is an attempt to obscure what is a very simple issue. What is going on here is an attempt to allow votes on other bills in order to pull votes away from H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act.

I think it is appropriate for the Senate to debate other related issues at a later time. In fact, yesterday I introduced S. 1520, the Human Cloning Ban Act—with 25 bipartisan cosponsors—which would prohibit once and for all the immoral and unethical act of human reproductive cloning. I believe strongly that Congress must pass a ban on human cloning or attempts to clone human beings.

But first we must act on the unanimous consent request offered today by Senator Reid, and I hope that request will be one of the first issues the Senate deals with after the August recess.

Embryonic stem cell research is the bright new frontier of medicine. We owe it to the 110 million Americans suffering daily with debilitating and catastrophic diseases to pass H.R. 810.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa yields the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exchange be scored as part of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. To be more precise for our timekeeping purposes, did the Senator say part of the leader’s time?

Mr. KENNEDY. The time not to be charged as part of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand we have half an hour; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair. I ask the Chair to notify me when I have 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

END TO ARMED CAMPAIGN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this morning the IRA has issued a statement indicating that it has formally ended an end to the armed campaign. I welcome the statement. Hopefully, the statement means we are finally nearing the end of this very long process to take guns and criminality out of politics in Northern Ireland once and for all.
I look forward to the final act of de-commissioning and the verification that paramilitary activity and criminality have ended. The all-important restoration of the Northern Ireland Assembly is re-established. Peace and violence cannot coexist in Northern Ireland, and neither peace and stability look forward to these final actions.

PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to speak on another subject, the underlying legislation, the gun immunity bill. This bill is deceptively named the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, but it will make it virtually impossible to bring lawsuits against the gun industry, even in circumstances in which the industry's conduct contributes to unlawful gun violence.

The bill purports to exempt suits in which the manufacturers and sellers engage in illegal or negligent conduct, but these exemptions are poorly defined and clearly would not cover many types of bad conduct.

The New York City leader says this bill is of urgent importance, taking precedence over the Defense bill because the Department of Defense faces the real prospect of having to outsource side arms for our soldiers to foreign manufacturers. But the real story is that the Republican leadership and the Bush administration will do whatever it takes to give the gun industry all that it wants.

The NRA wants gun dealers and manufacturers to be protected from lawsuits. The NRA expects—the NRA demands—that this body remove the last resort for victims of gun violence against negligent and often complicit gun dealers and manufacturers by barring all types of cases.

Let's be clear about what this bill does not do.

It does not help our law enforcement officials fight crime or terrorism.

It does not meet the urgent need to strengthen any of our gun control laws.

It does not affect—it does not address at all—the rights or ability of law-abiding citizens to purchase and own a gun.

It does not have anything to do with the second amendment, no matter how you interpret the language of that amendment.

This bill has one motivation: payback by the Bush administration and the Republican leadership of the Congress to the powerful special interests of the National Rifle Association.

As The New York Times reported less than 2 weeks ago, Wayne LaPierre, the executive vice president of the NRA, made it clear that the NRA expected total support from its allies—or else.

Mr. LaPierre said, "It's simply bad politics to be on the wrong side of the second amendment at election time," asserting that Vice President Al Gore lost the 2000 Presidential election because he supported gun control, including a Federal ban on assault weapons.

That is the same assault weapons ban that President Bush told the American people he supported but then allowed to expire.

We know what happened when the NRA pushed this special interest bill last year. When the Senate voted to re-authorize the assault weapons ban as part of the bill, the NRA called their supporters and told them to vote against the bill for which it had just lobbied. What a disgraceful spectacle, Members of this great body reversing themselves on the Senate floor minutes before a vote because of a single call from the NRA.

That same kind of raw special interest power is now being used again to take the Senate away from the important business of protecting our men and women who are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. And now we are about to undo gun control that is so necessary to save lives, and to save the lives of our police and federal agents to police unsavory gun dealers.

Congress has cut Federal funding for the anti-terrorism unit that President Bush told the American people he supported but then allowed to expire.
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and manufacturers. In fact, the GAO has recently reported that the ATF is so underfunded that it would take 22 years to inspect the records of all gun dealers in this country just once. The GAO report has also found that terrorists and people on the terrorist watch list are illegally barred from purchasing guns and are routinely buying guns in this country. This must stop.

The gun industry must have some accountability. That is why I am offering my amendment today that would ensure that cases could be brought against gun manufacturers and dealers aiding or abetting a representative of a designated foreign terrorist organization. One can find a list of the designated foreign terrorist organizations on the Internet, and it includes al-Qaida and Hamas among others.

How can Congress deny victims the right to challenge a manufacturer or dealer that provided guns to a foreign terrorist organization which caused them harm?

This administration continuously says that we are engaged in a war on terror, but it takes a position that the war on terror does not allow us to prevent gun dealers from buying guns in this country. Because of the actions of this administration, this Congress is caving to the NRA. Terrorists can now add assault weapons to their arsenals, all to appease the NRA so they will give them another $1 billion. This is not only a disgrace, it is criminal and it has to stop.

The hypocrisy is mind-boggling. After 9/11, the worst terrorist attack in the history of the Nation, the Justice Department, over the objection of the Department, over the objection of the gun industry, to teachers and volunteers under the headline of tort reform. The legislation is so extreme that it requires the immediate dismissal of any cases pending in either State or Federal court.

By doing so, the bill denies victims their day in court. It amounts to an outrageous violation of the rule of law. This bill would result in the automatic dismissal of any lawsuits involving New York City, the State or Federal court. This bill’s supporters misrepresent the real goal of the lawsuits filed against this industry. These lawsuits are not filed in an effort to bankrupt the industry. Like all tort suits, the victims turn to the courts to obtain compensation for their injuries and demand responsible conduct.

Let’s dispel a few myths that the other side is spinning. The gun industry is not uniquely burdened with lawsuits. They just do not like what the public discovers about the industry and its practices when documents are produced in litigation. This immunity is not aimed only at frivolous lawsuits. The truth is, it bars almost all actions for negligence. If this bill had become law last year, the families of the victims of the DC snipers would have been barred from suing and receiving the settlement from the gun dealer in Washington State that lost and could not account for more than 200 guns in its inventory, like the assault rifle used by the DC snipers, that were used in the commission of other crimes.

If passed, the bill forces the dismissal of a lawsuit filed by the family of Massachusetts victim Danny Guzman, an armed robbery victim in Hollywood at Christmas Eve in 1999. Danny was killed by a gun stolen by an employee working in a gun manufacturing plant. Danny, here in the picture with his cousin, was a true victim of negligent conduct. This gun factory lacked adequate security, recordkeeping, and other reasonable safeguards to prevent employees from taking guns in their pockets out of the plant. The lack of security was so bad that the owners of the plant did not even know the guns were missing. Danny’s mother and his two surviving sisters sued the manufacturer claiming that it had negligently hired criminals to work in its plant and had such irresponsible security that allowed them to walk out of the plant with guns that did not have serial numbers. One of these guns was used to shoot Danny. This case should not be dismissed.

This bill will result in the automatic dismissal of a case just filed in Pennsylvania. Anthony Oliver, a 14-year-old boy, was killed by a handgun that discharged accidentally when he was playing with his friends. Anthony’s life was cut short due to the gun seller’s reckless conduct. His family filed a case against the gun companies that negligently allowed one of Anthony’s friends to obtain a handgun. The dealer who sold the gun had a history of supplying guns to criminals and not even taking the minimum step to screen the purchasers. Over a 4-year period, Lou sold over 400 guns traced to criminals. Under this bill, Anthony’s family will not get their day in court, and the irresponsible activities of this gun dealer and its supplier will not be stopped. This case should not be dismissed.

This bill would also bar municipal lawsuits. If this case passes, four pending cases involving New York City, the District of Columbia, Gary, IN, and Cleveland, OH, will all be dismissed. This bill is not about protecting the gun industry from bankruptcy. This bill is a blatant special interest bill to protect gun manufacturers and sellers who provide guns to criminals and even terrorists.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to.

Mr. DURBIN. I first commend the Senator from Massachusetts victim Danny Guzman, an armed robbery victim in Hollywood at Christmas Eve in 1999. Danny was killed by a gun stolen by an employee working in a gun manufacturing plant. Danny, here in the picture with his cousin, was a true victim of negligent conduct. This gun factory lacked adequate security, recordkeeping, and other reasonable safeguards to prevent employees from taking guns in their pockets out of the plant. The lack of security was so bad that the owners of the plant did not even know the guns were missing. Danny’s mother and his two surviving sisters sued the manufacturer claiming that it had negligently hired criminals to work in its plant and had such irresponsible security that allowed them to walk out of the plant with guns that did not have serial numbers. One of these guns was used to shoot Danny. This case should not be dismissed.

This bill will result in the automatic dismissal of a case just filed in Pennsylvania. Anthony Oliver, a 14-year-old boy, was killed by a handgun that discharged accidentally when he was playing with his friends. Anthony’s life was cut short due to the gun seller’s reckless conduct. His family filed a case against the gun companies that negligently allowed one of Anthony’s friends to obtain a handgun. The dealer who sold the gun had a history of supplying guns to criminals and not even taking the minimum step to screen the purchasers. Over a 4-year period, Lou sold over 400 guns traced to criminals. Under this bill, Anthony’s family will not get their day in court, and the irresponsible activities of this gun dealer and its supplier will not be stopped. This case should not be dismissed.

This bill would also bar municipal lawsuits. If this case passes, four pending cases involving New York City, the District of Columbia, Gary, IN, and Cleveland, OH, will all be dismissed. This bill is not about protecting the gun industry from bankruptcy. This bill is a blatant special interest bill to protect gun manufacturers and sellers who provide guns to criminals and even terrorists.
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act that would allow the Defense Department to purchase light armored vehicles and to acquire in-service and operational aircraft. This amendment is critical to our national security.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question. The United States has a history of selling guns to criminals—in other words, someone comes in and buys 100 Saturday night specials, "fill up my trunk with guns"—obviously, not a sportsman, not a hunter or someone interested in personal defense, but someone who comes in and buys clearly for guns to be sold through straw purchasers to others—if the gun dealer has not even taken the time to check the FBI's Most Wanted list when making a sale across the counter, the gun dealer, so negligent in his conduct, cannot be held personally responsible, or responsible as a business, in court for the victims of the gun violence that follows from that negligent act?

Mr. DURBIN. I am not sure I understand the question, Mr. President. It is deplorable. I know of 20 most wanted fugitives who are wanted for murder and other crimes, with the FBI, and there are 11,000 other fugitives in the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair. Although everyone knows that one of the most important bills that we consider at any time of the year is the Defense Authorization legislation. That is the legislation which provides basic resources and support for our armed services, not only in Iraq and Afghanistan but all over the world. It is the basic document which is the expression of our national priority in terms of national security and national defense.

As one who has been here for some years, having been a member of the Armed Services Committee, we met in the day and in the evening to report that at any time of the year. The calendar could be considered before the August recess. That is what we heard, as members of the Armed Services Committee, and we were in the process of doing that at the end of last week. As a matter of fact, there was one amendment offered by the chairman of the committee to restore money for up-armoring humvees, which I welcomed the opportunity to support. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee had opposed that up-armoring at the time we had the supplemental. That is very important, making sure our men and women serving in Iraq are going to have the body armor and have the best in terms of their protection. That is what is in that legislation. That is what we were considering. That is what we hoped to deal with.

All of a sudden, out of the blue, the Republican leadership says, No, we are going to pull that bill down and we will put on the calendar and consider this special interest legislation, which they have called up. They now use parliamentary procedures in order to even deny those of us who want to amend that legislation the opportunity to do so.

I don't know whether the Senator was here a few moments ago when our majority leader was talking about stem cell research, which we wanted to take up, which offered such hope and opportunity to conquer diseases. The majority leader said: We want every opportunity to conquer diseases. The Senator from Massachusetts, another question about this bill. The Senator raises an important point. If a gun dealer in the United States has a history of selling guns to criminals—in other words, someone comes in and buys 100 Saturday night specials, "fill up my trunk with guns"—obviously, not a sportsman, not a hunter or someone interested in personal defense, but someone who comes in and buys clearly for guns to be sold through straw purchasers to others—if the gun dealer has not even taken the time to check the FBI's Most Wanted list when making a sale across the counter, the gun dealer, so negligent in his conduct, cannot be held personally responsible, or responsible as a business, in court for the victims of the gun violence that follows from that negligent act?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator makes an absolutely accurate point. We have here a list from the FBI of the Most Wanted fugitives. There is an amendment to say at least they have to look at the FBI's Most Wanted fugitives. Under this legislation, if the gun dealer sells it to one of the Most Wanted, they still get a free pass.

Under the current legislation, we are not even asking them to look on the Internet for those who are going to be listed on the Internet as members of terrorist organizations. We are not even asking them to do that. If they do, and they sell it, as we saw from the al-Qaida book over in Afghanistan saying that the FBI's Most Wanted fugitives. Under this legislation, if the gun dealer sells it to one of the Most Wanted, they still get a free pass.

Under the current legislation, we are not even asking them to look on the Internet for those who are going to be listed on the Internet as members of terrorist organizations. We are not even asking them to do that. If they do, and they sell it, as we saw from the al-Qaida book over in Afghanistan saying that the FBI's Most Wanted fugitives. Under this legislation, if the gun dealer sells it to one of the Most Wanted, they still get a free pass.

Just to complete the thought about the sense of priorities, as legislators we basically express the priorities for the people in our State and the Nation. We express those priorities in our budget, on what we ought to be expending our resources, and we express priorities by what we address on the floor of the Senate.

One of those amendments that was going to be offered to the Defense authorization bill—I know the Senator from Michigan was going to provide assurance that there was going to be mandatory spending to protect the veterans who are coming back from Iraq so they are guaranteed the kind of health care they are guaranteed before they go over there and fight and become wounded and need those kinds of services. That is offered in light of the fact that we are not providing the resources to serve our veterans.

That is something worthy of debate on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that has a lot more priority for debate than the special interest legislation that we are considering with the National Rifle Association.

I ask whether the Senator would not agree with me on that?
any of these kinds of amendments dealing with the Most Wanted list or the terrorist list—we can’t even get it before the Senate. That is the lock, the hold that the NRA has. It is disgraceful.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts yields the floor. The Democratic side has 30 seconds remaining.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized to conclude the morning business.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts had laid out the case. Can you imagine? We took the bill off the floor for the Department of Defense, for our soldiers and their families, and said we didn’t have time to finish it this week because we had to go to this bill, the National Rifle Association’s most important bill, which says that gun manufacturers and gun dealers selling their firearms to those on the FBI’s Most Wanted list, or to those in terrorist organizations, would not be held accountable for their misconduct? Where are the priorities of this Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the Senate side has expired. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have heard a lot of arguments on the floor in my day, but some of these arguments are so wrong they are wrong even here. I don’t know, maybe I missed something. We were moving ahead on the Defense authorization bill when all of a sudden we couldn’t get cloture. We couldn’t move ahead because of the very people who have been making these arguments, in a holy fashion, that they want to help our soldiers. Yet they filibuster by preventing cloture and preventing a full acceptance of the Department of Defense authorization bill, and then turn and say we stopped them from amending the bill. If they were stopped, it is because their amendments were not germane.

I have never heard arguments like this, that we are just going to give gun dealers an absolute right to violate the law. They haven’t read this legislation at all.

And then they bring in an antiterrorism argument. What they do not tell the American public is that there are million of guns out there in the underworld that people can get. But that doesn’t justify holding liable gun manufacturers—who manufacture guns for our soldiers, by the way; if they all go broke we will not have the guns for our soldiers—when somebody takes some of their guns and misuses it. The person misusing it ought to be liable, not the gun manufacturer who cannot supervise the persons to whom they legitimately sold guns.

Let’s face it. The problem with that side of the aisle, the Republican side, they talk in terms of, We want to take care of our hunters and our gun collectors and people who love guns who are decent, law-abiding citizens. But look over the years how they have argued against anything that makes sense with regard to the right to manufacture weapons that we have always had in this country, and the right to keep and bear arms, which the Constitution guarantees. These are the same people who are constantly arguing about things that are not explicitly in the Constitution, claiming that they should be given the sanctification of constitutional protection. Yet some language that is expressly written in the Constitution, they turn around and blast.

I could spend a lot of time on that, but that is not what I came over here to do. All I can say is I find it amazing that an argument would be made, after they voted against cloture—in other words, proceeding with the Defense authorization bill, they voted against proceeding—and now they are saying, Why didn’t we proceed. I missed something. But I don’t think so. This is just typical: Politics trumps everything maybe. But I don’t think so. This is just typical: Politics trumps everybody. No one is saying, with regard to this issue of the gun manufacturer’s right to manufacture guns that are legal, they have a legal right to do so, nobody is arguing that manufacturers who are honest and decent and honorable should not be able to sell those guns to decent, honorable people. We have plenty of restrictions already in law against illegality with regard to the sale of weapons.

My gosh, is there no end to politics in these issues? This argument that this modest bill gives criminals a free pass and aids and abets terrorists is as phony an argument as I have heard. And the argument that it lets manufacturers off the hook for their wrongdoing—if they do wrong, they are on the hook under this bill.

They are not doing wrong. That is the problem. The problem is the chief fundraiser of our friends on the left happens to be—the chief hard-money funder in this country happens to be the personal injury trial lawyer for liberals. And those people literally are the reason why these, I think, misconceived arguments.

I could not sit here without saying something about it because it is hard to believe that they can stand up and make these kinds of arguments. Much as I respect my fellow Senators, it is mind-boggling that they can make an argument that we are preventing going ahead with the DOD bill when they are the ones who stopped it. My gracious. Let me shift gears. I could talk for hours on that subject.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the nomination of Judge John Roberts to the Supreme Court presents the Senate with some real challenges and opportunities.

First of all, it allows us the specific opportunity to place on our Nation’s highest Court a man of impeccable qualifications and unquestioned character. Everybody here knows that.

After an unprecedented degree of consultation with the Senate, President Bush has nominated a truly outstanding individual.

Judge Roberts has a strong background in terms of education and experience.

Judge Roberts is a summa cum laude graduate of Harvard College—a degree which he finished in just three years—and a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard Law School, where he was the managing editor of the Harvard Law Review. Meaning he was at the pinnacle of Law School students at the time throughout the country.

He was a law clerk for two distinguished Federal judges: First for the late Judge Henry Friendly on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, widely recognized as one of the most influential appellate judges of his time; and next on the U.S. Supreme Court for then-Associate Justice William Rehnquist. Now Chief Justice, he tells us he is one of the most outstanding jurists of his time.

Judge Roberts’s career in legal practice covers both the public and private sectors.

He held several positions in two administrations, including Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Associate Counsel to the President, and Principal Deputy Solicitor General, all high positions. They don’t get much higher in the law.

In between his stints in public service, Judge Roberts became a leading member of the prestigious law firm of Hogan and Hartson, an internationally recognized law firm.

Overall, Judge Roberts became, by all accounts, one of the leading practitioners before the Supreme Court, arguing nearly 40 cases.

Not only does Judge Roberts have the education and experience, but his colleagues in the bar tell us that he possesses the integrity and character to make a fine member of the Supreme Court.

Just two years ago, the American Bar Association unanimously gave Judge Roberts its highest well-qualified rating for serving in his current position on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

Mr. President, a second opportunity, as well as a great challenge, presented by this nomination is more general.

In between his stints in public service, Judge Roberts became a leader of the prestigious law firm of Hogan and Hartson, an internationally recognized law firm.

We can clarify the kind of judge we need on the bench.

We can get straight just what judges are supposed to do.

We must seize this opportunity, because I am concerned that lack of clarity on this point, a misunderstanding of what judges are supposed to do, continues to trigger the rancor and the partisan conflict surrounding the judicial selection process.

Mr. President, last week here on the Senate floor, I began to address this by
comparing judges to umpires or referees. I used that analogy because I believe we can be simple without being simplistic, even regarding some of these very important, and sometimes confusing, matters.

Judges, like umpires or referees, take rules they did not make and cannot change and apply them to the contest before them.

Neither judges nor umpires may first pick a winner and then manipulate the rules to produce that outcome or the final result.

Every American of a certain age remembers only too well the Olympic basketball game in which biased referees unfairly replayed the final seconds of the game so that the Soviets would win. And we all saw the tainted, colluding French ice skating judge at the last winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.

Neither judges nor umpires may allow their personal views of the parties or teams before them to influence their application of the law or the rules.

And they certainly may not prejudice the contest before the teams even take the field.

This role or function, this job description, must guide the hiring or selection process.

We hear it said, for example, that we must know a judicial nominee’s views. At least on the surface, that notion sounds practical, even an assertion of common sense.

The problem is, that by itself, this general demand to know a nominee’s views begs rather than answers the important questions.

It is so general that it simply cannot mean what it says. We have neither desire, need, nor right to know most of Judge Roberts’s views on most imaginable subjects.

The real questions are these: What views do we actually need to know? What views may we properly seek to know?

I submit, that properly understanding what judges do helps us properly establish which of a nominee’s views we need to know.

This is quickly coming to a head.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, aided in turn by some of their friends among left-wing interest groups, are demanding to know Judge Roberts’s views related to how he is likely to rule in the future.

They seek to elicit those views in a variety of different ways and seem committed to ask carefully crafted questions designed to poke and prod, cajole and extract, but they are after questions designed to poke and prod, even as they seek to know, need to know, that he is impartial, that he will keep an open mind, and that he is prepared to balance the need to be consistent with judicial independence and impartiality, but others are not.

I have said before that Senators can ask any questions they choose, whether I disagree with those questions or not, whether I feel those questions are wise or not.

I have served on the Judiciary Committee during hearings for eight of the nine current Supreme Court Justices and many other court judges.

I know from experience that Senators want to know a great many things from a judicial nominee. Being legislators and being political, we may even want to know many political things.

I do, however, encourage my colleagues, and remind myself, to resist using a purely political standard to evaluate a nominee for judicial office.

Even more than Senators, however, the nominees before us will certainly use a judicial standard to answer even political questions.

Many of us have already met with Judge Roberts. I know him personally. I have seen him sit there for 14 years because he wasn’t even given the courtesy of a hearing.

He is a thoughtful, sincere, and honest man.

We can be confident that he will do his best to balance the need to be for the people responsive, on the one hand, with his commitment to judicial independence and impartiality, on the other.

There is, however, more for him to consider than simply that a Senator wants to know something.

Judge Roberts has not only been nominated to a judicial position, he already has one. He is a sitting judge.

He will be on the Federal bench, on one court or another, for many years to come.

Those who come before him deserve to know, need to know, that he is impartial. Nothing shatters that confidence more than knowing a judge has, under oath, already pledged to rule one way or another, which is being demanded by some of my colleagues on the other side.

In fact, this duty not to prejudice issues or cases is so important that it is codified in the Canons of Judicial Ethics. Let me read a portion of it here: I think it should be interesting to everybody.

"[A] judge or a candidate for appointment . . . to judicial office shall not . . . with respect to cases, controversies, or issues that are likely to come before the court, make pledges, promises or commitments that are inconsistent with the impartial performance of the adjudicative duties of the office of the judge.

I know that Judge Roberts takes his judicial responsibilities, his judicial ethics, very seriously.

We can look not only to the nature of this judicial office, but past judicial confirmations, for more concrete definition of this judicial standard.

As each Supreme Court nominee came before the Judiciary Committee, Senators asked difficult questions on a wide range of issues. Some of them sought, more or less obviously, to zero in on how the nominee would likely rule in the future cases raising particular issues.

We are probably all guilty of that at one time or another, but judges who use common sense refuse to answer those kinds of questions. They should.

Senators of both parties pressed nominees of both parties.

The remarkable thing, which we will do well to keep in mind today, is the consistency with which nominees handled these questions. There were variations, to be sure, but those were variations in degree.

Nominees regularly took the same basic approach to the issue of prejudging issues and cases.

Let us look briefly at some examples from nominees of both parties.

Anthony Kennedy’s nomination was sent by a Republican President to a Democratic Senate. At his confirmation hearing in January 1988, he said, "(T)he public expects that the judge will keep an open mind, and that he is confirmed by the Senate because of his temperament and his character, and not because he has taken particular positions on the issues." That is a pretty important statement.

The Senate confirmed Justice Kennedy by a vote of 97–0.

David Souter’s nomination was also sent by a Republican President to a Democratic Senate. At his confirmation hearing in September 1990, he asked rhetorically, "(C)an you imagine the pressure that would be on a judge who had stated an opinion, or seemed to have given a commitment in these circumstances to the Senate of the United States?"

By the way the Senate confirmed Justice Souter by a vote of 90–9.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s nomination was sent by a Democratic President to a Democratic Senate. At her confirmation hearing in July 1993, she gave what she called her rule when asked to prejudge issues or cases—a rule which we honored in the committee and the Senate—"No hint, no forecasts, no previews." That was a Democratic nominee and we honored those views, Democrats and Republicans.

The Senate confirmed Justice Ginsburg by a vote of 96–3.

And finally, Stephen Breyer’s nomination was sent by a Democratic President to a Democratic Senate. At his
confirmation hearing in July 1994, he said, "I do not want to predict or to commit myself on an open issue that I feel is going to come up in the Court. . . . It is so important that the clients and the lawyers understand the judges are really open-minded. I agree with his statements. Did members of the Judiciary Committee or by and large.

The Senate confirmed Justice Breyer by a vote of 87-9.

I hope everyone sees the pattern here. Each of these Supreme Court nominees was, like Judge Roberts, already a Federal appeals court judge.

Each of them, whether Republican or Democrat, used the same judicial standard when Senators, Republican or Democrat, sought prejudgment.

They refused.

These judicial nominees refused to prejudge issues or cases because it would compromise their own independence and impartiality.

They refused to prejudge issues or cases because litigants deserve confidence that the judge before whom they appear is impartial and open-minded. Let me put back up here the simple, straightforward Ginsburg rule. No hints, no forecasts, no previews.

We should do the same for Judge Roberts, and that is respect him and confirm him. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLISH). The majority whip.

Mr. MCCONNELL. How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes 20 seconds.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We are talking with the floor staff on the other side about getting additional time on this side since a bit more was used on the other side.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator CORNYN be given 2 extra minutes, then be allowed to speak for 10 minutes, followed by Senator BROWNBACK for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will spend no more than 10 minutes to comment on the President’s nomination of John Roberts to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Several weeks ago, shortly before the President nominated Judge Roberts, we went to the White House and asked the strategy on the other side of the aisle was a three-pronged strategy: one, to claim that there was inadequate consultation; two, to somehow paint the nominee as extreme; and three, to use document requests to go on a fishing expedition to delay the confirmation for as long as possible.

Before this nominee was proposed by the President, there was unprecedented consultation with both sides of the aisle, and, in fact, this nominee is clearly on the mainstream of American jurisprudence and has a distinguished record of public service as a judge and as an advocate on behalf of the United States in the Solicitor General’s Office and elsewhere, it looks as if we already have jumped to prong three, the first two prongs being unavailable.

Some members on the other side of the aisle are already intimating that, whether the White House turns over every piece of paper written by Judge Roberts when he was a Government lawyer, they cannot properly assess his qualifications to the U.S. Supreme Court. This is preposterous. The public record on Judge Roberts is already immense. It is telling that opponents of this nomination, or at least those who want to slow it down unnecessarily, have not even had a chance to review the documents that are already available. Yet they are calling for more documents. If history is any teacher, and I believe it is, this may indeed be the beginning of a case of moving the goalpost each time a document request is made and then satisfied, to then ask for another request for more, and a game that the nominee cannot win because the goalposts move each time.

I would like to remind my colleagues what we already have. Judge Roberts has been confirmed to the U.S. Court of Appeals just 2 short years ago. He testified extensively before this Senate on two previous occasions, and these transcripts total 14 hours of testimony. In conjunction with those hearings, he submitted more than 106 pages of responses to written questions posed to him by Senators on the Senate Judiciary Committee. If this were not enough, the Senate already has before it extensive legal briefs and oral argument transcripts from the hundreds upon hundreds of briefs written by Judge Roberts, or in which he participated, when he practiced as a lawyer both in the private sector and in the Solicitor General’s Office and the Congress already has before it 10 articles authored by Judge Roberts, scholarly legal articles which reflect some of his thought processes and his expertise on various issues of law.

All of this, of course, was more than enough for the Senate to unanimously confirm Judge Roberts as it did 2 short years ago to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have called the second most important court in the land.

There is more. Since his confirmation to the bench, Judge Roberts has participated in more than 300 appellate cases and opinions that cover more than 2,000 pages. The White House, as recently as yesterday or perhaps the day before, has pledged to expedite the public processing of more than 75,000 pages of memoranda that Judge Roberts wrote while an adviser to President Reagan during the 1980s. By any measure, this is a vast public record.

I am quite confident none of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or even on our side of the aisle have had an opportunity to digest this huge gorging of public information at this
point. Yet there is the clamor already for more, more, more and complaints that the President and this administration have not given them enough. Perhaps my colleagues, I respectfully suggest, should read what has already been published before they start complaining that it is not enough unless, of course, this is more about picking a fight than it is about finding a reasonable path toward an orderly process leading to an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor.

The documents my colleagues are demanding to see, the documents that remain that have not been provided, are documents written while he was a Government lawyer working in the Office of Solicitor General at the Department of Justice. As my colleagues know, the Solicitor General is the public official who argues cases on behalf of the U.S. Government in the U.S. Supreme Court. Of course, there are a number of lawyers who work there assisting the Solicitor General. Those lawyers write memoranda suggesting various litigation strategies—weighing, on the one hand, we could make this argument; perhaps it would be better to make this argument—and make a recommendation to the litigation strategy of the U.S. Government in the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2002, all seven former living Solicitors General of both political parties wrote a letter asking the President to refuse to turn over these confidential documents because they said such a move would chill for years to come the candid advice the Government receives from its lawyers. They noted that “our decisionmaking process requires the unbridled, open exchange of ideas—an exchange that simply cannot take place if attorneys have reason to fear their private recommendations are not private at all, but vulnerable to public disclosure.”

Most Americans understand that it makes sense to allow this sort of private communication between a lawyer and a client in order to provide the most effective legal representation, and the same principle applies, of course, whether you are the Solicitor General representing the U.S. Government or whether you are a lawyer representing someone who has been accused of a crime or someone who is pursuing a civil claim in a court of law. And a distinguished group of Senators from Vermont and Massachusetts have in recent days argued that confidential memoranda written by Government lawyers are the property of the American people and, therefore, should be handed over to the Senate. Of course, that is in direct contradiction to the principle that the relationship, between lawyers and clients as well. To hold otherwise would deny the American people the vigorous and outstanding representation they are entitled to before the U.S. Supreme Court.

I suggest, in accordance with traditional practice, that the claim of attorney-client privilege for these Solicitor General documents, these deliberate documents written by Judge Roberts when he was in that office representing the U.S. Government, can and should remain confidential. They should not be made public. And we should stop playing this game of “gotcha” by moving goalposts on the President’s nominee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yesterday, I expressed my concern that some may try to turn the confirmation process for Judge John Roberts into a political circus. After recent media reports, I have become concerned that some of those fears I spoke of earlier in this Senate are coming true; namely, that our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to do everything they can to obstruct the confirmation process of the President’s nominee to the Supreme Court.

Earlier, I spoke of the Washington Post article that outlined a carefully constructed plan of attack on the Roberts nomination. It was a three-staged battle plan.

The first stage was to assert that the amount of consultation from the White House, no matter the amount, no matter how much consultation, was somehow insufficient. But that dog clearly won’t hunt. The White House consulted with over 70 Senators, including two-thirds of the Democratic caucus and every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee. The President himself met with the Democratic leader and the Democratic ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. He and his staff were receptive to any and all suggestions our Democratic friends cared to give. Frankly, he has done more than the Constitution requires by far, and certainly more than his predecessor.

No one can say he did not consult the Senate, period. End of story.

The second salvo against the President’s nominee, as told to the Washington Post, was to try to distort and destroy his record and paint him as extreme. This plan, too, has failed.

Judge Roberts is one of the preeminent jurists of his generation. He is a top graduate of Harvard Law School and Harvard University. He was unanimously approved by the Senate for his current position on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Over 150 of his peers, Democrat and Republican alike, endorsed him for the current position he holds, six months before he was nominated, as we have pointed out numerous times, before the Supreme Court 39 times. He is clearly in the mainstream, is fair-minded, has a keen intellect, and a sterling record of integrity.

The real question now is why some Democratic friends, as some of us could have predicted, have come to the third and final stage of the attack plan. They are making unreasonable demands for documents about the nominee.

Now, the administration has been very generous in releasing documents from Judge Roberts’s time in the Justice Department as a special assistant to Attorney General William French Smith and his tenure in the White House Counsel’s Office.

In fact, the Judiciary Committee will receive some 70,000 pages of documents, at the behest of the administration. Let me say again: That is 70,000 pages turned over. I doubt that our colleagues have pored through those pages already, and yet they are hungry for more.

Since the release of these documents, some in the media have hurriedly—some might say recklessly—skimmed through document after document, many of them quite complex, looking for any hint of controversy so precious to the demands of the 24-hour news cycle. In so doing, they run the risk of simplifying complex constitutional issues beyond recognition.

For example, during the last couple of days, there has been a great deal of media attention regarding the arcane issue of so-called “court stripping,” a shorthand term describing the issue of whether Congress has the authority to deny jurisdiction to Federal courts.

The New York Times writes this morning that:

Mr. Roberts consistently argued that courts should be stripped of authority of abortion, busing, school prayer and other matters.

The Washington Post yesterday:

Roberts presented a defense of bills in Congress that would have stripped the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over abortion, busing and school prayer cases.

The Boston Globe:

One memo suggested that [Roberts] supported proposals in Congress to strip the federal courts of jurisdiction over abortion, busing and school prayer cases. “Aha,” say our friends in the media. The media and some of our friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that John Roberts may have taken a position on these controversial issues.

The problem is not that this is an oversimplification. The problem is that it is just plain wrong.

As a young attorney in the Justice Department, John Roberts was assigned to write a memo advocating that Congress had the constitutional authority to determine the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, a task that Congress had long assumed for itself. The memo was never leaked, never publicized, and has been kept secret since it was written.

The first stage was to assert that the amount of consultation from the White House, no matter the amount, no matter how much consultation, was somehow insufficient. But that dog clearly won’t hunt. The White House consulted with over 70 Senators, including two-thirds of the Democratic caucus and every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee.

The President himself met with the Democratic leader and the Democratic ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. He and his staff were receptive to any and all suggestions our Democratic friends cared to give. Frankly, he has done more than the Constitution requires by far, and certainly more than his predecessor.

No one can say he did not consult the Senate, period. End of story.

The second salvo against the President’s nominee, as told to the Washington Post, was to try to distort and destroy his record and paint him as extreme. This plan, too, has failed.

Judge Roberts is one of the preeminent jurists of his generation. He is
jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and other federal courts. This memo was written in response to legislation introduced in Congress proposing to strip Federal jurisdiction on a number of controversial social issues. Now, Mr. Roberts was a constitutional scholar, and we did write that Mr. Roberts are frequently asked to do: argue a legal theory about congressional authority. Mr. Roberts was given this assignment by his boss, and he responded with the outstanding advocacy for which he is justly admired.

Making a legal argument, however, is miles away from endorsing the policy underlying the constitutional argument. And, as it turns out, John Roberts did not think that “court stripping” was good policy in the first place. Let me say again: John Roberts did not think that “court stripping” was a good policy in the first place.

The Associated Press reported, yesterday, that in 1985:

[A]s a lawyer in the Reagan White House, John Roberts wrote that Congress had authority to strip the Supreme Court of jurisdiction over cases involving school prayer and similar issues, but he added that “such bills would be opposed.”

The second half of the story was he added that “such bills were bad policy and should be opposed.” This tempest in a teapot over “court stripping” refers to a position that Mr. Roberts never agreed with in the first place.

That is the problem with a rush to judgment on a complex legal document—these documents that have been released just recently. Instant media reports can muddy the waters by confusing a legal opinion with a policy position. A legal opinion is different from a policy position.

Now, half the story only conveys half the truth. Half the story only conveys half the truth. And a half-truth is frequently 100 percent wrong. Read all the documents before reaching a conclusion.

So, Mr. President, I suggest we all take a deep breath and not rush to judgment in an effort to get tomorrow morning’s headlines out before we have read the entire story.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

STEM CELL LEGISLATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise/standing to address some of the comments that have been made on the other side of the aisle regarding the Castle bill on embryonic stem cell research that passed in the House a few weeks ago: I have heard the proposal this morning from my colleagues from the other side that we should discuss and talk about embryonic stem cell research and the proposed umbilical cord blood bill that have been put on the calendar here in the Senate, but without human cloning, I want to try to put this issue in context a little, and to propose some factual information.

Mr. President, we need to have a broad discussion about bioethical issues in this body and all across the country, and it needs to involve the full range of issues that have come to light as we attempt to grasp the implications and come to understand the decisions that must be made in this challenging area.

This discussion should involve cord blood stem cells. These types of cells are stem cells that come from the umbilical cord when a child is born; they are a rich source of pluripotent stem cells that have proven very helpful in providing a number of treatments for humans.

We need to continue to talk honestly about embryonic stem cell research: the possible limitations of this research in particular cell lines in humans, as well as the certain destruction of embryos that this type of research necessitates.

We need to talk about human cloning, whether or not we want to continue the practice of cloning to take place in the United States of America (it is currently a legal process in this country, to clone, create and kill an embryo, a young human).

We need to talk about the cutting edge related research applications, we need to consider where the science is leading us on issues such as the creation and manipulation of chimeras—human-animal crosses that are created by, for instance, taking human brain cells and putting them into a mouse—we cannot bypass these critical issues in this discussion.

And we need to talk about some exciting new application prospects of these broad-based pluripotent cells, cells that can do virtually anything—but I speak of cells where it is not necessary to extract them from a human embryo, destroying that embryo in the process, but cells yielded from other places in the body.

With this background in mind, I want to point out a couple of quick facts.

No. 1, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, from this morning’s Washington Post, an article describing new revelations about pluripotent adult stem cells that can answer many of these questions. I ask that the article be included and printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wish to read one section of this article:

A team of Harvard scientists is claiming the discovery of a reservoir of cells that appear capable of replenishing the ovaries of sterilized mice, possibly providing new ways to create human eggs.

Adult stem cells in the body with the ability to create human eggs. Now, people may say: What do you mean by that? Well, here we have a pluripotent adult stem cell (derived from bone marrow) with a broad capacity to create a lot of different cell types so that they can generate, when placed in the right place in the body—a woman’s ovary—human eggs.

Listen to what the scientists here say about this:

In addition, because the cells appear to be a particularly versatile type of adult stem cell—

I would like to pause for a moment to point out that there are no ethical problems or objections to research conducted with adult stem cells. We should put billions of dollars into this type of research. This type of research is yielding cures—65 treatment applications for humans with adult stem cell research. However, I’d like to conclude the reading of this excerpt:

particularly versatile type of adult stem cells [which] could provide an alternative to those obtained from embryos, avoiding the political and ethical debates raging around the use of those cells.

End of quote, in this morning’s Washington Post, from Harvard researchers.

Mr. President, I ask then, why would we want to kill young human embryos, young humans, who are clearly alive, who are clearly human, when we have the capacity, in adult stem cells, to conduct useful and productive research to cure diseases, is that not hindered by ethical problems?

In an article from this month’s The Lancet—a well-respected British medical journal—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. BROWNBACK. The author of this editorial—this is the lead British medical journal—says:

. . . what is unarguable is that the human embryo is alive and is human, and intentionally ending the life of one human being for the potential benefit of others is not territory to which mainstream clinical researchers have hitherto sought claim—or even conscious objectors could ever concede.

These embryos are alive. They are alive. They are human.

I want to conclude, because time is very limited—Mr. President: I want single people, I want single people for juvenile diabetes, for cancer, for spinal cord injuries, for Parkinson’s disease. And, with research generated from pluripotent adult stem cells, we are getting these treatments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of human clinical trials going on now, using adult or cord blood stem
cells, involving no ethical dilemmas, for 65 different human maladies. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. The number of areas of treatment for human ailments or medical conditions in humans using human embryonic stem cells is zero. So the notion that delaying this Castle-Spender bill is going to hurt current patients is completely false. If we want to help current patients, the key—is to put more research into adult and cord blood stem cell research. If you want to help current patients, you should be ever so careful not to promise impossibilities to these hurting individuals; you should state what the scientists are telling us, that the possibility of embryonic stem cells yielding cures, if ever—and I really doubt if it ever happens—is decades away and that we have had problems in the past with these types of cells forming dangerous and dangerous—foreign cells which has not yet been worked out. If we want cures, let’s go the route where we know we are going to reach our destination, and where we know treatment is true possibility.

Mr. President, yield to the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 2005]

SCIENTISTS CLAIM TO FIND CELLS THAT RESTORE EGG PRODUCTION

(Rob Stein)

A team of Harvard scientists is claiming the discovery of their cells that appear capable of replenishing the ovaries of sterilized mice, possibly providing new ways to help infertile women have babies.

While cautious that more research is needed to confirm that similar cells exist in women and that they can safely restore fertility, the researchers said the findings could revolutionize the understanding of female reproduction and the power to manipulate it.

“This may launch a new era in how to think about infertility and its ‘cure’,” said Jonathan L. Tilly, a reproductive biologist at Harvard Medical School and Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston who led the work being published in tomorrow’s issue of the journal Cell.

Other researchers agreed that the findings could have profound implications, yet several expressed caution and skepticism, saying many key questions remain about whether the researchers have proved their claims.

“This is really exciting and a revolutionary idea. The implications are potentially huge,” said Lawrence Nelson of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. “But before this could have any clinical application to humans, a whole lot of work has to be done. We have to be careful not to get ahead of ourselves.”

But Tilly’s team was confident that its findings, which could, for example, enable women to bank egg-producing cells when they are young in case they have health problems that leave them infertile or they get too old.

“In theory, these cells could provide an insurance policy. We could harvest them and store them every 2 to 3 years. Then, if you put them back in, and they are going to do exactly what they are supposed to—find the ovaries and generate new eggs—to restore fertility,” Tilly said.

The discovery could also lead to ways to prevent, delay or reverse menopause, perhaps by stimulating dormant cells in the bone marrow or “tweaking” the ovaries to accept them, Tilly said. It may also be possible to transplant them from one woman to another, he said.

In addition, because the cells appear to be a particularly versatile type of adult stem cell, they could provide an alternative to those obtained from embryos, avoiding the political and ethical debates raging around the use of those cells.

“The implications are mind-boggling, really,” Tilly said.

The research is a follow-up to results the team reported in March 2001, when it claimed to find egg-producing cells throughout their lives. For decades, scientific dogma has been that female mammas such as mice and humans are born with a finite number of eggs. To alleviate doubts about their original claim, the researchers conducted another round of experiments, which they said confirm the findings and explain how it might work.

First, the scientists sterilized female mice with a cancer chemotherapy drug that destroys eggs elsewhere. They tested the animals’ ovaries 12 to 24 hours later and found signs their egg supply was rapidly regenerating. The animals’ ovaries looked normal, and they remained that way for life.

After tests indicated the source of the cells may lie in the animals’ bone marrow, the researchers infused marrow from healthy mice into those that were either genetically engineered to be infertile or had been made infertile with chemotherapy. Two months later, the recipients’ ovaries looked normal, whereas those that had not received the transplant remained infertile, the researchers reported. Blood transplants produced similar results, they said.

The researchers then infused blood into infertile mice from animals that had been genetically engineered so that their reproductive stem cells glowed fluorescent green. Within two days, green egg cells appeared in the recipients’ ovaries, which the researchers said indicated the cells had traveled through the blood to the ovaries.

Finally, the researchers screened human bone marrow and blood from healthy women and found that both tested positive for biological markers indicating the presence of immature reproductive cells.

“Mice and humans appear to be the same—they appear to have a set of genes in bone marrow consistent with... cells that can make themselves,” Tilly said.

The findings could help explain previously mysterious cases of women sterilized by cancer treatment who spontaneously became pregnant after receiving bone marrow transplants, Tilly said. This may happen only rarely because some, but not all, techniques used to process bone marrow before transplantation may destroy the cells in some cases, he speculated.

The research triggered a mixture of excitement, caution and skepticism.

“It’s quite amazing,” said Hans Schoeler of the Max Planck Institute in Germany. “The idea that cells from bone marrow may be a reservoir for egg cells would be quite astonishing.”

But Schoeler and other researchers cautioned that more research remains.

Several researchers had doubts about some of the techniques the researchers used. Others were puzzled by the speed with which the researchers infused their marrow with eggs. Many pointed out that the researchers had failed to show the eggs were viable, the mice were ovulating or that they could give birth to healthy offspring.

“I’m very skeptical,” said David F. Albertini of the University of Kansas Medical Center in Kansas City, Kan. “There are a lot of holes in the research.”

Tilly attributed the skepticism to the radical nature of the findings and said he already had work underway addressing the concerns, including breeding studies aimed at producing healthy offspring.

“We’ll be able to answer the questions very soon,” Tilly said.

EXHIBIT 2

STEM-CELL THERAPY: HOPE AND HYPE

In the fifth year since human cloning to generate stem cells was legalised in the UK, what progress has been made towards taking stem cell therapy from the lab to clinical practice? In 2000, articulating robust UK Government support, then Health Minister Yvette Cooper proclaimed that stem cell research had moved from the Holy Grail in finding treatments for cancer, Parkinson’s disease, diabetes, osteoporosis, spinal cord injuries, Alzheimer’s disease, leukaemia and multiple sclerosis... transforming the lives of hundreds of thousands of people... But 4 years later, the technical difficulties and biological hazards inherent in embryonic embryos and developing treatments from their stem cells led Richard Gardner, Chairman of the Royal Society Working Group on Stem Cells, to doubt whether this would ever be a “a procedure that becomes widely available... There are concerns about the efficiency and elaborate nature of the procedure going to be very time-consuming and very expensive...” So, to paraphrase May 25th’s Saving Faces event in London, UK, are stem-cell therapies hope, or hype, or substance?

Only two UK groups currently seek to clone human embryos, both with immediate aims of developing treatments for improving understanding of embryonic development or specific diseases. Techniques for culturing human embryonic stem cells have advanced—e.g., allowing them (like adult stem cells) to be grown—but an increasing appreciation of the hazards of embryonic stem cells has rightly prevented the emergence or immediate prospect of any clinical therapies based on such cells. The natural propensity of embryonic stem cells to form teratomas, their exhibit of chromosomal abnormalities, their selection for cloning in cloned mammals all present difficulties.

The prospect of having to clone (to obtain embryonic stem-cells) every patient requiring stem-cell therapy is surely ruled out. The recent Korean report of cloning human embryos for stem cells used almost 250 human eggs in generating a single stem-cell line. If cloning is unrealistic and/or too hazardous, the autologous advantage of (closed) embryonic stem cells vanishes: and immune rejection of embryonic stem cells generated from “for foreigners” i.e. non-UK women still being implanted into the life of one human being for the potential benefit of others (i.e., for research) is not territory to which mainstream clinical researchers have hitherto clung. Claims about embryologically conscious objections could ever concede.

So is stem-cell research a damp squib, another over-hyped funding gambit? Far from it: the embryonic stem cells only one aspect. Excitement about the potential of adult stem cells was tempered by...
1.5. Testicular Cancer
1.6. Tumors of the soft tissues
1.7. Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma
1.8. Hodgkin's Lymphoma
1.9. Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia
1.10. Acute Myelogenous Leukemia
1.11. Chronic Myelogenous Leukemia
1.12. Juvenile Myelomonocytic Leukemia
1.13. Cancer of the lymph nodes: Angelim/malignant lymphadenopathy
1.14. Multiple Myeloma
1.15. Myelodysplasia
1.16. Breast Cancer
1.17. Neuroblastoma
1.18. Renal Cell Carcinoma
1.19. Various Solid Tumors
1.20. Soft Tissue Sarcomas
1.21. Waldenstrom's macroglobulinemia
1.22. Hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis
1.23. POEMS syndrome
1.24. Multiple Sclerosis
1.25. Crohn's Disease
1.26. Scleromyxedema
1.27. Scleroderma
1.28. Rheumatoid Arthritis
1.29. Juvenile Arthritis
1.30. Systemic Lupus
1.31. Polychondritis
1.32. Sjogren's Syndrome
1.33. Behcet's Disease
1.34. Myasthenia
1.35. Autoimmune Cytopenia
1.36. Autoimmune Cytopenias
1.37. Alopecia universalis
1.38. Flowering disorders
1.39. Heart damage
1.40. Ocular damage
1.41. Neurological damage
1.42. Immunodeficiencies
1.43. X-Linked hyper immunoglobulin-M Syndrome
1.44. Severe Combined Immunodeficiency Syndrome
1.45. X-linked lymphoproliferative syndrome
1.46. Neural Degenerative Diseases
1.47. Parkinson's disease
1.48. Huntington's disease
1.49. Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
1.50. Alzheimer's disease
1.51. Muscular dystrophies
1.52. Neurological diseases
1.53. Cerebral vascular diseases
1.54. Heart disorders
1.55. Stroke damage
1.56. Limb gangrene
1.57. Surface wound healing
1.58. Jawbone replacement
1.59. Skull bone repair
1.60. Other Metabolic Disorders
1.61. Osteogenesis imperfecta
1.62. Sandhoff disease
1.63. Hunter's syndrome
1.64. Krabbe Leukodystrophy
1.65. Osteopetrosis
1.66. Cerebral vascular diseases
1.67. X-linked adrenoleukodystrophy

EXHIBIT 3

BENEFITS OF STEM CELLS TO HUMAN PATIENTS—ADULT STEM CELLS (PUBLIC TREATMENTS IN HUMAN PATIENTS)

ADULT STEM CELLS: 65—S9210

Cancers
1. Brain Cancer
2. Renal Cell Carcinoma
3. Ovarian Cancer
4. Skin Cancer: Merkel Cell Carcinoma

PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate's time has expired.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will receive consideration of S. 397, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 397) to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others.

PENDING:

Frist (for Craig) amendment No. 1605, to amend the exceptions.

Frist amendment No. 1606 (to amendment No. 1605), to make clear that the bill does not apply to actions commenced by the Attorney General to enforce the Gun Control Act and National Firearms Act.

Reed (for Kohl) amendment No. 1626, to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the provision of a child safety lock in connection with the transfer of a handgun.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 596

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we are back on this very important piece of legislation, S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

Under a unanimous consent agreement entered into last evening, we are on the Kohl trigger lock amendment. I understand there is an hour equally divided, and we hope we can get to a vote on this before 12:30. This is an important amendment, which I am confident Senator Kohl will be here in a few moments to discuss.

In the short term, let me visit the broader issue of the bill itself. We now have 62 cosponsors. I am pleased Senator Conrad has joined us in support of this important piece of legislation to limit predatory and junk lawsuits from attempting to destroy the capability of the private sector to produce legal, effective firearms for our Nation's citizens and for our police and military. Unlike most nations, we are a nation that does not have a government component of gun manufacturers of firearms. It has always been the responsibility of the private sector. They have done extremely well. Innovation and creativity has always allowed the latest and best firearm capability, not only for our private citizens but for the military and police departments and the armed services that contract with these private sector companies to produce not only the firearms but the effective ammunition for them.

Some years ago, we saw a frustration growing in the gun control community that the public and the Congress collectively would not bend to their wishes. The public, in its inevitable wisdom, recognized that guns were not an issue in deaths caused by guns or in the commission of crimes, but the criminal element was the issue and that we ought to get at the business of law enforcement and taking those off the streets who used a gun in the commission of a crime. That is exactly what the administration has done for the last 5½ years. The use of a firearm or criminal activities in which a firearm is used has rapidly dropped in the last
The law was basically if you use a gun in the commission of a crime, you do the time. You don’t get to plea bargain it away and go back to the streets to reengage as a criminal to once again misuse a firearm that makes a citizen in a violent or criminal activity.

Because the anti-gun community didn’t get it their way, they, over the years, have determined that they could use the legal system, the court system, to bypass and suggest that the third party, or the manufacturer, even though he or she was a law-abiding company and produced under the auspices of the Federal laws in responsible ways in that those products were sold through federally licensed firearms dealers, wasn’t good enough. Somehow you had to pass through and say that the crime and the fallout of crime was going to get paid for in some way by these responsible citizens who were building a legal and responsible product. That is the game—I say—that has been played.

As a result, these legal, law-abiding manufacturers who build citizens have increased to pay higher and higher legal costs to defend themselves in lawsuits after lawsuits that have, in almost every instance, been denied and thrown out of court by the judges when filed against companies who, obviously frustrated by gun violence in their communities, chose this route. Instead of insisting that their communities and prosecutors and law enforcement go after the criminal element, they, in large part, in their frustration, looked for an easy way out. That has brought this legislation to the floor to limit the ability of junk or abusive kinds of lawsuits in a very narrow and defined way, but in no way—and I have said this—denying the recognition that if a gun dealer or a manufacturer acted in an illegal or irresponsible way or produced a product that was faulty and caused harm or damage, this bill would not preempt or in any way prevent them or any of the appropriates and necessary legal sentence.

That is what we are about. I see that the sponsor of the trigger lock amendment is on the Senate floor.

Before I relinquish the floor, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a letter from the Department of Defense as to the importance of this issue. Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense speaking to the importance of S. 397 in safeguarding and protecting these gun manufacturers that produce a large amount of our firearms and weapons for all of our men and women who serve in harm’s way in defense of our freedoms.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,

Hon. JEFF SESSIONS,
Senator from Alabama,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SESSIONS: This responds to your request for the Department of Defense’s view on S. 397, the National Firearms Act of 2005. The Department of Defense strongly supports this legislation.

We believe that passage of S. 397 would help safeguard our national security by limiting unnecessary lawsuits against an industry that plays a critical role in meeting the procurement needs of our men and women in uniform.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration’s program, there is no objection to the presentation of this letter for the consideration of the community.

Sincerely, DANIEL J. DELL’ORTO, Acting

Mr. CRAIG. In the last few days, I have found interesting editorials in the Wall Street Journal. They get it. They understand and very clearly as to the reality of this bill, that is not just for the protection of law-abiding citizens but recognizing that tort reform is necessary. When the Congress can’t do it in sweeping ways, we have the right to go to the judges and try how we may have misconceptions, the suits at the misuse of our court system in large part by the trial bar.

I ask unanimous consent to print those in the RECORD as well.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 27, 2005]

GUN LIABILITY CONTROL

If we recall correctly, it was Shakespeare who wrote “the first thing we do, let’s kill all the lawyers.” That’s going too far, but the Senate recently heard a bill this week by voting to protect gun makers from lawsuits designed to put them out of business.

Senate Republicans say they have 60 votes to pass the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, which would protect gun makers from lawsuits claiming they are responsible for firearm injuries or deaths caused by the products. The support includes at least 10 Democrats, which speaks volumes about the political shift against “gun control” in recent years.

The “assault weapons ban” expired with a whimper last year. State legislatures have been rolling back firearm laws because the restrictions were both ineffectual and unpopular. Gun-controlers have responded by avoiding legislatures and going to court, teaming with trial lawyers and big city mayors to file lawsuits blaming gun makers for murder. Companies have been hit with at least 25 major lawsuits, from the likes of Boston, Atlanta, St. Louis, Chicago and Cleveland. A couple of the larger suits (New York and Washington, D.C.) are sitting in front of highly creative judges and could drag on for years.

Which seems to be part of the point. The plaintiffs have asked judges to impose the sort of “remedies” that Congress has refused to impose, such as trigger locks or tougher restrictions on gun sales. Some mayors no doubt also hope for a big payday. But short of that, the gun-control lobby’s goal seems to be the suits being dragged long enough to drain profit from the low-margin gun industry.

Gun makers have yet to lose a case, but those stories have cost the industry collectively smaller than any Fortune 500 company and that supports 20,000 jobs at most. Publicly listed companies such as Smith & Wesson have seen the legal uncertainty reflected in their share price. Money for legal fees could be better spent creating new jobs, retraining make guns safer, or returning profits to shareholders.

Congress has every right to stop this abuse of the legal system, all the more so because it amounts to an end-run around its legislative authority. A single state judge imposing blanket regulations on a gun maker would effectively limit the Second Amendment rights of gun buyers across the nation. Liability legislation would also send a message that Congress won’t stand by as the tort bar and special interests try to put an entirely lawful business into Chapter 11.

The gun makers aren’t seeking immunity from liability: they just want to face civil suits for defective products or for violating sales regulations. The Senate proposal would merely prevent a gun maker from being held liable for one of its products to perform its felony. Murder can be committed with all kinds of everyday products, from kitchen knives to aspirin, but no one thinks twice because a drunk driver kills a pedestrian. (On the other hand, give the lawyers time.) To adapt a familiar line, guns don’t kill industries; lawyers do.

Cashing in its election gains, the gun lobby was the big winner in a 66-32 Senate vote that moves Congress closer to enacting legislation that would shield the firearms industry, within 180 days, but the agreement it moved the Senate closer to enacting legislation that would shield the firearms industry, within 180 days, but the agreement to shield from all liability; they would continue to adapt a familiar line, guns don’t kill industries; lawyers do.

The action came as House-Senate negotiators reached agreement on a $28 billion-plus natural resources budget last evening that would cut funding for clean-water and lands-conservation programs after Oct. 1. The Environmental Protection Agency is directed to complete a rulemaking on human toxicity studies, important to the pesticide industry, within 180 days, but the agreement prohibits any use of pregnant women, infants or children as part of such studies.

The Senate gun bill, as drafted, seeks to bar third parties from bringing civil-liability actions against manufacturers, distributors or dealers for damages from the unlawful misuse of a qualified product. People directly harmed in a firearms incident still would be able to sue for punitive damages, the standard for charging negligence is so tightly written that critics say it would be difficult to prevail.

The National Rifle Association’s goal is a clean Senate bill that the House can send on to President Bush quickly for his signature.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, if we are going to give gun dealers immunity from lawsuits, then I believe we should insist they take every safety precaution available when selling firearms. This amendment goes a long way to help reduce the number of accidental shootings, particularly among the most vulnerable members of our society, our children, by requiring dealers to sell guns to anyone with all handguns. We have all read troubling stories about lives cut short by accidental shootings and teen suicides. They are made all the more terrible by the knowledge that many were preventable.

According to the most recent stats available, thousands of people are injured every year in accidental shootings, including more than 800 gun-related tragedies that resulted in death. In addition, it is estimated that every 6 hours, a young person between the ages of 10 and 19 commits suicide with a firearm. Ten million children were injured by firearms in 2002. Securing the firearm with a child safety lock could have prevented many of these tragedies. The sad truth is that we are inviting disaster every time an unlocked gun is easily accessible to children.

Eleven million children live in households with guns, and in 65 percent of these homes, the gun is accessible to the child. In 13 percent of them, the gun is loaded and not locked. This amendment will help address this problem. It requires that a child safety device be sold with every handgun. These devices vary in form, but the most common is a childproof padlock that wraps around the gun trigger and immobilizes it. Trigger locks are already used by tens of thousands of responsible gun owners to protect their firearms from unauthorized use, and they can be purchased in virtually any gun store in this country.

The Senate has already expressed its support for the sale of trigger locks with handguns, most recently last year, when 70 Senators voted in favor of this exact same amendment. The mandatory sale of trigger locks is equally supported in the rest of the country and the law enforcement community. Polls have shown that between 75 and 80 percent of the American public, including gun owners, favors a mandatory sale of safety locks with guns. In a recent survey of 250 of Wisconsin's police chiefs and sheriffs, 91 percent agreed that child safety locks should be available.

The current administration has indicated its support for this concept. During his campaign in 2000, President Bush indicated that if Congress passed a bill making the sale of child safety locks mandatory with every gun sale, then he would sign it.

All of these people agree that we should be doing everything within our power to promote the use of locks or other safety devices with handguns. Nobody has ever claimed that this would be a total panacea. To be sure, it will not prevent every single firearm-related accident. But its importance cannot be overstated. Stats show that 200,000 children every year, will be sold locks are more likely to use them. And when they are used, they do prevent accidental deaths. While imposing a minimal cost on consumers, it would prevent the deaths of many innocent children every year.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I commend Senator Kohl for this amendment. He has worked with so many of our colleagues to ensure that children are adequately protected. There are too many deaths each year of children because the weapons are unsecured. There are often not access to them, and they are able to discharge them. These are accidental deaths. Sadly, there are too many childhood suicides that result from having access to weapons.

The Kohl amendment is a practical and appropriate response to that by requiring the sale of a child safety lock along with the weapon. There is huge public support for this issue. Over 70 percent of Americans polled think this is an appropriate and necessary proposal. In fact, I believe 6 out of 10 gun owners, particularly because this is a sensible approach to dealing with the issue of accidental death of children with firearms. We are here today to move forward on this amendment, to have a vote which is scheduled. I would hope, also, that we can move to other amendments so they could be offered for votes. Several of my colleagues have offered amendments. It is appropriate, since we have begun the process of debate on amendment and vote, to continue that process forward. I hope we can do that.

I certainly commend Senator Kohl for his efforts over many years. As he rightfully points out, there was overwhelming support for this measure last year. More than 70 Senators supported it. I hope we see that same support this year. Certainly, the danger to children has not diminished from the last Congress. The practicality and efficacy of this approach continues to be compelling. I would hope we would have another strong vote in support of the amendment, as we go forward.

I yield the floor.
Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, a trigger lock does not a safe weapon make. A trigger lock can lay right beside a firearm. Unless it is inserted and locked, the firearm is still accessible. You can demand that there be a trigger lock. Yet still someone who is irresponsible in the storage and/or use of a firearm can cause that firearm, by the absence of a trigger lock or the absence of a safe storage place, to be harmful to a child. That is reality.

Sometimes we stand on the floor of the Senate and think we can fix the world by simply writing a law. I am not, by that statement, questioning the sincerity of Senator KOHL. Last year, his amendment got 70 votes in the Senate. At the same time, it is a mandate. In that mandate, have you created a safer world? I am not sure.

I do know this: I do know what creates a safer world. That is an awareness, an understanding of and an educational process by how you, in fact, create a safer world. Gun manufacturers know that. Licensed and responsible firearms dealers know that.

Today, more than 70 percent of the 28.6 million handguns already sold in the United States have a safety device attached to them or that comes with it that is part of the sales package.

So clearly, today, the educational process has gone forward. There are several national private organizations out there who have constantly and repetitively taught young people about the misuse of firearms. The Eddie Eagle program of the National Rifle Association educates thousands and thousands of young people each year to stay away from a firearm if they see one, to report it if they see one and, obviously, to seek an adult's knowledge about it.

Still, tragically enough, a child's curiosity in a misplaced firearm can cause accidents; it always has and, even with the passage, tragically enough, of the Kohl amendment, if it becomes law, it always will. You cannot create the perfect world. It is simply an impossibility to do. We try, and we try to at least shape that world in a way that makes it safer. But there is a reality I think all of us clearly understand. The statistics, though, while we are not, by that statement, questioning the uniqueness of a mom or dad's firearm, owned and held in the homes of America. I think what he suggests today, as it relates to fines, or revocation of license, or failing to sell, is an inappropriate fashion to go. But again, it is a mandate that I think today's reality in the marketplace would suggest is in part an unnecessary thing to do. I yield the floor and retain the remainder of our time.
sue a gun manufacturer. If the gun malfunctioned, then that kind of law-

suit, of course, would be allowed. They would also be allowed where there is a know-

ing violation of a firearms law, when the violation is the proximate cause of the harm for which a relief is sought. Negligent entrustment, defective product, or breach of contract or warranty are certainly areas where litigation is warranted. But when we have lawsuits filed by cities against plaintiffs such as Colt or Beretta, and the only way we can stop the gun manufacturer to stop the manu-

ufacture of guns, that is wrong.

The second amendment is one of the most treasured of our amendments to the Constitution, and that is the right to keep and bear arms, the right to protect yourself and your family in your home. That is something I have a bill to address right here in the Dis-

trict of Columbia, to make sure no per-

son is deprived of their right under the Constitu-
tion to protect themselves in their homes by owning a firearm. You know, America is one of the few coun-

tries that doesn’t have Government manufacture of guns. We don’t. We have private manufacturers of guns and, therefore, we have the private use and private lawsuits that sometimes are filed just because a gun is used in a crime.

Well, it is not the fault of the gun manu-

facturer a crime is being committed, or put the fault for a crime on the person committing the crime. So I am speaking for this bill. I think Senator Craig has laid out very well the issues of the gun laws. I cer-

tainly want every gun to be sold with a lock, and most guns in America are.

And if they are not, having that device added to the gun, I think, is fine.

I want everyone to have safety pro-

tection for guns in homes, because nothing could be worse than a child going into a gun cabinet and getting a gun that is not understood by the child and is fired. That is why we have safety locks. Most gun owners are responsible gun owners, and they should have a safety lock on a gun, particularly if there are children in the home.

I want to add my support for the bill and the ability for our private gun manufacturers to face lawsuits that are legitimate, but not to have a frivol-

ous lawsuit that is filed against a gun manufacturer through no fault of the manufac-
turer. The misuse of the gun—not a malfunction, but a misuse.

I applaud the efforts of Senator Craig, and I hope we can take one more step toward curbing the lawsuit abuse that has been happening in this country in many areas. Frivolous law-
suits have been filed against gun manu-

facturers not for the malfunction of a gun, but the misuse. That is not the fault of the manufacturer, just as it is not the fault of other manufacturers of products

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will support this important legislation. Let me say, in closing, I have heard a lot of debate about stopping the De-

fense bill to go to this bill.

We had a cloture vote on Defense. Many people voted against cloture, and therefore the bill was brought down. I hope we can address the Defense au-

thorization bill. There is no cloture so we could go forward—not to stop the debate, but to curb it and keep it to relevant amendments so we may get this very important legislation through. With the cooperation of the other side, we will be able to do that the very first week we return. But I do think relevant amendments, not 100 amendments, including issues that do not even pertain to our defense, are leg-

itimately cut off through a cloture vote.

If we can get cooperation from the other side, we certainly intend to purs-

ue the Defense authorization bill. I wish we could have done it this week, and I would have a cloture so that would. We did not win. There would have been over 40 people who voted against cloture. So now we are on another very important bill, and we intend to take up the energy conference report and the highway conference report, to work on two major pieces of legislation that we will be able to send to the President this week.

I think we are going to have quite a successful week, a successful first part of this session of Congress to get im-

portant legislation on energy to create more incentives for different sources of energy for our country so we can be-

come more self-sufficient.

Certainly the highway bill will be a jobs creator to put the highway people to work with the larger amount of money that is now available in the highway trust fund. Mass transit is going to get its authorization as well in this highway bill.

So we have a lot to do. I hope we can continue to pass this gun manufacturers liability bill—it is a good bill—and go forward with the other important business of our country. The first week we get back, I hope we will be able to address elimination of inheritance taxes, death taxes, and I hope very much that we can get the Defense au-

thorization bill and the Defense appro-

priations bill out by the first of the fiscal year so there will not be one day’s delay in the money that is needed by our Department of Defense for the needs of the men and women who are fighting for the continued freedom of our country by fighting terrorism over-

seas.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the other side has asked if we would consider yield back time. I certainly will work with the floor leader. We are checking to see if there is anyone else on our side who would want to come for the purpose of debating the Kohl amendment. If there is not, we will yield back time and accommodate as much as we can.

While we work out our time here, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, while we are working out the time situation to see if anyone else wants to debate, the time under the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are ready to vote on the Kohl amendment. So I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICIAL. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient sec-

ond.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1626. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 30, as follows: (Roll Call Vote No. 207 Leg.)

YEAS—70

AKaka

Baucus

Bayh

Biden

Bingaman

Boxer

Brownback

Byrd

Cantwell

Carper

Chafee

Cheney

Clinton

Coleman

Collins

Conrad

Corzine

Courtesty

Dayton

DeWine

Dodd

Domenici

Dorgan

Franken

Feinstein

Alexander

Allard

Bennett

Baucus

Bunning

Burns

Burk

Chambliss

Coats

Corzine

Crapo

DeMint

Dole

NAYs—30

Nelson (FL)

Nixon (NJ)

Obama

Pryor

Reed

Reid

Roberts

Rockefeller

Salaaz

Sandorum

Sarbanes

Schaumer

Smith

Snowe

Specter

Stabenow

Stevens

Suhum

Voinovich

Warner

Wyden

Ruggiero

Joseph

Meese
The amendment (No. 1626) was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MODIFICATIONS TO AMENDMENTS NOS. 1605 AND 1606

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a technical drafting error in the Craig amendment No. 1605, and I would therefore ask unanimous consent that amendments 1605 and 1606 be modified with the changes at the desk. I would note that these are technical changes only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The modifications are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1605

On page 10, line 16, at the end, add the following:

"(iv) an action or proceeding commenced by the Attorney General to enforce the provisions of chapter 44 of Title 18."  

AMENDMENT NO. 1606

At the end of the Amendment, add the following:

"or chapter 53 of Title 26, United States Code.".

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for those who are interested and watching, at this moment we are attempting to look at all the amendments that have been offered, and we are close to proceeding on another meeting. We are requesting unanimous consent now which will allow Members to debate that between 2 and 3, with votes, and then we will attempt in all sincerity to move forward on the process that takes us through to a cloture vote at some time late afternoon, evening, or early tomorrow morning on this important issue. There is progress being made as we move through this process.

With that, until the unanimous consent is ready, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, under a previously proffered unanimous consent agreement, we will spend 1 hour, from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m., on the Levin amendment, with the time equally divided. We anticipate a vote at or around 3 o’clock.

I see the Senator from Michigan is now on the floor and ready to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 1623

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1623.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes an amendment numbered 1623.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the prohibition on certain civil liability actions)

On page 13, after line 4, add the following:

SEC. 5. GROSS NEGLIGENCE OR RECKLESS CONDUCT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to
bring or continue against a person if the gross negligence or reckless conduct of that person was a proximate cause of death or injury.

(b) DEFINITIONS. As used in this section—

(1) The term "gross negligence" has the meaning given that term under subsection (b)(7) of the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act (42 U.S.C. 1791(b)(7)); and

(2) The term "reckless" has the meaning given that term under section 2A1.4 of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, although I have read the amendment, I would like to explain the necessity of this amendment, as I think the current section 2A1.4 of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual is not sufficiently precise.

The stated purpose of this bill is that if negligence or recklessness is caused by others, if the misconduct of a third party is the cause of damage, that the gun dealer or manufacturer should not be held accountable. We agree with that. But what if their own recklessness, their own gross negligence contributes to the damage or, to put it in legalistic terms, what happens if their own misconduct is a proximate cause of the damage, injury, or death to somebody else? Why should they be off the hook for their own misconduct?

In the Levin amendment, what the amendment says is this act does not prohibit a civil liability action from being brought or continued against a person if his own gross negligence or reckless conduct was a proximate cause of the damage or injury.

We have heard about a number of cases that have been brought to the attention of this body. These are cases where manufacturers or dealers have been held liable for their own misconduct, their own negligence, their own recklessness where the allegation against a dealer or manufacturers had to do with their own behavior.

We heard about the tragic DC area sniper shootings case where there was a settlement that was obtained from a gun supplier, called Bull’s Eye Shooter Supply, for their own negligence. Mr. President, 238 guns had gone missing from Bull’s Eye’s inventory. Fifty had been traced to criminal actions since 1997. If this bill had been enacted prior to the DC area sniper shootings, the victims would have been able to even
manage trains, hotel operators who negligently fail to secure rooms, and contractors who negligently leave dangerous equipment unguarded are all potentially liable if their conduct—

creates an unreasonable and foreseeable risk of third party misconduct, including illegal behavior, leading to harm.

In this amendment, we make it clear that if the conduct of gun manufacturers and gun dealers is grossly negligent or reckless, and if that is a proximate cause of the death or injury of someone else, they are not off the hook, and they should not be. No one in this country should be. No one in this country is, as far as I know, responsible or liable. And this bill does that. It does not say that it does that. It says it is protecting folks from the conduct of others. But the bill’s analysis clearly indicates, when you go beyond the stated purpose, that the gun manufacturers and gun dealers’ own negligence and recklessness which is immunized, with very narrow exceptions.

If they committed a violation of law, if they have committed a crime, you can go after them, they are still liable. If they negligently entrust, knowing that the person to whom they have entrusted a weapon is going to go out and commit a crime or do something unlawful, they are still on the hook. But if they just left their guns sloppily around the store, or if they hired employees who they knew or should have known were going to illegally sell guns, steal guns, and then have those guns used in a criminal endeavor—and these are real cases—if that is the type of negligence or recklessness that is at issue, then they are off the hook. They are only kept on the hook, under the language of this bill, if they designed something negligently, if they have negligently entrusted in a very narrow definition, or if they have committed a crime.

I want to read excerpts from a letter which has been signed by, I believe, 75 law professors:

Dear Senators and Representatives: S. 397 . . . described as “a bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others.” This would broadly immunize the firearms industry from liability for negligence. This would represent a sharp break with traditional principles. No other industry enjoys or has ever enjoyed such blanket freedom from responsibility for the foreseeable and preventable consequences of negligent conduct.

American law has never embraced a rule freeing defendants from liability for the foreseeable consequences of their negligence merely because those consequences may include the criminal conduct of third parties.

Under American tort law, they say: . . . actors may be liable if their negligence enables or facilitates foreseeable third party criminal conduct.

These professors remind us:

Thus, car dealers who negligently leave vehicles unattended, railroads who negligently

have their case against that supplier heard in court. And there are many other cases. There are so many cases that this is why police officers, police chiefs, and police departments around the country oppose this bill as it is written.

We should protect innocent manufacturers and gun dealers, just the way we should protect any innocent party in this country. But we should not protect anybody— I don’t care if it is the manufacturer of guns or a manufacturer of automobiles or a manufacturer of refrigerators or a dealer in those products or any other products—we should not protect their folks from their own reckless conduct by their own negligence. And this bill does that. It does not say that it does that. It says it is protecting folks from the conduct of others. But the bill’s analysis clearly indicates, when you go beyond the stated purpose, that the gun manufacturers and gun dealers’ own negligence and recklessness which is immunized, with very narrow exceptions.

If they committed a violation of law, if they have committed a crime, you can go after them, they are still liable. If they negligently entrust, knowing that the person to whom they have entrusted a weapon is going to go out and commit a crime or do something unlawful, they are still on the hook. But if they just left their guns sloppily around the store, or if they hired employees who they knew or should have known were going to illegally sell guns, steal guns, and then have those guns used in a criminal endeavor—and these are real cases—if that is the type of negligence or recklessness that is at issue, then they are off the hook. They are only kept on the hook, under the language of this bill, if they designed something negligently, if they have negligently entrusted in a very narrow definition, or if they have committed a crime.

I have enjoyed the support of the NRA in the past, probably not in the future. Last year in this country, by the industry statistics, over 1.3 million handguns were sold and over 2 million long guns—legally, properly, in almost all cases, completely protected. Nothing in this country, nothing being considered here, nothing that would ever pass this body, in my lifetime, would prevent law-abiding citizens from lawfully buying and owning firearms. Nothing should and nothing will, not because of the existence of the NRA, not because they are holding forth and preventing the marauding hordes from somehow overriding and overturning this constitutional amendment—it is not going to be changed because the political support in this country would not be for it. The people would not support it. That right is constitutional and it is inviolable, but it is not inconsistent with that right to also require the responsible distribution and sale of those millions of firearms.

We all know what damage they can do to innocent people when they are misused by criminals or mistakenly used by children. We should do all we reasonably can to prevent those tragedies to innocent people and to innocent families. But every one in the gun industry do all they can to prevent them as well. That is what the legal standard of negligence requires. It is what most people in this industry consistently practice. I own two shotguns. They are in Minnesota, purchased from Minnesota dealers who take their responsibilities very seriously, and they are free. They need not be concerned because their own practices are a clear defense against any unwarranted accusations.

However, there are a few in this country, as there are in any industry, that are not responsible manufacturers, distributors, or dealers. Senator LEVIN has cited evidence of the results of those irresponsible actions, and they should be our concern. They certainly do not deserve or have an inherent right to our protection. They certainly do not deserve to be elevated to a special status that is not accorded to responsible manufacturers and sellers of every other consumer product in America.

I support the Levin amendment, and I will read it again, says that if gross negligence or reckless conduct of that person was the proximate cause, a direct cause of death or injury to somebody else, this act shall not prohibit a civil action for damages. It defines its terms more clearly than does the underlying bill. So if this amendment falls, it truly gives lie to the claim that this bill intends to hold the gun industry to any standard of liability. If not for gross negligence that is a direct cause of death or injury to an innocent person, if not for that, there is no standard of liability at all.

The American Bar Association has taken a position in opposition to this legislation, and I would just note a couple of excerpts. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, this be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DAYTON. It says that this proposed legislation would remove defendants from one of the oldest principles of civil liability law—that persons or companies who act negligently should be accountable to victims harmed by this failure of responsibility. It states that under product liability laws in most States, manufacturers must adopt feasible safety devices that prevent injury. When their products are foreseeably misused, regardless of whether the uses are “intended” by the manufacturer or whether the product “fails or improperly functions.” As the Senator from Michigan noted, automobile makers have been held civilly liable for not making cars crashworthy even though the intended use is not to “crash the cars.” Manufacturers of cigarette lighters must make them childproof even though children are not intended to use them. Under this proposed legislation, however, State laws would be preempted so
that gun manufacturers would enjoy a special immunity.

The letter also points out that this is happening in the existing legal backdrop of the present unparalleled immunity that the firearms industry already enjoys from any federal safety regulation. Unlike all other consumer products except for tobacco, there is no Federal law or regulatory authority that sets minimum safety standards for domestically manufactured firearms because that industry was able to gain an exemption for firearms from the 1972 enacted Consumer Product Safety Act, the primary federal law that protects consumers from products that present unreasonable risk of injury. Of all the products we should have included in that legislation, firearms are among them given the inherent danger from their misuse or from their improper manufacture. Instead, they are exempted from the consumer product safety laws by the Federal Government. That is the power of the industry. I guess they have the power, they are demonstrating, to get this bill enacted as well and remove themselves from all liability. That is not in the best interest of America. It is not a fair standard for an industry that is an integral function of state common law to other businesses, manufacturers and sellers of every other product in America.

If we are going to recognize, as we should, that each time a gun is a problem for this industry and for most all others, we should deal with tort reform in its entirety as it applies fairly and equally to all businesses and all industries, not single out one for special treatment.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS OFFICE,
April 4, 2005.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the American Bar Association to express our strong opposition to S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and to similar legislation that would exempt the firearms industry from all liability. S. 397 opposes the protection of the public interest. It is not in the interest of the legal profession, and any of us who have had a lot of experience in the legal profession, and any of us who have had any experience with civil litigation, particularly tort litigation, know that the scope of the discovery, the scope of the litigation is determined by what is pled actually by the party which result from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

Now, the Senate has many people who have had a lot of experience in the legal profession, and any of us who have had any experience with civil litigation, particularly tort litigation, know that the scope of the discovery, the scope of the litigation is determined by what is pled actually by the party which result from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of the opposition time to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment that has been proposed by the Senator from Michigan and cosponsored by the Senator from Minnesota. While this amendment appears to be innocuous, it would actually gut the very underlying purpose of this legislation. Let me explain briefly.

First, the purpose of this bill is to prohibit frivolous lawsuits from being brought against gun manufacturers who sell to sellers of firearms, lawful products, but which result from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

There is no evidence that federal legislation is needed or justified. There is no hearing record in Congress or other evidence to contradict the fact that the state courts are adequately serving this function in this area of law. There is no data of any kind to support claims made by the industry that it is incurring extraordinary costs due to litigation, or that current number of suits, or that current state law is in any way inadequate. The Senate has not examined the underlying claims of the industry that there has been abnormally highvolume of suits that would hold a single hearing on S. 397 or its predecessor bills in the two previous Congresses. The proponents of S. 397, on the other hand, have failed to point to a single court decision, final judgment or award that has been paid out that supports their claims of a “crisis”. All evidence points to the conclusion that state legislatures and state courts have been and are actively exercising their responsibilities in this area of law with little apparent difficulty. S. 397 opposes to exempt this one industry from state negligence law. The proposed federal negligence law standard will unfairly exempt firearms industry defendants from accountability in state courts for design defects in their products. The proposed new federal standard would preempt state negligence law in all 50 states with a new, higher standard for negligence actions for this one protected class, different than for any other industry, protecting them from liability for their own negligence in all but extremely narrow specified exceptions. The ABA believes that the legal standard for all other products, and its legal bedrock duty of reasonable care should remain the standard for gun industry accountability in state civil courts, as these state standards do for the rest of our nation’s individuals, businesses and industries.

The proposed federal product liability law standard will unfairly insulate firearm industry defendants from accountability in state courts for design defects in their products. The proposed new federal standard would preempt state substantive law standards for most negligence and product liability actions for this one industry, abrogating state laws since our nation was founded. S. 397 would preempt state substantive law standards for most negligence and product liability actions for this one industry, abrogating state laws that protects consumers from products that present unreasonable risk of injury. Over the last 30 years, an average of 200 children under the age of 14 and over a thousand adults each year have die in gun accidents which might have been prevented by existing but unused safety technologies. A 1991 Government Accounting Office report estimated that 31 percent of children’s accidental firearm deaths could have been prevented by the addition of two simple existing devices to firearms: trigger locks and load-indicator devices. Clearly, these minimal safety features are still not required.

This bill, if enacted, would insulate the firearms industry from almost all civil actions, in addition to its existing protection from any consumer product safety regulations. Such special status for this single industry raises serious concerns about its constitutionality; victims have the right—as do persons injured through negligence of any party—to the equal protection of the law.

The risk that states may at some future date fail to appropriately resolve their tort responsibilities in an area of law—where there is no evidence of any state failure—cannot justify the unprecedented federal preemption of state responsibilities proposed in this legislation. The ABA believes that the states will continue to sort out these issues capably without a federal rewriting of state substantive tort law standards. The wiser course for Congress, we believe, is to respect the duty of state legislatures and state courts to administer their historic responsibility to define the negligence and product liability standards to be used in their state courts. For these reasons, we urge you to reject S. 397.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. EVANS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of the opposition time to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment that has been proposed by the Senator from Michigan and cosponsored by the Senator from Minnesota. While this amendment appears to be innocuous, it would actually gut the very underlying purpose of this legislation. Let me explain briefly.

First, the purpose of this bill is to prohibit frivolous lawsuits from being brought against gun manufacturers who sell to sellers of firearms, lawful products, but which result from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

Now, the Senate has many people who have had a lot of experience in the legal profession, and any of us who have had any experience with civil litigation, particularly tort litigation, know that the scope of the discovery, the scope of the litigation is determined by what is pled actually by the party which result from the criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

In my experience, and I am confident that it is generally true, in virtually
every civil lawsuit where damages are sought, not only is there a pleading of ordinary negligence—or perhaps strict liability if it is a product or manufacturer—but in addition there is an allegation of gross negligence, which is what I am trying to say. It would exempt from the general prohibition against lawsuits against manufacturers of these lawful products for harm resulting from criminal or unlawful use of a firearm.

It is clear to me that the litigation expense, the harassment of a lawful manufacturer of this product, would not be avoided. In fact, one of the very purposes of this legislation would be undermined if this amendment were agreed to. So I urge my colleagues to oppose it, as I do.

The fact is, in America today, we are less competitive globally because of a variety of reasons, but it cannot be summarized this way: our tax policy, our regulatory policy, our lawsuit culture, the cost of health care, just to name four items. But the fact is, because of our litigation culture today in this country and the competition with other countries around the world, and we are seeing the exodus of jobs in America because, simply stated, manufacturers and producers of other lawful goods can do it cheaper and more efficiently elsewhere. That is a threat to our economy and our prosperity that we enjoy in this country.

This is actually true in the case of gun manufacturers. For example, one such manufacturer is located in the small town of Eagle Pass in my home State of Texas. A company by the name of Maverick Arms, Inc., assembles Maverick and Mossberg brand firearms there and is one of a group of companies that is in the fourth generation of family ownership that dates as far back as 1919. Maverick employs approximately 150 skilled workers in Eagle Pass, as well as supplying other work to other vendors.

Maverick and its parent company, Mossberg, cannot withstand the continued onslaught of frivolous litigation against this manufacturer for merely doing what lawful manufacturers do—making a legal product but in this instance one that is misused by a criminal. They know if they get caught up in the litigation, too often emotions run high, reason and rationality is suspended, and these manufacturers become not only sued but actually on occasion held responsible for the acts of criminals.

I certainly respect the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I was just thinking, of course, his State is known in part for manufacturing automobiles. It strikes me that automobiles can be used safely or unsafely, but certainly no one would claim that General Motors or any other manufacturer of an automobile should be held responsible if someone decides to take that automobile that is operating in completely good condition and decides to run over somebody and kill them or cause them physical harm.

For the same reason, firearms can be used both for lawful purposes and safely or they can be misused. For the same reason we would say General Motors or any car manufacturer would not be responsible for the criminal use of an automobile, so should manufacturers of firearms be held responsible for the criminal acts or misuse of their lawful product?

We know in the end that what this is all about is trying to drive gun manufacturers out of business. Unfortunately, unfortunate accidents are what people are threatened. Eventually it means that the second amendment rights of law-abiding citizens are compromised. I wish we would focus more of our efforts, as we have in the recent past, on criminals, the people who misuse firearms, the ones who cannot lawfully own or sell firearms, and leave those who are making a lawful product that can be and is used safely in and day out out of the picture. Indeed, and indeed, as the amendment I submit to my colleagues, is to undermine the effect of the entire bill which would protect these lawful manufacturers from frivolous litigation when their product is misused by a criminal and causes harm to some person. So I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, and I thank the managers for the courtesy they showed us in the course of managing this bill. I rise, as I did in the previous consideration of this bill, to support my colleague from Michigan. I do so because I basically want to be counted among those who are trying to bring a measure of relief to those professional people, such as doctors and educators, a whole list of people I enumerated last night when I addressed this bill on the Senate floor, who need help. In my judgment, Senator Levin—both of us are lawyers—is reaching back to the very fundamentals of the common law. These standards which the Senator wishes to have in this bill are the same standards that have withstood the test of time in court litigation from the very beginning of the judicial process, not only in England and in our country. It is for that reason that I support it.

I also draw the attention of my colleagues to my amendment, which is not pending, but as I understand, it is not pending, but as I understand, it is pending. Senator Levin—both of us are lawyers—is reaching back to the very fundamentals of the common law. These standards which the Senator wishes to have in this bill are the same standards that have withstood the test of time in court litigation from the very beginning of the judicial process, not only in England and in our country. It is for that reason that I support it.

I also draw the attention of my colleagues to my amendment, which is not pending, but as I understand, it is filed at the desk, amendment No. 1625. I rise at this time to speak to it because it really addresses, in a very narrow way, one of the ultimate goals of the Senator from Michigan.

My concern is that the gun dealers across America are being forced, in my opinion, to segregate themselves in this legislation. Ninety-nine percent are honest, law-abiding citizens. Yet they are subjected to the problems of our society today; namely, people can come in and steal from them. My amendment adds to the bill, which has a provision in it on page 8 of the exclusions, and it would simply say, in actions brought against a gun dealer, the dealer has a record of misconduct, negligence, and other types of criteria should not be entitled to the exemptions provided by this piece of legislation. So I want to be supportive. It protects those dealers who are trying to act in a lawful way who may have an accident, for some reason, and it does clearly remove from the protection of this bill dealers such as the one the Senator cited in the sniper case which struck my State of Virginia and Maryland and the District and paralyzed our businesses. People were afraid to go out on the street at night to conduct their ordinary affairs of life because of the threats.

That was a stolen weapon from a gun dealer that, for one reason or another, some 200 weapons disappear from the shelves of that store or inventory over a period of a year or two. That dealer, in my judgment, would be protected as it now stands, unless the provisions comparable to perhaps those from the Senator from Michigan or in my amendment are brought to the attention of the Senate. At some time, I will ardently try to get my amendment in that status—I believe it is germane—that it can be considered by this body, as I think the amendment of the Senator from Michigan was also allowed.

So I say to my distinguished manager, I hope that whatever procedure by which you hereby determine such amendments can be heard—other than that mine, which I understand is germane, can be heard by the Senate at an appropriate time.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator. I thank the Chair.

Let me get back to the Levin amendment which is our pending business. This amendment was tabled last year, and it should be again defeated or tabled. It is an amendment which would, in effect, be a poison pill for the entire bill because, in effect, what it says is if you allow gross negligence or recklessness, then the exemption the bill provides evaporates. So you are a lawyer. All you do is allege gross negligence or recklessness and, bingo, you are back in court again. So it totally undercut the purpose of this legislation.

Secondly, last year the bill didn’t contain a definition of gross negligence or recklessness. This year that was corrected, at least after a manner of speaking. But what definition do we have of gross negligence, for example? The bill provides the definition. The Bill of the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Dononation Act. The definition of gross negligence under the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food
Donation Act is totally different from the case law definition of any State in the Union. It is totally different from the settled or standard concept of gross negligence in tort law.

Let me illustrate the difference. Under the term we mean: Voluntary and conscious conduct, including a failure to act by a person who at the time of the conduct knew that the conduct was likely to be harmful to the health or well being of another person.

That is not gross negligence. Black's Law Dictionary captures the essence of the definition. It defines gross negligence as the intentional failure to perform a manifest duty in reckless disregard of the consequences as affecting the life or property of another. And it consists of the conscious and voluntary act or omission which is likely to result in grave injury when in the face of clear and present danger of which the alleged tortfeasor is aware. And there is, obviously, a comparison to the Levin standard to be inserted into the statute this year, is quite different. Even if the judge were to look to the standard itself, he would find that that standard is significantly different than the usual concept of the term and does not rise, in any meaningful way, to what any of us who have practiced tort law would understand gross negligence to mean.

Third, this is a highly regulated industry by Federal law and State law and even some local laws. And most of the acts that would meet the definition of gross negligence would already be in violation of law. And if they are in violation of law, they are not exempted from this legislation. We don't try to exempt any gun manufacturer for conduct which is in violation of law. So by definition that would be an exemption from the provisions of the bill, if it becomes law, and therefore would not need to be included.

The bottom line here is that if there really is a problem, that is to say, the conduct is so bad that it is a violation of law, no lawsuit is precluded under our bill in any way. And if it doesn't rise to that level, then it should not be considered to be within the concept of gross negligence under that term as it has always been applied in tort law. The definition that is to be substituted this year is clearly not a definition most of us would consider appropriate under these circumstances.

So in fact if the gross negligence or reckless conduct of a person was the proximate cause of death or injury—that is the allegation—you are in court reasoning because it is going to undermine this bill and stop this kind of legal reasoning in our country—when under what circumstances can someone get in your wallet, hold you responsible financially for an event, no matter how unfortunate it might be, might be not in the law of negligence, the first thing you have to establish in civil liability is a duty. You have to prove that the person being sued had a duty and violated that duty and the violation was the proximate cause and the damages flow from the violation.

Here is what this bill does not do. It does not let a gun manufacturer off the hook from the duty of producing a reliable and safe gun. If you defectively produce a weapon, you can be held liable. It doesn't let a seller or a distributor off the hook for violating a statute or making a sale illegally because it says, if you violate the law that exists, then you have broken a duty. Duty can be established by relationships that you have by fulfilling a statute. So this bill does not allow someone to sell a gun without following the procedures that we have set out to sell a gun. It doesn't allow someone to make a gun that is unsafe. You are on the hook, and you can be held liable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. How much time remains for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 18½ minutes, the Senator from Michigan has 8 minutes and 11 seconds.

Mr. CRAIG. The Senator from Idaho has how much time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 18½ minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chair, I thank the Senator from Arizona for his statement. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason I am supporting this bill, from a 30,000-foot view of it rather than getting down into the weeds, I think the defining "cultural moment" in the history of our country—when under what circumstances can someone get in your wallet, hold you responsible financially for an event, no matter how unfortunate it might be, might be not in the law of negligence, the first thing you have to establish in civil liability is a duty. You have to prove that the person being sued had a duty and violated that duty and the violation was the proximate cause and the damages flow from the violation.

Here is what this bill does not do. It does not let a gun manufacturer off the hook from the duty of producing a reliable and safe gun. If you defectively produce a weapon, you can be held liable. It doesn't let a seller or a distributor off the hook for violating a statute or making a sale illegally because it says, if you violate the law that exists, then you have broken a duty. Duty can be established by relationships that you have by fulfilling a statute. So this bill does not allow someone to sell a gun without following the procedures that we have set out to sell a gun. It doesn't allow someone to make a gun that is unsafe. You are on the hook, and you can be held liable accountable based on a simple negligence theory or a negligence per se theory, if you violate a specific statute during the sale of a gun or manufacturing a gun.

But what this bill prevents, and I think rightfully so, is establishing a duty along this line: That you have a responsibility, even if you do a lawful transaction or make a sale, for an event that you can't control, which is the intentional misuse of a weapon in a criminal fashion by another person. That is the heart of this bill. It doesn't relieve you of duties that the law imposes upon you to safely manufacture and to carefully sell. But we are not going to extend it to a concept where you are responsible, after you have done everything right, for what somebody else may do who bought your product and they did it wrong and it is their fault, not yours. So it does not matter whether you use a gross negligence standard, a simple negligence standard, you have blown by the concept of the bill in my opinion. The debate should be, is there a duty owed in this country for people who follow the law? That's why this bill is within the confines of the laws we have written at the State and Federal level to the public at large if an injury results from the criminal act of another? If that ever happens, this country has made a major change, and we relate to each other and a major change in the law.

There are other efforts to make this happen. There is an effort, on the part of some, to hold food manufacturers liable if you choose to buy a lawful product and misuse it by eating too much of it, creating a duty on the part of the people who sell food to manage your own behavior, the behavior of another. Once you leave the store, if you buy something, you should go home with you and make sure you are doing everything right.

That to me is why this amendment from my good friend from Michigan should not be adopted and why we need to pass this bill. I think that ever happens, this country has made a major change in the way we relate to each other. Once you leave the store, if you buy something, you should go home with you and make sure you are doing everything right.

The bill even has a negligent proviso. If you negligently entrust a weapon on someone you know or should know should not have that gun, you will have your day in court. What we are not going to do, under a gross negligence or simple negligence standard, you have a duty on the part of sellers and manufacturers for an event that they can't control, which is the intentional misuse of a weapon to commit a crime or something akin to that, something that you can't control, nor should you be required to be responsible for the misdeeds and the mistakes of others when there is no rational relationship or no rational ability to control it, then we have fundamentally changed America. This bill is very important, I say to Senator Craig. We have to pass this bill and stop this kind of legal reasoning because it is going to undermine our country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I wonder if Senator GRAHAM might wait. I want to comment on his remarks, and I don't want to do this without him being aware of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I wonder if Senator GRAHAM might wait. I want to comment on his remarks, and I don't want to do this without him being aware of it.
The good Senator said that if you have done everything right, you should not be held accountable. Of course. That is a given. I accept that. But what if you have been reckless, what if you have been grossly negligent and that gross negligence causes your death or injury, you should hold yourself accountable. To accept the Judiciary Law Dictionary definition if my good friend from Arizona wants to substitute that for the definition in this bill. That is not the issue. But if the gross negligence and recklessness is a proximate cause of your death or injury, you should show gross negligence or recklessness. It is a matter of proving negligence and recklessness is a proximate cause of death or injury. The question is whether you should be held accountable for your own negligence, your own gross negligence. We should not immunize people against their own negligence. That is the issue. That is the only issue of this amendment. We don’t want to eliminate rights of people to get compensation against others who have been a cause of their death or injury. That is what the bill does, and that is what is wrong. There is no other industry, no other industry has that immunity. But this industry would be given that immunity for the first time that I know of in American history or tort history. You can perform, perpetrate an act of gross negligence or reckless conduct and not be held accountable. Now, if you commit a crime you will be held accountable, or if you negligently entrust, you will be held accountable, but all the other acts of negligence, which are perpetrated, are going to be immunized. It is not a matter, by the way, of alleging gross negligence or recklessness. It is a matter of proving recklessness or gross negligence, because the amendment says, not that the allegation is enough; it is that if you have been reckless, what if you have done everything right, you should hold yourself accountable. 

I am happy to yield at this time to my dear friend from Illinois. I don’t know how much time I have remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield 5 minutes. Does the Senator from Rhode Island want any time?

Mr. REED. No. Go ahead.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

Let me describe a tragedy, a tragedy which hit a little close to home for me. My grandson is 9 years old.

This is a tragedy involving a 10-year-old little boy in Philadelphia. On February 11 of last year, this little boy, Faheem, was on his way to school, walking from home to school. As he came to a little girl who climbed a wire gate, a gun member came up and shot him in the face. He remained conscious for a short period of time, lapsed into a coma, and died 5 days later. That is a tragedy.

The reason I bring it up is because the amendment of Senator LEVIN, before us, addresses this tragedy. Where did the gun from come? It turns out it was in the hands of a gang member, one of those drug gang members, crazy, trying to find money, shooting in every direction. He had the gun in his hand.

The obvious question to be asked is, Where did this drug gang member get his gun? We have got to get it. He got it through the American Gun and Lock Company of Girard Avenue, in Philadelphia, PA.

Did he buy it there? No. What happened was one of the gang members walked into this gun store with his girlfriend and he said, My girlfriend wants to buy some guns.

Why did he say his girlfriend? Because the gang member had a criminal record. He couldn’t buy the guns. So, the gun store owner, sees the girlfriend buying the guns for the gang member standing next to her, and decides he is going to charge a handling fee because she is a third-party purchaser.

They knew what was going on. The girlfriend buys guns for the gangs to use on the street. So the store sold the gun, clearly understanding what was going on here, even charging a handling fee for it. It gets on the street in the hands of a gang member and a 10-year-old little boy, who was walking into the schoolyard is shot in the face and killed.

So the question is this: Did the gun dealer do anything wrong? That is the question. I think it is a legitimate question. I think the gun dealer knew exactly what was going on here. The gun dealer wanted to make some money. The gun dealer was willing to look beyond the obvious criminal standing in front of him to the straw purchaser, and let the girlfriend buy the gun and even charge a handling fee. What Senator LEVIN’s amendment says is this is gross negligence. If you did not know this gun was going to be used in a crime, you stand to make a responsibility to do the right thing, to sell it in the legal context. We have heard some of the most fascinating arguments in relation to the Levin amendment on both sides. I think it is clear if the Levin amendment were to become part of this legislation and this legislation were to become law, it would be relatively meaningless as to where we are in relation to the kind of junk or dilatory lawsuits that are currently being filed against gun manufacturers and gun dealers who not only produce a legal product to the market but sell it in the legal context.

It is important that we understand the arguments about gross negligence and reckless conduct. The idea that has been expressed by the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Texas, and certainly the Senator from South Carolina, is that once you argue that, then obviously as an attorney the process must prove you are either right or wrong. In so arguing it, and in the effort of making proof, you have in large part destroyed the intent of the legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I am more than happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. This has been a fascinating legal discussion. May I have a minute or two to answer?

Mr. CRAIG. I will allow the Senator to take as much time as he desires.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the fact pattern goes along the lines of a criminal goes in with a girlfriend or some other person and tries to purchase a weapon. What responsibility would someone have there?

If the dealer or the seller or the person in question has had a reasonable opportunity to know a crime was afoot, or this was a sham deal, then I argue the bill would cover it under negligent entrustment. But here is what we would not want to do, in my opinion. You would not want to hold the seller or the distributor liable if he had no reason to understand that a criminal conspiracy by two people he is not responsible for

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 13 minutes 19 seconds for the Senator from Idaho, 36 seconds for the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have been expressing to the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from Texas, and certainly the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from South Carolina, is that once you argue that, then obviously as an attorney the process must prove you are either right or wrong. In so arguing it, and in the effort of making proof, you have in large part destroyed the intent of the legislation.
was about to happen. Because that would be unfair. But if he had a reason to know, a reasonable opportunity to know, then that would be a totally different scenario.

That is a classic example of what we do not want people to do. If you are about to make a sale, should have known something was afoot to violate the law, they can be held responsible. But if you as a dealer are a victim of a criminal conspiracy you had no part or knowledge of, we are not going to make you responsible. That is the essence of common law. Because to do so would undo legal concepts that stood 200 years, would put people out of business, and makes no sense.

I yield back to Senator CRAIG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, over the last good number of years, law-abiding gun manufacturers in this country producing a legal product to the market, law-abiding gun dealers performing within the confines of the Federal firearms licensing process, have spent over $225 million defending themselves from the very arguments the Senator from Michigan would like to have continued.

The South Carolina has well spelled out that there is a duty and there is a responsibility. But if that duty is taken beyond your ability to know it, to understand it, to be able to act against it, then you ought not be responsible.

We have gotten ourselves into a very litigious society. So in a way it has cost our society more than almost any other society in the developed world today. Why? Because we would like to shove blame off onto someone else. When society wrongs society, it has to be somebody else's fault besides the one who perpetrated the wrong. So we have attempted to reach back through law, time and time again. As a result—we have heard it, whether it is the cost of an automobile or whether it is the cost of a firearm today or whether it is the cost of almost any consumer product—it is going to cost you more because somewhere the producers have to mount large amounts of money to pay their legal fees to fend off someone looking for an excuse to blame someone else for the action of someone who should have been responsible for themselves.

That is the essence or the underlying construction of what has brought us to the floor today. This argument will not be argued in behalf of gun manufacturers. Over the course of the next several years it will be argued in behalf of a lot of law-abiding, producing Americans who have simply grown tired and fed up with the idea that they always have to be sued although what they are doing is legal, even though they are within the law. That is because somehow sometime the person about to be sued should have known and they are responsible because surely the person who perpetrated the crime cannot be held responsible because society either produced them or the environment in which they became irresponsible was a societal responsibility.

Oh, my goodness, where do we rest the blame? I think many of our parents suggested that we were responsible for our actions, we have to pay the price. But the argument here is quite the opposite, that someone who might have a deep pocket somewhere down the road, because what they produced is a legal product for the market and we need it, should pay that price. And the criminal—not suggesting they would go free, but certainly suggesting they can't afford to pay, so someone else ought to pay, and the argument goes on and on.

You have heard my arguments over the course of the last 48 hours. We are the only nation who doesn't have a government-owned weapons factory. It has always been a product of the private market. If we choose to run them out of our country, then all of the firearms our men and women in the military use, our law enforcement community uses, our law-abiding citizens own, will be made in some other country.

I do not believe that is where our country wants to go. And it is clear that is not where a majority of the Senate wants to go. I do believe the Senate, as reflected by its vote on the cloture motion to proceed and ultimately get us to this bill, is reflective of society as a whole.

I hope a majority of the Senate will oppose the Levin amendment. I do not believe you can suggest you are going to correct a problem in one instance and then open another door and allow a death by a thousand cuts, as obviously would occur here, if that case were the one we are arguing.

Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. CRAIG. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague. He has made very strong arguments here. Nobody who is thinking should vote for this amendment. I yield the next 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Thank my colleague. He has made very strong arguments here. Nobody who is thinking should vote for this amendment.

I rise today to speak against this amendment No. 1623, an amendment which, in my view, would meet the definition of gross negligence referenced in this amendment would already be a violation of Federal, State or local law, and therefore would not receive the protection of this law anyway.

This amendment is an attempt to undermine this legislation. We defeated this amendment soundly last year—soundly. I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat it again.

Thank my distinguished colleague and friend from Idaho who has led this fight courageously and in every way with the highest of standards. Frankly, this is one that should not see the light of day. I hope our colleagues will vote against it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. LEVIN. I believe I have half a minute remaining, and I would like to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 36 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have been told people should not be held accountable for the wrongdoing of others; that is true. The question is whether they should be held accountable for their own wrongdoing.

This amendment would make sure that gun dealers and manufacturers—such as any other dealer or manufacturer—could be held accountable for their own wrongdoing.

This amendment would make sure that gun makers and sellers know their products are “likely to be harmful,” without having to prove any duty or clear connection to the injured party. This turns common law tort principles on its head. This is more than a calculated effort by opponents of this legislation to expand the reach of this doctrine to get at conduct that had not previously been covered.

Furthermore, this amendment is simply not needed. Virginia that would meet the definition of gross negligence referenced in this amendment would already be a violation of Federal, State or local law, and therefore would not receive the protection of this law anyway.

This amendment is an attempt to undermine this legislation. We defeated this amendment soundly last year—soundly. I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat it again.

Please my distinguished colleague and friend from Idaho who has led this fight courageously and in every way with the highest of standards. Frankly, this is one that should not see the light of day. I hope our colleagues will vote against it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time if the Senator from Michigan is.

Mr. LEVIN. I believe I have half a minute remaining, and I would like to use it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 36 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have been told people should not be held accountable for the wrongdoing of others; that is true. The question is whether they should be held accountable for their own wrongdoing.

This amendment would make sure that gun dealers and manufacturers—such as any other dealer or manufacturer—could be held accountable for their own wrongdoing. That is the issue. It is very clear in the wording of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent the letter from 75 law professors describing what this bill would do in terms of eliminating responsibility for manufactur- ers' and gun dealers' own conduct be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
LAW SCHOOL,
Ann Arbor, MI.

DEAR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES: As a professor of law at the University of Michi-
gan Law School, I write to alert you to the legal implications of S. 397 and H.R. 800, the “Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.” My colleagues, who join me in signing this letter, are professors at law schools around the country. This bill would represent a substantial and radical departure from traditional principles of American tort law. Though described as an effort to limit the unwarranted expansion of tort liability, the bill would in fact represent a dramatic
narrowing of traditional tort principles by providing one industry with a literally unprecedented immunity from liability for the foreseeable consequences of negligent conduct.

S. 397 and H.R. 800, described as "a bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, importers, and sellers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others," would largely immunize those in the firearms industry from responsibility for the foreseeable and preventable consequences of negligent conduct.

It might be suggested that the bill would merely parrot what traditional tort law ought to be understood to preclude in any event—lawsuits for damages resulting from third party misconduct, and in particular from the criminal misuse of firearms. This argument, however, rests on a fundamental misunderstanding of American tort law. American law has never embraced a rule from the criminal misuse of firearms. This would represent a sharp break with traditional principles of tort liability.

No other industry enjoys or has ever enjoyed such a narrow immunity from responsibility for the foreseeable and preventable consequences of negligent conduct.

Another exception would leave open the possibility of tort liability for truly egregious misconduct, by virtue of several exceptions set forth. These exceptions, however, are in fact quite narrow, and would give those in the firearm industry little incentive to attend to the risks of foreseeable third party misconduct.

One exception, for example, would purport to permit certain actions for "negligent entrustment." The bill goes on, however, to define "negligent entrustment" extremely narrowly. The exception applies only to sellers, for example, and would not apply to distributors or manufacturers, no matter how egregious their conduct. Moreover, the exception would apply only where the particular person to whom a seller supplies a firearm is one whom the seller knows or ought to know will use it to cause harm. The "negligent entrustment" exception would, therefore, not permit any action based on reckless distribution practices, negligent sales to gun traffickers who supply criminals (as in the above example), careless handling of firearms, lack of security, or any of a myriad potentially negligent acts.

Another exception would leave open the possibility of liability for certain statutory violations, variously defined, including those described under "the leading of negligence judgment." Statutory violations, however, represent just a narrow special case of negligence liability. No jurisdiction attempts to legislate standards of care as to every detail of life, even in a regulated industry, and there is no need. Why is there no need? Because general principles of tort law make more sense.

Prominent scholars and advocates of gun control have noted that S.397 and H.R. 800 would leave open the possibility that a firearms dealer, distributor or manufacturer might be held liable if their negligence enables or facilitates foreseeable third party criminal conduct.

Thus, car dealers who negligently leave vehicles unattended, railroads who negligently manage trains, hotel operators who negligently fail to secure rooms, and contractors who leave dangerous equipment unguarded are all potentially liable if their conduct creates an unreasonable and foreseeable risk of third party misconduct, including illegal and reckless behavior, leading to harm.

In keeping with these principles, cases have found that sellers of firearms and other products (whether manufacturers, distributors or dealers) are liable if their negligence enables or facilitates foreseeable third party criminal conduct.

In other words, if the very reason one's conduct is negligent is because it creates a foreseeable risk of illegal third party conduct, that illegal conduct does not sever the causal connection between negligence and the consequent harm. Of course, defendants are not automatically liable for illegal third party conduct, but are liable only if—given the foreseeable risk and the available precautions—they were unreasonable (negligent) in failing to guard against the danger. In most cases, moreover, the third party wrongdoer will also be liable.

But, again, the bottom line is that under traditional tort principles a failure to take reasonable precautions against foreseeable dangerous behavior by others is no different from a failure to guard against any other risk.

S. 397 and H.R. 800 would abrogate this firmly established principle of tort law.

Under this bill, the firearms industry would be the one and only business in which actors would be free utterly to disregard the risk, no matter how high or foreseeable, that their conduct might be creating or exacerbating a potentially preventable risk of third party illegal or dangerous behavior. S. 397 and H.R. 800. As currently drafted, this Bill would not simply protect against the expansion of tort liability, as has been suggested, but would actually limit the application of longstanding and otherwise universally applicable tort principles. It provides to firearms makers and distributors a literally unprecedented form of tort immunity not enjoyed or even dreamed of by any other industry.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN J. CLARK
Professor Sherman J. Clark, University of Melbourne Law School; Partner, Maxwell & Abuel, UCLA Law School; Professor Barbara Bader Adley, University of Oregon School of Law; Professor Mark F. Anderson, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Professor Emeritus James Francis Bailey, III Indiana University School of Law; Professor Elizabeth Bartholow, Harvard Law School; Professor Justin Bay, Loyola Marymount University College of Law; Professor Margaret Berger, Brooklyn Law School; Professor M. Gregg Bloche, Georgetown University Law Center; Professor Michael C. Blumm, Lewis and Clark Law School; Professor Carl T. Bogus, Roger Williams University School of Law; Professor Cynthia Grant Bowman, Northwestern University School of Law; Director of the MacArthur Justice Center and Lecturer in Law, Locke Bowman, University of Chicago Law School; Professor Scott Burris, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Professor Donna Byrne, William Mitchell College of Law; Professor Emily Calhoun, University of Colorado School of Law; Professor Lynne Cram, Fordham University School of Law; Associate Clinical Professor Kenneth D. Chestek, Indiana University School of Law; Associate Professor Stephen Clark, Al- bany Law School; Professor Patricia A. Cohen, University of California Hastings College of the Law; Professor Anthony D'Amato, Northwestern University School of Law; Professor John L. Diamond, University of California Hastings College of Law; Professor David R. Dow, University of Houston Law Center; Professor Jean M. Egen, Widener University School of Law; Associate Professor Christine Haight Farley, American University, Washington College of Law; Associate Professor Ann E. Freedman, Rutgers Law School—Camden.

Professor Gerald Frug, Harvard Law School; Professor Barry R. Furrow, Widener University School of Law; Associate Clinical Professor Craig Futterman, University of Chicago Law School; Professor David Gelfand, Tulane University Law School; Professor William Goldfarb, Boston College Law School; Professor Lawrence Gostin, George-town University Law Center; Professor Mi- chael Gottesman, Georgetown University Law Center; Professor Richard Siegel, Albany Law School; Professor Phoebe Had- don, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Professor Jon D. Hanson, Harvard Law School; Professor Douglas R. Heidenreich, William Mitchell College of Law; Professor Kathy Hessler, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Professor Eric S. Jans, William Mitchell College of Law; Professor Sheri Lynn Johnson, Cornell Law School; Professor David J. Jung, University of Cali- fornia, Berkeley School of Law; Associate Professor Ken Katkin, Salmon P. Chase College of Law, Northern Kentucky University; Professor David Kairys, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Professor Kit Kinports, University of Illinois School of Law; Professor Martin A. Kotler, Widener University School of Law; Professor Baily Lattin, Brooklyn Law School; Professor Mi- chael S. Lisuzzo, Tulane University Law School; Professor Daniel H. Mark, Antioch College of Law; Professor David MacGillivray, Northeastern University School of Law; Professor John J. Monahan, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Professor Walter Dean Myers, University of Michigan Law School; Professor Christian W. Myers, Loyola Law School; Professor Jennifer A. Nagel, University of California, Davis School of Law; Professor Christopher J. Nielson, University of Texas School of Law; Professor Joseph A. Orsi, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Professor Mari J. Matsuda, Georgetown University Law Center; Professor Sherman J. Clark.
Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senators 37, as follows:

YEAS—62

NAYS—37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>Logan</td>
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<td>Raubh</td>
<td>Bein</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Mikielski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baneh</td>
<td>Bertray</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>Boxer</td>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td>Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantewell</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Nolen (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafei</td>
<td>Kory</td>
<td>Rhode</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffe</td>
<td>Kork</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Schames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Loury</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>Schamon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colem</td>
<td>Lathenberg</td>
<td>Weyden</td>
<td>Wetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coa</td>
<td>DeWine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didd</td>
<td>DeMint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT VOTING—1

Domenci

The motion was agreed to. Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to. Mr. CRAIG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe the legislation before us today is a good tort reform bill. It deals with a discrete area of abuse in our legal system. We in this Congress have the responsibility to protect law-abiding citizens of decent, law-abiding citizens in this country who possess firearms and use them to hunt and for recreational purposes on a regular basis. But I understand crime is a big part of the objection to firearms. It is out of that fear and concern that we have mayors and cities passing laws that create strict liability, such as the District of Columbia. In a recent case that ruled against the Beretta Company, Beretta wrote us that if this law responsible for our police and national defense; that is where they get their firearms industry in America indeed would implicate and undermine the constitutional right Americans have of keeping and bearing arms. It is good for jobs.

We know American manufacturers are under siege from lawsuits, and we could end up losing an entire industry, which is a pretty big industry. It is good for our police and national defense; that is where they get their firearms industry. The Secretary of Defense wrote us a letter indicating—actually, the legal counsel wrote the letter to say they support it because they are concerned about the manufacturing capability of firearms used by our military. The same companies fighting these suits are also the companies that produce arms for the military and our police forces.

It is good because it restores the historic principles of what liability should be in our country. Where and how should one be liable? What companies should be liable? Is it the manufacturer, or should it be the consumer? Most penalties encour and undermine the manufacture arms by some. If you look at it, it is mostly in the big cities where they are not familiar with hunting, outdoors, and recreational shooting. The emotional fervor for radically limiting the historic American right to keep and bear arms arises out of fear of crime and a desire to be safe, and I think, a misunderstanding of the history and character of decent, law-abiding citizens in this country who possess firearms and use them to hunt and for recreational purposes on a regular basis. But I understand crime is a big part of the objection to firearms. It is out of that fear and concern that we have mayors and cities passing laws that create strict liability, such as the District of Columbia. In a recent case that ruled against the Beretta Company, Beretta wrote us that if this law responsible for our police and national defense; that is where they get their firearms industry. The Secretary of Defense wrote us a letter indicating—actually, the legal counsel wrote the letter to say they support it because they are concerned about the manufacturing capability of firearms used by our military. The same companies fighting these suits are also the companies that produce arms for the military and our police forces.
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our communities safer, do the right thing? Does passing more and more burdensome laws and regulations that fall on lawful gun owners help reduce crime? I submit to you it does not.

There are dramatic numbers that I think effectively demonstrate how gun law prosecutions to reduce crime. When I came to the Senate in 1997, I had been a U.S. attorney and, as such, prosecuted criminals who utilized guns and violated Federal gun law. I know the Presiding Officer has done that, too; he has been a prosecutor. He dealt with these Federal gun laws. What we did was focus on the law that dealt with criminal behavior, and we were aggressive about it. I remember coming up with a name for our project. We called it Project Triggerlock in, I guess, the late 1980s. We had a newsletter and we talked with all our sheriffs and local police about the new, tough Federal gun laws that crack down on the utilization of a gun during a crime. Of course, the 5-year mandatory penalty without parole if you carry a firearm during a drug offense, or if you possess a firearm after having been convicted of a felony, you would go to jail and it would be without parole.

I thought it was an effective thing and we worked hard to prosecute those cases. Then I was elected Alabama attorney general and then I came to the Senate. When I came here, there was one new gun law after another that attempted to restrict gun ownership and the ability to get guns. We were voting on them all the time. I began to say, what are we doing prosecutionwise with the laws we have? I began to inquire in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. In 1997 when Attorney General Janet Reno or the division chief, or the head of the ATF came up, I began to ask questions.

If you can see this chart, you begin to see concerns come from. Going along in the 1990s, in 1992 and 1993, there were 3,700 and 3,800 gun prosecutions per year. They began to drop off 20 percent. By 1996, they had fallen 20 percent, and by 1997, 20 percent. We began to ask questions about that and push this issue with the Attorney General. I raised it every time she came before the committee with her staff people. I think maybe that or other things happened that began to show concerns. We started moving up a little bit. By 2000, we were back up to 6,000 gun prosecutions.

President Bush campaigned on it. When John Ashcroft came up for his confirmation, I reminded him of the promise the President had made. I asked Attorney General Ashcroft: Will you make prosecution of gun crimes a high priority by the U.S. Department of Justice? He said: Yes, sir, I will. Now we have Attorney General Gonzales. Look at these numbers; they have doubled and have tripled. We have 11,000 prosecutions per year now. Many of those carry significant time in jail. If a person carries a fully automatic weapon—a MAC-11 or a machine gun of some kind—during a drug trafficking offense, the penalty they suffer is 30 years in jail without parole. We saw that happen all over Miami. People were shooting. There were gang wars, with machine guns that were used to shoot people down.

These tough laws that were passed in the early 1980s cracked down. Now you don’t see machine guns among drug dealers. In fact, because of these prosecutions, we are seeing fewer and fewer machine guns among drug dealers carrying guns and fewer other criminals carry guns because they know if they get caught, they will be sent to Federal jail without parole for a long time.

I want to talk about that. Somewhere along in 1998, 1999, or 2000, we had before the Judiciary Committee the testimony of a very impressive U.S. attorney from Richmond, appointed by the Clinton administration. He was an African American. He had developed what he called Project Exile. I called it “Project Trigger Lock with Steroids.” It was a better plan than I had developed. He believed if you utilize these laws aggressively, you could save lives. He said we need our community dying in shootouts and criminal fights, he believed, unnecessarily. So he started this project.

He put up billboards that said: You use a gun, we will send you off for a long period of time. You will be exiled. You will go off to a Federal jail. You don’t get to go to the county jail. You will go off to the Federal jail, 10 years without parole, 20 years without parole, depending on the offense. He had some dramatic results from that project.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will be pleased, I say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Project Exile in Richmond, which the Senator referenced, in Richmond was a fascinating demonstration, as I think the Senator is pointing out, that when you arrest a person for holding up a 7-Eleven—he went in with a baseball bat; this is true evidence—when he was being questioned as to why he used a bat instead of a gun in the commission of a crime, he said, Because if I use a gun in the commission of a crime, I do time in a Federal jail, just as the Senator has spoken to. So he chose the baseball bat as his weapon and not the firearm. That happened in Richmond under Project Exile.

Mr. SESSIONS. I could not agree more. The U.S. attorney in Philadelphia was aggressive on some of these cases, and they would make a big bust and arrest the State enforcement and Federal officers. The criminals did not want to go to the Federal court. They were afraid they would go there and sort them out, and the ones who had the guns would be the ones sent to the Federal court, and they would get tough time.

Here are some of the numbers that occurred on Project Exile. From 2000 to 2003, Federal gun crime prosecutions nationally increased 68 percent. There is this perception that Republican administrations, because they are dubious and concerned about enroaching controls on the right of lawful Americans to have guns, that they are somehow on gun issues. It is not. They do not care about people being victimized by crime.

Nothing could be further from the truth, as these numbers will show. From 2000 to 2003, Federal gun crime prosecutions increased 68 percent. Between the year 2002 and fiscal year 2003, the number of Federal firearms prosecutions nationally increased nearly 24 percent. In Colorado, for example, under their Project Exile program, Federal firearm charges between 1999 and 2003 were brought against more than 600 defendants, and in 365 of those cases that were completed, prison sentences were handed down qualifying at 18,671 months or 1,600 years.

When these prosecutions have increased, the number of crimes where a gun is used has decreased. Surprise. Between 1999 and 2000 and between 2001 and 2002, the violent crime victimization rate plunged 21 percent. Approximately 13 fewer Americans were victims of gun crime in 2001 and 2002 than in 1999 and 2000.

Project Exile began as a coordinated approach to fighting gun violence in the Richmond metropolitan area. That is where it started. It began in 1997 by a group of Federal prosecutors. They did a communitywide effort. In 1997, there were 140 homicides in Richmond. Just one year after the project was initiated, the overall murder rate dropped 36 percent, the number of firearm homicides dropped 41 percent, and robberies dropped by one-third.

In 2000, 3 years after Project Exile was implemented in Richmond, there were only 72 homicides during the year, equating to a 55 percent drop. In its first year, Project Exile achieved the following: 372 persons were indicted for Federal gun violations, 440 guns were seized, and 196 persons sentenced to an average of 55 months of imprisonment.

There are three essential elements: Federal prosecution; integrated and coordinated partnership among local, State, and Federal law agencies; outreach for community involvement; and a new public attitude where we make sure the people in the community know in advance that if they carry a gun around while they are carrying on their criminal activities, they are in big trouble.

One of the main reasons that Project Exile has been so successful is the campaign to educate citizens about the lengthy terms they would be facing. Billboards all over Richmond broadcast it: An illegal gun gets you 5 years in Federal prison. It rambled throughout the community. Police and criminals knew the stories of what was happening on the streets. The criminals would throw away guns when officers
approached. They would confess to almost anything, but they would not confess to having a gun, and they specifically referred to Project Exile. So we know it was having an impact.

There are a number of important laws that have been passed in the last several years on the Federal level that allow proper focus on criminal use of firearms. What I want to say is real simple. I don’t want to overstate all of this, but it is significant. The simple fact is, it is not how many laws we pass, it is whether we pass some convoluted law about this, that, or the other in Federal laws. It is whether we are allowing the gun prosecutions to drop 20 percent or whether they have gone up from under 4,000 to almost 12,000, three times.

If we maintain aggressive, systematic prosecution of dangerous criminals who carry firearms and they are sent to jail for long periods of time, we will protect the public. That is what I am saying. These other things make life more difficult for lawful gun owners and implicate, sometimes improperly, the constitutional right to keep and bear arms. But the real power of reducing crime, making our streets safer, resides in effective prosecution of these cases.

I could not be more pleased to see some of the good numbers we are getting in terms of reducing crime.

Look what is happening in States. It further amplifies what I have said. The overall homicide rate in jurisdictions that have the most severe restrictions on firearms purchases and ownership-let’s look at this. Let’s look at the homicide rate on the States that have the toughest firearm purchase laws, States that make it the hardest to buy a firearm: California, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Washington, DC. Their homicide rate is 23 percent higher than the rest of the country.

The Federal Gun Control Act of 1968 imposed unprecedented restrictions on gun manufacturers, dealers, and owners. However, in the 5 years after its enactment, the national homicide rate averaged 50 percent higher than in the 5 years before the bill was enacted. The national homicide rate was 75 percent higher 10 years after the enactment of the Federal Gun Control Act, and 81 percent higher after 15 years. So passing a law that is not effectively prosecuted, selectively prosecuted, to the extent the criminals know you mean business—does not mean anything. You end up with just restrictions, regulations, costs, and burdens on honest Americans.

I have offered legislation—I am having a hard time getting any cosponsors on the Democratic side, but I think the Federal crack cocaine laws tend to be too tough, and they tend to fall disproportionately on African Americans. I think we ought to fix it and do something about it. I have proposed and written legislation and offered it more than once to do just that.

I am not here as one who believes locking people up and throwing away the key is the answer to fighting crime, but it is a big part of fighting crime that people receive substantial punishment if they represent a danger to the community or if they commit a serious crime.

Look at the incarceration rates: From 1980 to 1994, the 10 States with the greatest increase in prison population averaged a decrease of 13 percent in violent crime, while the 10 States with the smallest increase in prison population averaged a 55-percent increase in violent crime.

They say lock everybody up. Everybody does not shoot someone. There is only a small number of people in this country who have the maliciousness, the violent nature, or the hostility or meanness to go around shooting somebody. The more of those you can identify, the more of those you lock up, you can reduce the violent crime rate. You can make our communities safer and protect innocent Americans from that kind of activity. It is just as plain as night and day.

If you put violent criminals behind bars and keep them there, good things can happen. In 1997, 160,000 criminals who were placed on probation committed 44,000 violent crimes during their probation. A fourth of them committed a violent crime while they were out on probation. Twenty-one percent of the persons involved in the felonious killing of law enforcement officers during the last decade were on probation or parole at the time they murdered a police officer.

Some say if you really like police officers, you will vote against this bill because somehow this bill has something to do with protecting police officers from being murdered. Police officers are not telling me if one of their brothers or sisters is killed by a criminal that the prison system is safe. They are saying they want the criminal convicted and prosecuted. They believe if more criminals were prosecuted aggressively and fewer were given parole and probation early, then more police officers would be alive and healthy today. This is what we need to do.

I want to share this story on this general subject. It came to my attention recently, in June of this year, Laura Canary, a former Dothan police officer, presented a story to the Montgomery, Ala., the Middle District of Alabama, presides over 23 counties in the southwestern part of the State as a Federal law officer, and she works with others. She was presented a national award for most improved gun violence program.

I saved this release and would like to share it with you because it is emblematic of what we can do to save lives, protect the innocent, and reduce crime in America.

She calls their program Alabama ICE. It emphasizes cooperation among Federal, State, and local law agencies. They developed in the region an effective task force, a task force to combat gun crimes. The task force developed a training program and a case preparation technique plan. It produced significant results.

Look at this. Federal gun prosecutions in the middle district of Alabama tripled in fiscal year 2003 over fiscal year 2002. Three times as many were prosecuted. And the number of gun crime matters referred for prosecutions increased 257 percent in that same period. Between 2000 and 2003, the number of gun prosecutions in the middle district has increased 513 percent.

She obviously taught Attorney General Ashcroft’s injunctions and directions to heart, a fact mentioned by Attorney General Ashcroft in his keynote address.

According to local officials, these efforts—local officials, not the U.S. attorney—have had a measurable effect on violent crime. In calendar year 2003, there was a 42-percent reduction in criminal homicides in the city of Montgomery over the previous year, 2002, a 42-percent reduction in the number of people murdered in the city of Montgomery.

Montgomery Police Chief John Wilson, whom I have known for quite a number of years, and who has been a professional in his career, who was an early partner in this effort, Alabama ICE task force, said:

Alabama ICE is the only new program we implemented during this time period which targets violent crime in our city. I believe that the key to making a significant reduction in the number of violent offenses. Without this program, these criminals would still be in our community committing crimes.

And, I would add, murdering people.

Local Alabama ICE task force members also expressed their reactions to the program and the award. Chief Anthony Everage of the city of Troy, a medium or smaller city than Dothan, said:

I think this is an excellent example of what can be accomplished through a joint effort by the United States Attorney’s Office on the Middle District. Ms. Canary presented this very effective program along with a plan of action to our agency and the implementation has and will continue to make Troy a safer place.

“When Alabama ICE was implemented in Dothan, it was as though someone threw a large rock into still waters. The ripple effect shuddered through the criminal culture almost overnight. The word is out, get caught committing a crime while holding a gun and you’re done. Even Johnny Cochran can’t get you off,” said Dothan Police Chief John White.

Actually, Johnny Cochran supported this effort and warned that people who commit crimes with guns suffer serious Federal time, because he knew innocent people’s lives are at stake.

District Attorney Randall Houston of the 19th Judicial Circuit of Autauga, Elmore, and Chilton Counties joined.

Working with Federal prosecutors has expanded our charging options and our ability to lock up the most dangerous criminals in our community. We blamed the award because of the effectiveness of our partnership in combating crime.
Sheriff Jay Jones of Lee County said:
This award represents the positive result of criminal justice agencies on Federal, State, and local levels working in concert to confront and effectively reduce the incidents of gun violence.

Is that not what it is all about, reducing gun violence?

Actual, measurable reductions in violent gun crimes have occurred in all of the fine programs implemented throughout the United States. All of those the programs in the Middle District, administered under the direction of U.S. Attorney Leura Canary, was chosen as one of the best. It puts an exclamation point on the work that so many law enforcement agencies in central Alabama do each day to provide for the safety of the public.

Sheriff Jimmy Abbett of Tallapoosa County said:
Alabama ICE has been very beneficial to our department in the successful arrest and convictions of persons in our area. The U.S. attorney has provided a willingness to work with local agencies. The program has provided local law enforcement agencies another tool to take the habitual criminals off the street.

That is what it is all about. Violent crime rates have reached the lowest level in over the last 50 years. In 1995 the crime rate went up steadily into the 1990s into the early 1990s to the mid-1970s. In 15 years the murder rate doubled in this country. President Reagan came in and we saw about 20 percent reduction. Then that flattened out during the crack cocaine years and then in the 1990s we began to see this go down.

One of the reasons is the Project Exile program that began in 1997 and is now spreading all over the country, which focuses on the criminal use of firearms. Whereas I am proud to review the Senator yield for a question?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will take a moment to talk about the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SESSIONS. I hope the Senator is not too disturbed with me. I noticed in the New York Times today they had my picture in there and they described it as that of Senator Reed. It probably will only cost 50,000 to have his home in the State. But it was not my fault and if the Senator sees anybody, sue the New York Times.

Mr. REED. Reclaiming my time, I say to my distinguished friend and dear friend from Alabama, I am not perturbed. I just fear for his safety, and I thank him.

Mr. President, we have heard over the course of the last few days numerous homilies about personal responsibility. This is the right approach, this legislation says everyone is responsible except for gun manufacturers, gun dealers, and gun trade associations.

There has been a discussion about the law. If one breaks a law they should be punished, but such discussions fail to capture the fact that we have essentially two systems with our legal system. There is the system of laws, the statutes, the ordinances that are passed by legislative bodies such as criminal jeopardy. This is the civil law: the criminal law and the civil law.

The Senator from Alabama went on at length about how we can enforce criminal laws more effectively; we can do good things with respect to criminal law enforcement. But I think we are ignoring the sense that there exists also this civil law, where people can go to court if they have been injured and seek redress.

What this legislation would do is prevent many Americans who have been injured from going to court and seeking redress, either some type of compensation or some type of equitable remedy.

It is important that we recognize this bill will deny a voice to many people, modest people, who have been injured and who seek redress.

I was trying to think of a somewhat mundane example about these different kinds of responsibilities. Since this legislation talks about, well, if a particular statute is violated, one will be liable, but there is this intersection of obligations both under the criminal law and statutes and under the general principles of civil law.

I simply think of there is some jurisdictions that make it a violation of the law to operate a cell phone in one’s hand while they drive, and if one had an accident in that circumstance and someone is injured, the person could be prosecuted for violating the law, but they also could be sued because they have an obligation and duty to pay full attention as they drive. In other jurisdictions without this law, one could not be criminally punished and sued but, of course, they could be sued.

Here is what essentially this legislation does in lots of respects. It says we are disregarding those instances where one has a duty to someone under the law. We will proceed with their suit if there is a criminal violation or a statutory violation, a violation of regulations, but for the vast number of other responsibilities we owe to each other, that are defined for the civil law, one will not have the opportunity to go to court.

Essentially, what we have said is we all have these obligations and responsibilities, except this now special, privileged class of gun manufacturers, gun dealers, and gun associations.

There is the presumption that has been persistent throughout that the law of the United States in general does not recognize any type of obligation if there is a criminal intervention, if a criminal gets involved in proximity to the injury. As I mentioned before, the black letter law of this country that is established in the restatement of torts clearly says if there is a criminal intervention, one can still be held liable for negligence if they fail to perform their duty, even if in the chain of action of causation there is a criminal act. So this notion that we are charging these gun dealers and gun manufacturers with the crimes of another, a bad person or criminal, is without substance.

What Senator LEVIN said so eloquently and others said so eloquently talking about his amendment, is this about the responsibility of the manufacturer, the gun dealer, and the gun associations to fulfill their duties to the general public and to specific individuals who have been harmed: the duty to secure weapons, the duty to act reasonably, the duty to look beyond the superficial aspects of someone coming into a store.

We have seen classic examples: The fellow who walks in with the girlfriend and picks out 12 weapons, gives her...
cash, she pays for it. It is so suspicious that the operator of the gun store calls ATF and says, well, I got the money, they got the guns, but watch out for them. That was the circumstance that led to a chain of causation to the serious criminal activity of two New Jersey officers. That gun dealer had an obligation to avoid straw purchases. He did not even follow the standards of the industry in terms of being careful of selling multiple guns to some person under those circumstances.

So it is not about the crimes of others being attributed to gun dealers and gun manufacturers. It is not about social conditions that are being excused by these suits. It is about whether an individual had a duty to another person who was injured and failed to carry out that duty.

One of the major reasons we are here, taking very radical action to change 200 years of legal history in the United States, taking the radical action of going into 50 States and saying, We don’t care about your laws—the General Assembly of Rhode Island, the General Assembly of North Carolina, of Alabama—they care about your laws, we don’t care that for 200 years, you specified the standards for negligence in your State, we are changing them for these special people. We don’t care that your courts should have the right to determine the rights of your citizens who have been harmed. We don’t care about that. And we are doing it for a very narrow, defined group of individuals. This is a radical departure from the standards we have adopted and abided by for 200 years.

The pretext for all of this is that there is this huge crisis with respect to manufacturers that threatens their existence, that they are financially on the ropes, that these suits are numer-ous and literally driving them to bankruptcy.

Where are the facts? The facts that we can establish from the public filings of certain companies suggest that there is no crisis at all. This is a manufactured crisis. This is a pretext to do the bidding, I believe, of the gun lobby. If you look at the facts as reported, there is no financial crisis that is apparent.

Yesterday, my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, read a letter from the president and chief executive officer of Smith & Wesson that talked about or tried to explain their filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, their 10-Q filing, and concluded with a stirring passage about the necessity, the criticality of this legislation to Smith & Wesson. It gave the suggestion, of course, that my discussion of their financial reports was somehow inaccurate. So we wrote back, and I got their 10-Q report, which was filed on March 10, 2005, for the period January 31 to March 10. It was filed, let me say, March 10, 2005.

They go on to describe these suits, as generally is done. They conclude:

We monitor the status of known claims and the product liability accrual, which in-cludes amounts for defense costs for asserted and unasserted claims. While it is difficult to forecast the outcome of these claims, we be-lieve, after consultation with litigation counsel, it is uncertain whether the outcome of these claims will have a material adverse effect on our financial position, results of op-erations, or cash flows.

They are not quite certain whether those cases will cripple them. They go on to say:

We believe that we have provided adequate reserves for defense costs.

They go on and say further:

We do not anticipate material adverse judgments and intend to vigorously defend ourselves.

They went on to say, and we said this before on the Senate floor:

In the nine months ended January 31, 2006, we incurred $2,135 in defense costs, net of amounts receivable from insurance carriers, relative to product liability and municipal litigation.

That is $4,500, basically, out-of-pocket costs they have received from reimbursements from insurance companies. That is the nature of insurance: You pay the premium; if something happens, you get reimbursed.

During this period, we paid no settlement fees relative to product liability cases. As a result of our regular review of our product li-ability claims—looking at these claims we talked about here as straining their ability to be competitive and to survive—we were able to reduce our reserves by $296,022 for the nine months ended January 31, 2005. This is such a perilous threat to a company like Smith & Wesson that they are actually reducing the reserves they have on hand to handle these claims.

Again, this is not a crisis. Again, their own data suggest—this from their Web site. This is 2001. These are the industry municipal cases pending or on appeal: 32 and 10 in 2001; in 2002, 26 and 8; 2003, 20 and 5; 2004, 13 and 4; 2005, 4 in industry municipal cases pending and 2 product liability cases pending against Smith & Wesson.

The curve is going the wrong way for a crisis. It is going down: four, and two pending cases. It suggests that the courts are doing their job, that the present system we have in place is actually handling these cases pretty well. There is no flood of cases coming over the transom. In fact, this is exactly consistent with their reduction of the reserves for liability because it appears that the court cases are not increasing. It appears that the system is working pretty well right now. Yet we are here today debating legislation that will deny the rights of individual citizens to go to court, rights they have enjoyed for 200 years in this country, rights that stem not from the actions of criminal third parties but from the failure of the individual defendants to act appropriately and in their duty with respect to the general public and specific individuals.

It is the same with respect to other companies for which we have public records. Many of these companies are privately held. Beretta USA is domiciled in the United States, but it is a subsidiary of an Italian corporation which is privately held, and they are not publicly reporting. But all of this suggests again—that Smith & Wesson but with Sturm, Ruger—that there is no material adverse impact reflected by these individuals in their reporting under the pain of penalty for perjury under the Securities and Exchange Commission.

There is not a general record of claims and legal cases which goes to suggest that these suits are not an epidemic. As we have indicated before, from 1993 to 2003, 57 suits were filed against the gun industry, out of an estimated 10 million tort suits. I am not good at math, but that is way below 1 percent. This is not an epidemic. This is not a crisis. Certainly this is not a crisis that is going to threaten our national security.

We have heard claims that the gun industry is being forced to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. The alleged litigation costs have risen in $25 million increments. In fact, I think they have risen since we started this debate, from what I have heard, without any kind of factual data to support them. They are just claims that they are spending all of this money. In fact, if you look at these SEC reports, it hardly adds up to $25 million. It seems, based on Smith & Wesson, that reflecting the declining cases they are actually reducing their reserves and potentially, hopefully, reducing what they have in pocket. But their estimates go up and grow. In 2004, it was $150 million in July. In November 2004, other estimates, $175 million. Now it is up to $200 million. I think I heard in this debate $250 million. No substantiation, no documents, no data.

This is not a crisis. Yet we have displaced the Defense bill to take up this legislation. We have displaced other legislation that could be extremely valuable in order to take up this legislation. Because there is no crisis—Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. First, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his leadership on this issue. The Senator from Rhode Island is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I think it raises some questions and bears repeating that we left the Department of Defense authorization bill, which was on the floor of the Senate, the bill for our Department of Defense that covers our
soldiers and their families, buys the necessary equipment so they can execute the war successfully and come home, with amendments pending relative to payments to widows and orphans for soldiers who died in the line of duty, with amendments pending to provide additional assistance to Totally disabled veterans, with an amendment pending that would have provided additional compensation to members of the Guard and Reserve who happen to work for the Federal Government and are activated.

I would like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, can the Senator from Rhode Island tell me, before we moved to this special interest legislation to protect the gun industry manufacturers and dealers from personal responsibility for their wrongdoing, would the Senate from Rhode Island describe for those following the debate what was on the floor of the Senate when the Republican leadership decided to move to this bill?

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his question. There were a series of extraordinarily important questions with respect to the quality of life for our soldiers and their families: childcare amendments, amendments with respect to veterans health care, amendments that applied not only to active-duty personnel but their dependents. We had passed legislation already, an amendment that would increase the number of up-armored HMMWVs to be provided to our soldiers. That stands in abeyance until we finish the legislation.

There were important inducements for additional service and enlistment that are necessary to meet the growing and real crisis in recruiting military personnel. If you want to talk about a crisis, it is a crisis, the fact that our Army, despite efforts, has fallen short of the recruiting goal at a time when we need every person to fill out the demand for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and the world. It is extraordinarily serious.

I don't know if I can find it, but I saw an editorial cartoon in a magazine, a newspaper, which had a picture of a hummingbird and three soldiers. The caption, if I recall it, is:

Why don't we just take a 4-week recess during this difficult time and then return to this operation afterwards?

Essentially, I think it captured the dilemma the soldiers are feeling right now. What are we doing?

As Senator Enzi previously indicated, in the Army Times, they wrote of this:

Senate delays action on the defense bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have two articles printed in the Record, one from the Hill and the other from the Army Times, which talk about this issue of leaving the Defense bill and also the topic of gun procurement of weapons because of this legislation.

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

[From The Hill, July 28, 2005]

FRIST: LAWSUITS THREATEN GUN SUPPLY

(By Roxana Tiron)

Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) interrupted debate on the 2006 defense authorization bill to consider legislation to block lawsuits against manufacturers, saying that “frivolous” litigation could leave the Defense Department without a U.S. source for sidearms.

Despite Frist’s alarming claims, the military is not currently facing any shortage of small arms, according to Pentagon officials. American gun manufacturers supply the military with billions of dollars worth of small arms, which includes a broad variety of firearms from pistols to machine guns. The weapons are worth even more when amortized over the special features such as optical sights are included.

The U.S. firearms industry has been facing repeated lawsuits, an attempt to hold manufacturers liable when guns that were sold lawfully are subsequently misused by criminals, explained Lawrence Keane, senior vice president and general counsel for the National Shooting and Sports Association, a nonprofit organization representing the firearms industry.

The Senate is considering a new version of a gun-liability measure that was effectively killed by its own supporters last year. Sponsored by Sen. Larry Craig (R-Idaho), the measure would void liability actions against manufacturers, dealers and importers of firearms and ammunition in any state or federal court.

In April, the Supreme Court of Columbia Court of Appeals ruled that any victim of a shooting in the District could sue the industry, which Keane said would make gun manufacturers “absolutely absurd” liable for criminal shooting in D.C. Beretta USA, the manufacturer of the M9 pistol, the standard firearm for the armed forces, expressed concern that a single jury ruling in the District could bankrupt the company.

“Every criminal shooting in the district gives rise to a suit against the industry, and these are the types that need to be stopped,” Keane said.

“Without this legislation it is probable the American manufacturers of legal firearms will go out of business, ending a critical source of supply for our armed forces, our police and our citizens,” Frist said.

Frist’s decision to push the gun-liability measure comes amid an Army review of more than a half-dozen requests for proposals for new small arms. In fact, the Army has extended the request for six months to allow more companies to compete and included the Marine Corps’ requests, according to an Army spokesperson.

While the Defense Department refused to comment on “speculative legislation,” an Army spokesperson said the Army currently is not experiencing any problems with the supply of its sidearms. The Army is the purchasing agent for most services’ sidearms; some exceptions exist for special-operations forces.

Army leaders are revamping their small arms inventories to be better suited to the kind of guerrilla wars being fought in Iraq. The Army spokesperson has not had any problems buying these weapons, although the spokesperson acknowledged that because the Defense Department is the largest gun purchaser, it has a “relevant hypothesis” for Frist’s arguments.

“These frivolous suits threaten our ability to make next year’s pots,” Frist said. “Many support this legislation, and I am hopeful that with the cooperation of members we can complete all action on this legislation before the recess.”

Frist used the gun-liability legislation in part as a strategy to divert attention from amendments related to detainees and the Pentagon’s base closures and realignments. The Bush administration opposes those amendments.

Keane argued that the liability bill still allows manufacturers to be sued if they violate any laws governing gun sales.

“There is nothing in the legislation that prevents the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau from enforcing the gun-control act because a dealer has violated regulations,” he said.

According to Keane, the gun industry has spent at least $235 million on lawsuits in the past 10 years and small companies such as Charco 2000 have filed for bankruptcy because of lawsuit expenses. Both Beretta and Sigarms, the two top suppliers to the military have been sued numerous times.

“If [a company] like Beretta, which has been sued, is driven out of business, it will not be able to fulfill [its] contractual obligations,” to the military, Keane said. He argued that the sharpshooting legislation should pose immediate concern to the Defense Department.

The firearms (buying) system hasn’t “collapsed,” said the spokesperson.

Beretta recently signed a contract to supply 18,744 M9 semiautomatic pistols to the U.S. Air Force with an option to purchase an additional 5,190 pistols.

The M9 pistol is produced by Beretta USA headquarters in Acacoke, Md., where it has been made for 20 years. The Air Force plans to buy 34,374 M9s between 2004 and 2007 at a price of $9 million to $10 million over Air Force budget projections. Meanwhile, the Army is planning to buy $8 million worth of modifications to the M9 and M11, which is produced by Beretta, between 2004 and 2007.

The Navy is planning to buy 1,069 M11s through 2011 at a total cost of $722,000 and to spend $5.6 million on modifications to the M9 Pistols, which are supposed to be completed this year.

According to Hoovers, a business-information service, Beretta’s revenue is estimated at $72.7 million annually.

Another major gun manufacturer, Smith & Wesson, which provides firearms to law-enforcement agencies, filed a suit in U.S. District Court and Exchange Commission that it is expecting its sales to reach $124 million this year, 5 percent higher than last year.

[From the Army Times, July 26, 2005]

SENATE DELAYS ACTION ON DEFENSE BILL

(By Rick Maze)

Senate Republican leaders decided Tuesday that a gun manufacturers’ liability bill is more important than next year’s $411.6 billion defense authorization bill.

With Democrats expressing amazement that there could be any higher legislative priority than that of securing funds for the war, Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-Tenn., the Senate Republican leader, decided Tuesday that a bill protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits over the illegal use of firearms was a higher priority.

The decision came after Republican leaders failed to muster the 60 votes needed to prevent amendments not strictly related to the defense budget from being offered to the defense bill.

In a count of 50-48, seven Republicans joined Democrats in voting not to restrict debate on amendments related to detainees and the Pentagon’s base closures and re-alignments. The Bush administration opposes those amendments.

Keane argued that the liability bill still allows manufacturers to be sued if they violate any laws governing gun sales.

“There is nothing in the legislation that prevents the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Bureau from enforcing the gun-control act because a dealer has violated regulations,” he said.

According to Keane, the gun industry has spent at least $235 million on lawsuits in the past 10 years and small companies such as Charco 2000 have filed for bankruptcy because of lawsuit expenses. Both Beretta and Sigarms, the two top suppliers to the military have been sued numerous times.

“If [a company] like Beretta, which has been sued, is driven out of business, it will not be able to fulfill [its] contractual obligations,” to the military, Keane said. He argued that the sharpshooting legislation should pose immediate concern to the Defense Department.

The firearms (buying) system hasn’t “collapsed,” said the spokesperson.

Beretta recently signed a contract to supply 18,744 M9 semiautomatic pistols to the U.S. Air Force with an option to purchase an additional 5,190 pistols.

The M9 pistol is produced by Beretta USA headquarters in Acacoke, Md., where it has been made for 20 years. The Air Force plans to buy 34,374 M9s between 2004 and 2007 at a price of $9 million to $10 million over Air Force budget projections. Meanwhile, the Army is planning to buy $8 million worth of modifications to the M9 and M11, which is produced by Beretta, between 2004 and 2007.

The Navy is planning to buy 1,069 M11s through 2011 at a total cost of $722,000 and to spend $5.6 million on modifications to the M9 Pistols, which are supposed to be completed this year.

According to Hoovers, a business-information service, Beretta’s revenue is estimated at $72.7 million annually.

Another major gun manufacturer, Smith & Wesson, which provides firearms to law-enforcement agencies, filed a suit in U.S. District Court and Exchange Commission that it is expecting its sales to reach $124 million this year, 5 percent higher than last year.
of deceased service members, along with other issues.

With Congress planning to leave town Friday for a one-month break, debate on S. 397, Protections for Commerce in Firearms Act, is expected to last two or three days, and then Senate leaders plan to take up an energy bill, an estate tax reform bill and an Interior Department funding bill that would include a $1.5 billion bailout attached for veterans’ health care programs, leaving no time until September to get back to the defense bill.

The House approved its version of the defense bill in May and has been waiting for the Senate to catch up to begin negotiations with the Bush administration on a final version.

Delay in the Senate is partly a result of senators spending three weeks this spring debating federal judicial nominations before reaching a compromise on President Bush’s nominees.

It all points toward a difficult autumn. When the Senate returns in September from its month long summer recess, it will need to consider recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, due to finish its work by Sept. 8, and begin deliberations on the John Roberts to the Supreme Court vacancy left by retiring Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

Mr. DURBIN. I will ask a question through the Chair. The Senator from Rhode Island has been speaking about the lack of emergency, the lack of crisis in the gun industry, and the fact that this is certainly not an emergency legislation—I don’t believe it is even wise legislation for us to consider. The Senator from Rhode Island is a graduate of West Point and a former officer in the U.S. Army. I would like to ask the Senator, who serves on the Armed Services Committee, as he has read these Army Times articles which raise questions about why the U.S. Senate would give up on the Department of Defense authorization bill for our troops, leave it behind and move to this bill, the special interest bill to protect the gun industry from their liability for their own negligence because they would like to ask the Senator, what kind of impact can this have on the morale of the men and women who read about the Senate leaving this important legislation?

Mr. REED. I think at a minimum it puzzles them why we would shift from their concerns, which are so central to our national security and so central to the families of America, to move to a bill that is so narrowly focused on a special interest group and does not help in any terms of anything we might do on this bill.

Perhaps it is summed up. I have located the cartoon. It is as I described before—a group of soldiers in a humvee, and the caption is:

I move we adjourn for 5 weeks and take up this contentious issue after the summer recess.

Frankly, no one in our military has the option of adjourning for 5 weeks to take up contentious issues after that time.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator from Rhode Island will further yield for a question to the Chair, I wish to make sure those following the debate understand what this bill does. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, who has followed this issue more closely than any other Senator on our side of the aisle, is my understanding correct that if this is enacted into law, as a result of this legislation, if you are a gun dealer and someone you knew or should have known was in a drug gang, a criminal, a drug trafficker, someone who is likely to misuse that gun, use it for criminal purposes, that this bill says that the victims of the violence from that purchaser cannot hold the gun dealer responsible for his negligence in selling this gun to someone they knew or should have known was going to misuse it and create victims, tragic victims, in their community?

Mr. REED. The legislation generally bars all suits involving negligence and restricts the exemption to some categories of specific violations of Federal law which arguably, in your hypothetical, it would not reach. The only exception, to be fair to the legislation, that might allow someone to go to court under the concept of negligent entrustment, which as drafted in the legislation it is subject to suspect, know that the person would use the weapon illegally, and that person has to use the weapon. But most commonly what happens is there is a straw purchaser, so the negligent entrustment argument doesn’t work because they would prove to a jury that person had knowledge that person; it is given to a third party.

But I think the Senator’s comment is exactly right. There are so many cases where this legislation has been carefully crafted to prevent people going to court, and the best examples are the ones of which we are already aware. The sniper case in Washington, DC, where a young teenager walked into a shop, shoplifted apparently a 3-foot assault weapon which was used to murder two police officers in the District of Columbia. That suit would be prevented by this legislation; in addition, the case of the straw purchaser and the police officer in New Jersey, prevented by this legislation. We have a case pending now where an individual, a young man, was killed by a weapon that was taken out of a factory, and the gun manufacturer would be exempt, immune from liability, even though he had no background checks on his potential criminals and drug addicts, he had no security devices and, in fact, missed any rudimentary standard of care that most reasonable people would say is associated with running a gun factory.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island another question, through the Chair. If someone owned a daycare facility and hired, without any background check and without adequate investigation, an employee with a long criminal record of who had been hired to do a job and this person to work in a daycare center and that employee then harmed one of the children at the daycare center, I think the Senator from Rhode Island and I would agree that many would argue that daycare center was negligent, it had a responsibility it did not meet, and that this daycare center should be held responsible, even in court, for the harm that came to the child.

The example that the Senator from Rhode Island used was a gun manufacturer, who hired employees with long criminal records, including felonies, that had guns stolen out of the manufacturing plant by some of these employees with criminal records, and the guns were then used on the street to harm innocent people.

In the second example we have used— not the daycare center but the gun manufacturer—this bill would say you can sue the daycare center because they didn’t do a background check on the employee who molested the children, but you can’t hold the gun manufacturer liable for hiring employees with criminal records on the street and killing innocent children.

Mr. REED. That is exactly right, in my reading of the legislation. There are certain jurisdictions that have specific laws with respect to background checks on daycare centers. The gun industry is virtually unregulated, which is a very important point here. There is very little regulation deliberately on the manufactured weapon. The standards as you point out so often with respect to product safety, toy guns are regulated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, real guns are unregulated in terms of their safety. So there is no legal—very little legal statutory requirement. So it depends upon claims of negligence to get at this harm and to redress the harm caused, and this bill essentially wipes out that civil liability under our court system.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island because I think it is a critical point, how many other businesses in America enjoy this exemption from liability, how many other businesses, producers of goods or services are held harmless for their own negligence and wrongdoing in courts of law across America? How many other businesses would have this special interest legislation that is being considered and may be passed by this Chamber?

Mr. REED. Virtually no other. Comments were made on the floor with respect to legislation passed back in 1994 with respect to general aviation. I think it is important at this juncture to clarify that. There was very limited legislation that applied to general aviation aircraft, 18 years or older, in terms of liability because of the concern about the manufacturing base. But there is a distinct difference between this legislation and the General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994.

There is no more highly regulated industry than the aviation industry. Every time an engine is worked
on, there has to be a log entry made which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration. It is the most detailed legislative scheme we have in place perhaps because the safety of the passengers, all of us, is at stake. So giving a limited grant of immunity to an industry that is so highly regulated is quite different than telling an unregulated industry you have no liability. That is essentially what this bill does, with very few exceptions. Clearly, if we were to give a limited grant of immunity to the gun manufacturer who did not do a background check on his employees and the people who stood in line to buy guns, that is hardly consistent with the broad exception granted to firearm dealers. We have talked about the gun manufacturer who did not do a background check on his employees and the people who stood in line to buy guns, that is hardly consistent with the broad exception granted to firearm dealers.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask, through the Chair, if the Senator from Rhode Island who are we trying to protect, he or she?

Mr. REED. The Senator asks an important question. According to Federal data from the year 2000, 1.2 percent of gun dealers accounted for 57 percent of all guns recovered from criminal investigations. The Senator knows, from our conversations, that what is subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. DURBIN. These are the gun dealers who continue to sell these guns used in crime and we know it and we have the facts to prove it.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask, through the Chair, if the Senator from Rhode Island who are we trying to protect, he or she?
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Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask, through the Chair, if the Senator from Rhode Island who are we trying to protect, he or she?
We are coming down with a variety of different ways to deal with these criminal gangs, to investigate them, to break them up, to arrest them, to make certain they face serious sentences for intimidation of witnesses, for recruiting young people into their gangs.

I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, how can a Member stand in the Senate and say they are dedicated to stopping criminal gang activity in America and vote for a bill which allows gun dealers who have clear histories of selling repeatedly to gang members firearms that are being used to kill innocent people? How can a Member say they are against criminal gangs but are in favor of gun dealers who are providing them with their firearms?

Mr. REED. The Senator raises an excellent point. I phrase it slightly differently, but I reach the same conclusion.

If gun dealers—who now have the threat of a civil suit if there has been negligence—are so cavalier in their attitude about guns, selling them to criminals, to straw purchasers, what happens when they are fully realized or virtually immunized from any type of liability? What happens when they know that no family is going to come in and say, My son or daughter died because of your negligence, and we are going to see if we can take you to court and get something back—we will never get the child back—but something back.

What about the surviving spouse or children of someone who has maintained the quality of their life because they have lost their breadwinner?

There is the case of Conrad Johnson, killed by one of the DC snipers. Those cases would be barred by this legislation.

It is not that the individuals, families, and the survivors are denied their day in court, but any incentive to be responsible, to be scrupulous, to look harder, to determine whether the person is buying the weapon at the direction of another, as a straw purchaser, is virtually eliminated. The consequences are going to be much worse. These dealers will be more flagrant, more blatant, less restrained. It is hard to see how they could be more blatant than they are today.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask a final question. There has been a lot of discussion in the Senate about the fact there is no exception for gun dealers who sell their guns to people who turn out to be on the FBI’s Most Wanted list or those who may be involved in terrorism.

As the Senator from Rhode Island is undoubtedly aware, immediately after September 11, we raided one of the al-Qaeda headquarters in Afghanistan and discovered one of their training manuals in which they gave advice to terrorists coming to the United States about buying their firearms in the United States because it was easy to buy a gun in this country.

I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, when it comes to the exceptions in this bill, is there any exception such as the one suggested by Senator KENNEDY that would put gun dealers on notice not to sell guns to people who are on the FBI’s Most Wanted list so that we would say, you cannot get off the hook and be exonerated if you are not liable, you are responsible for wrong dealing with a weapon if you did not take the time to check the FBI’s Most Wanted list when you made that sale.

Mr. REED. The Senator is again accurate. Unless Senator KENNEDY’s amendment is voted upon, there is no prohibition against looking at the person’s picture on the FBI’s Most Wanted list, looking at the person and saying: Have a nice day. Take the gun.

Again, one could argue that if that person actually uses the weapon, it might be negligence, but if he or she is a straw purchaser or buying lots of weapons to pass out, they would escape liability.

Mr. DURBIN. I might just say, in closing, to the Senator from Rhode Island, when we traced criminal guns used in Illinois to kill people and commit serious crimes and tried to figure out where they were coming from, the largest supplier of guns to the streets of Illinois was Mississippi. In Mississippi, the enforcement of local gun laws is so relaxed and the enforcement of Federal laws is so relaxed that people could literally buy a van full of cheap “Saturday night specials,” get on the interstate highways and head north to Chicago, Springfield, and St. Louis, selling those guns on the street.

I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, is there anything in this bill which will make it more difficult for those gun traffickers to buy these guns, turn them loose on the streets to kill innocent people in my State or any State in this country?

Mr. REED. I don’t see that. In fact, I don’t see it as the purpose of the legislation. This is not about preventing criminals from getting weapons. It is preventing victims of gun violence from getting their day in court.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his questions.

The line of questioning that the Senator from Illinois has opened raises the issue: What are the exceptions? How can someone get to court if they have been harmed?

Since we have had a robust discussion, and I see the Senator from Ohio in the Senate, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, when this bill was before the Senate in the last Congress, I came to the Senate to oppose it. I opposed it because it denied certain gun crime victims, certain individuals who were victims of crimes committed by those who had guns in their day in court. It singled out a particular group of weapon victims that it treated differently than we treat any other victims in the whole country. It set them apart.

Unfortunately, the bill before the Senate is no better than the one we had last year. In fact, it is worse. Not only does it grant immunity to the gun dealers, but it grants the bill itself, the Federal, State, and local government agencies from shutting down gun dealers who violate the law. Local and State governments are responsible for ensuring that restaurants are clean, that doctors are properly licensed, stores do not sell alcohol and cigarettes to our children. Why can’t they also ensure that gun dealers and manufacturers operate responsibly? Why do we want to take that right away from them? Yet the current language of the bill before the Senate would do that.

I have great respect for the many firearms dealers and manufacturers around this country who are legitimate, honest, and hard working. The majority of dealers deal with tolerance for buyers who circumvent gun laws. These dealers are also responsible, ensuring that they have adequate inventory control systems in place so that guns do not get lost or become missing.

This bill would not help them. The responsible dealers don’t need this bill. Cases filed against responsible dealers and manufacturers who have done nothing wrong can already be tossed out if they have no merit, as any frivolous lawsuit will be tossed out in a court of law if they are filed against any manufacturer of any product or against any wholesaler or retailer of any product.

Who, then, will benefit by the passage of this bill? The people who will benefit are the irresponsible dealers and the irresponsible manufacturers.

Let me describe some cases. Every one remembers all too well the tragedies of the DC sniper cases. Some of the victims of the DC snipers sued Bull’s Eye Shooter Supply, the gun dealer that negligently allowed a Bushmaster rifle to reach the hands of Allen Mohammed and Lee Boyd Malvo. That suit was successful. In the settlement, the negligent dealer—we could have assumed he would have been found negligent in a court of law—agreed to pay the victim and their families $2.5 million.

If this bill had been in effect a few years ago, these victims would have had no recourse in court.

Perhaps we remember Danny Guzman, from Worcester, MA. On December 24, 1999, Danny Guzman was shot and killed by a gun that was taken from a factory run by Kahr Arms. Unfortunately, Kahr Arms hired Cronin, an infamous history of crack cocaine addiction and theft. Cronin was given unfettered access to the untraceable, unstempered guns in the factory. He bragged, in fact, that it was so easy to remove every gun that he “does it all the time and he could just walk out with them.”

Cronin removed one of these guns from the factory. That gun ended up on
the streets, and tragically it was used to kill Danny Guzman. Those are the essential facts.

Danny Guzman’s estate, on behalf of his widow and two young daughters, sued Kahr Arms, alleging that it operated its plant in a grossly negligent manner. In the spring of 2003, a State judge allowed that case to proceed. If this bill passes, however, the widow and children of Danny Guzman would be out of court.

As I see it, this bill cuts to the core of civil liability law and guts it. As my colleagues know, now, under current law throughout this country, the victim needs to prove the defendant acted in an unreasonable manner—basic negligence law, the law those who are lawyers learn about in the first and second year of law school. It is the law of negligence that prevails in courts of law in every type of civil case. It is not unusual. It is what it is.

Under negligence law, if the defendant failed to meet or do his duty to act in a responsible fashion, they are liable for negligence as long as that failure leads to harm to the victim. That is what is required. It is negligence. It is as simple as that. That is the standard. It is a rule of law, the common law, that dates back over 200 years in this country, a standard we inherited from the British system. So we have hundreds and hundreds of years of experience in how to apply the rules of law, the common law negligence.

This bill says that those rules will no longer apply for one set of victims. These rules that we have developed over 200 years in this country, a standard we inherited from the British system. So if they think it is such a great idea, let them come to the floor and propose that, to make it a universal law for every civil suit in the country.

I would like to talk for a moment about the language in this bill that might well prevent the Government from enforcing our gun laws against irresponsible gun dealers. This provision goes well beyond barring civil suits by private citizens who have been wronged. This provision is a new provision. It was not in last year’s bill. This provision potentially curtails the ability of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the ATF, from enforcing our gun laws that are currently on the books.

Two former ATF Directors recognize the potential harm that comes from this provision. According to Stephen Higgins, ATF Director from 1982 to 1995, and Rex Davis, ATF Director from 1970 to 1978, this broad, new language contained in this legislation in front of us today would likely prohibit the ATF from initiating proceedings to revoke a gun dealer’s license, even when that dealer supplies guns to criminals.

Let me repeat that. According to both of these former ATF Directors, this broad, new language would likely prohibit the ATF from initiating proceedings to revoke a gun dealer’s license, even when that dealer supplies guns to criminals.

So not only are we shielding these bad apples, bad actors, people who ought to not be doing business, not only are we shielding them from civil liability, now we are coming along and saying the ATF cannot enforce the law against them. What in the world are we thinking?

I think that everyone in this body can agree it is important for us to enforce gun laws that we have on the books. Why in the world is there attached a provision to this bill that would make it harder for ATF to enforce our laws and shut down wayward and dangerous gun dealers? Why in the world would we want to do this? I don’t know.

Why would we want to strip away the opportunity of a gun victim to get into court? Why do we want to do either one of those things? I guess the answer is pretty simple. This bill ties the ATF’s hands, ties the hands of private citizens, ties the hands of State and local agencies. It shields a certain group of defendants—gun manufacturers and dealers—from liability. This bill grants immunity. It overturns well over 200 years of civil law, 200 years of tort law, 200 years of common law.

If it passes, this bill would fundamentally change our justice system. It would do this by denying one group of citizens access to the court system in order to protect another group of citizens. Why in the world are we about to do this? The only reason I can think of is because there are the votes here to do it. There is the power to do it. It can be done. One group in the country can get it done, can get it done.

Now, Mr. President, I can count. I know how this vote is going to turn out. But that still does not make it right. Just because there are votes to pass this legislation does not mean it is right. Just because one can do so is not the reason we give to the victims, or for the American people.

I said this last year, and I will say it again. I will make a prediction about this bill. I will make a prediction about the effect it will have on this group of victims. Yes, the passage of this bill will get rid of some frivolous lawsuits. There is no doubt about that. We could get rid of a lot of frivolous lawsuits in this country by prohibiting access to the courthouse. There will be lawsuits that will never be filed because of this bill. That is true. There is no doubt about that.

But, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, mark my words: If this bill passes, in the future there will be a case, or cases, that will be so egregious, so bad, that it will sicken your stomach, and Members of this Senate will read about it, and Members of this Senate will look up from their paper, or will look up from the evening news, and will say: I didn’t do that. I didn’t intend for that victim not to be able to go into court. I didn’t intend for that child, that man, that woman not to be able to sue that defendant. Oh, I never intended that.

There will be that case, and that day will come. And whether it is a terrorist who is the defendant or whether it is some horrible criminal or whether it is some horribly negligent gun dealer—whoever it is—there will be some case, and we will see it, and we will have to revote this bill. We cannot arbitrarily close the door to the courthouse and say, “You cannot come in, victim, if you are of a certain class,” and not
have injustice done. You cannot do it. That day will occur, and we will regret what we are about to do.

There is an additional aspect of this bill that has not been talked a lot about; and that is the fact that it is retroactive. It will actually kick existing cases out of court. How dare we do that. How dare we have the audacity to do that. How dare we in this Congress come to the Senate floor and wipe out every lawsuit that has been filed by any industry that would come within the parameters of this bill. How arrogant are we to do that? Did we really get elected to the Senate to tell crime victims that their case is frivolous, without ever even knowing the facts of that particular case?

We will have in front of us, in a few weeks, a Supreme Court nominee. There will be a lot of talk, as there already has been, about the separation of powers. There will be a lot of talk about judicial restraint, as well there should be reasonably will be talking about it as well.

What about legislative restraint? We do not talk much about that. We get mad here on Capitol Hill when we pass a bill and the Supreme Court says we did not power to pass that bill. I think we should remember what our role is. I do not think anyone elected us to the Senate to bar their ability to go into court—not to completely bar the door. I think it is one thing to set standards and parameters and maybe limits. You can talk about that. But to totally say, “You can’t go into court,” I think we ought to think long and hard before we do this.

If passed, this bill would kick people out of court retroactively. It would not just bar people from coming to the courthouse. Apparently, that is not enough. No. What this bill does is kick people out who are already in court. It kicks people out who have already survived the hassles and costs for summary judgment. It likely even tosses out victims who have won at trial and are defending their cases on appeal. To me, that is just plain wrong.

The courts are supposed to decide these cases. Juries are supposed to decide them. People are supposed to have their day in court. That is how our system is supposed to work. I do not think it is my job or the job of other Members of the Senate to judge these cases. It is not up to determine whether these cases should or should not proceed. It is not my job to determine whether someone is negligent or is not negligent.

I also think it is not my job to tell a victim that he or she does not have the right to go to court and present a case to a judge or a jury. People in this country are supposed to have their day in court. That is fundamentally the American way. This bill creates two classes of victims in this country. If you are injured by any industry in America, you can file a lawsuit in State court in an attempt to redress your injury. After the passage of this bill, however, if you are injured by the gun industry, you are likely out of luck.

Other industries face legal challenges. Other industries, other defendants, have had lawsuits filed against them. They will defend on behalf of their defendants, every single day in this country, face suits that in their eyes, many times, are frivolous, that they cannot stand, that they do not think are fair. But they are not here petitioning us, telling us to tell the judge to throw that case out. This bill blocks the ability of someone to sue them. Other industries are involved in cases where many people die. We understand that. We do not grant to them this kind of immunity from civil liability.

I support the second amendment. I support individuals’ rights to own guns. I support legitimate gun dealers. And I support responsible tort reform. I certainly understand there are some abuses in the system, and that sometimes Congress needs to act to prevent these abuses. For example, just recently, I voted in favor of class action reform, and we passed that legislation to modify certain class action procedures.

But what we are about to do in this Congress, in this Senate, is wrong. This bill keeps victims out of court altogether. This bill about to victim. But more important than that, it is a horrible precedent. If we do this, this time, what is to stop a future Congress—where there are the votes, maybe configured differently—from saying: “Oh, there is another group of victims, and we need to protect them, another group of victims that we are not going to protect, another group of defendants that we are going to protect, another group of victims to whom we are going to say, you can’t sue them, you can’t get your day in court.”

If we deny this group of victims in front of us today their rights, what is to stop a future Congress from denying another group of victims their rights? We need to think about this long and hard before we cast this vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the roses red upon my neighbor’s vine
Are owned by him, but they are also mine. His was the cost, and his the labor, too. But mine as well as his the joy, their loneliness to view.

They bloom for me and are for me as fair
As for the man who gives them all his care. Thus I am rich because a good man grew a rose-clad vine for all his neighbors’ view. I know from this that others plant for me, That what they own my joy may also be; So why be selfish when so much that’s fine Is grown for me upon my neighbor’s vine?

The appreciation of a good neighbor is among the most cherished, and enduring of human values. It is a value that transcends both time and space.

This value was vividly and eloquently expressed more than 2,000 years ago in the Bible which commands us in eight different passages to love our neighbors: Leviticus 19:18, Matthew 19:19, Matthew 22:39, Mark 12:31, Luke 10:27, Romans 13:9, Galatians 5:14, James 2:8. In fact, this is one of the most repeated commands in the Scripture. In other passages, the Bible tells us how to treat our neighbors, Proverbs 25:17 and Romans 15:2; and in others, it speaks against mistreating our neighbors, Deuteronomy 14:14, Exodus 20:16, Proverbs 3:29.

The appreciation of a good neighbor is also a value that knows no cultural or geographical boundaries. An old Chinese proverb, for example, maintains that “a good neighbor is a found treasure.”

In the United States, towns and states celebrate Good Neighbor Days. Acrossing the West Virginia coalfields, corporations, radio stations, and newspapers present Good Neighbor Awards. Stores and businesses proclaim “Good Neighbor Days” to promote sales. Since the early 1970s, the Federal Government has celebrated Good Neighbor Day. This year Good Neighbor Day will be observed on September 25.

The web site for the national Good Neighbor Day points out that “being good neighbors is an important part of the social fabric that makes ours a great country.” Indeed it is. Good neighbors are always there when you need them, offering a helping hand, providing comfort.

Seldom have I observed a stronger sense of neighborliness than among the coal miners in the West Virginia communities where I spent my boyhood years. Fred Mooney, a leading figure in the West Virginia coal miners in the early Twentieth Century, in his autobiography, “Struggle in the Coal Fields,” recalled how his coal-mining neighbors, although themselves quite poor, sacrificed to help him and his family with food. After he had been fired from his job and blacklisted for his union activities, Mooney explained, “This is the spirit of fellowship, love, and devotion that permeates the life of a union coal miner. He will give until it hurts and then divide the rest.”

That, Mr. President, is loving thy neighbor: “giv[ing] until it hurts” and expecting nothing in return.

We have observed the value of neighborliness following mine explosions, floods, and other disasters that have befallen on my state over the years. I will never forget how the people of Buffalo Creek, WV, came together following disaster to help the community. How they worked together and shared together while caring for and comforting each other, thus enabling themselves and their neighbors to survive that horrible tragedy. Being a good neighbor involves most often small, simple acts of kindness. The former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Tip O’Neill, liked to point
out that “all politics is local.” Being a good neighbor is also local. It begins right over the backyard fence. It involves small, simple acts of kindness, as well as dramatic gestures during catastrophic events.

A good neighbor is the friendly face who shows up with a cake or a pie at the house of a family who has a member who is ill. A good neighbor is a person who mows the lawn of the widow down the street. He may be the lawyer who is quick to pull out his tool belt when a neighbor has a busted pipe, or a mechanic who starts his neighbor’s car on a cold winter morning so he can get to work. He is a neighbor who shows up the next day to shovel your sidewalk when it snows, or rake leaves, just to make life easier for you.

Such simple acts of kindness are part of the social fabric that makes for a better community, a better country, and a better world.

I am thinking now of a neighbor who lives about 3 miles from where I live in McLean, VA. I have known him a good many years. His name is James Nobles. Jim Nobles is a neighbor who always seeks ways to help my wife Erma and to help me. Many is the time that he has come to my home and sat and talked with my wife, who has gone through a long period of illness, an illness of many years. Many times Jim Nobles has come by and sat on the front porch with Erma and talked with her. So when Erma and I have been busy or tired, Jim Nobles somehow appears at our door with a basket of food or a cake from the local Giant store. He provides transportation if we need it.

On cold winter days, often to my surprise and my delight, I have looked out the glass windows, and I have seen him out shoveling the snow from the walkway to the mailbox. I find he has already shoveled the snow off my sidewalk.

When he is able, he makes sure that my newspaper is on my porch in the morning. There it is, the Washington Post. There it is, Roll Call. There it is, The Hill. Jim Nobles gets up, comes over to my house, 3 miles from where he lives, and brings the paper to the mailbox on the sidewalk before he goes off to work. He brings the papers during the day, he stops, picks up the newspaper out there on the sidewalk near my mailbox, walks up to my door, and puts that paper down. Finally, I found this caring, good neighbor whose name I had been wishing to learn. Her name is Ms. Mary Lucas, from the Philippines. I told her this morning that I was in the Philippines 50 years ago this year. I had breakfast with the late President Magsaysay, who was later killed in a plane crash.

So there she was, a good neighbor making her way to work, doing a special favor for someone like myself and then going on, not receiving my thanks. This could have gone on a long time, as it had already gone on a long time. I finally found her and found out her name.

I must confess that at times I feel a little guilty because I am not a better neighbor. My work in the Senate, my family life, and my other responsibilities prevent me from performing the kind, neighborly acts that Mr. Nobles and Ms. Lucas have performed for me over the years. But they, in the true neighborly ways, never expressed any complaint. They never want anything in return; they never expect anything in return. They just want to be good neighbors. And they are, indeed, they are treasured.

Sometimes Jim goes on a vacation. He is retired now. He goes on a vacation. He has a place somewhere down in Virginia, perhaps 100 miles away or more from where we live. Sometimes he goes and spends a few days there at that place. Then what am I to do but go out and get the paper. I have to get up, go out and get the paper. It is not a great chore, but it is something.

But lo, to my surprise, the newspaper keeps on being delivered to my door. So for quite a while, I wondered, who is the other good neighbor who pinch-hits when Jim Nobles is away?

On two or three occasions, I have sat up just to catch one other good neighbor delivering that newspaper. I remember on one occasion I got up early and I put a little chair beside the front door and I sat there and watched, waiting for that person to walk up and deliver my newspapers. Jim Nobles was away. But, you know, that neighbor on that particular occasion didn’t come, didn’t deliver that paper.

So time has gone on, and this morning, I decided I am going to catch this neighbor this time—this good neighbor who delivers my newspaper when Jim Nobles is away on vacation. So there I sat. This time, luck was with me. I saw her come down the street, pick up the newspaper, pick up the Roll Call and The Hill. She came up to the door and knocked. But that particular day she was away. But, you know, that neighbor on that particular occasion didn’t come, didn’t deliver that paper.

A good neighbor is the friendly face who shows up with a cake or a pie at the house of a family who has a member who is ill. A good neighbor is a person who mows the lawn of the widow down the street. He may be the lawyer who is quick to pull out his tool belt when a neighbor has a busted pipe, or a mechanic who starts his neighbor’s car on a cold winter morning so he can get to work. He is a neighbor who shows up the next day to shovel your sidewalk when it snows, or rake leaves, just to make life easier for you.

Such simple acts of kindness are part of the social fabric that makes for a better community, a better country, and a better world.

I am thinking now of a neighbor who lives about 3 miles from where I live in McLean, VA. I have known him a good many years. His name is James Nobles. Jim Nobles is a neighbor who always seeks ways to help my wife Erma and to help me. Many is the time that he has come to my home and sat and talked with my wife, who has gone through a long period of illness, an illness of many years. Many times Jim Nobles has come by and sat on the front porch with Erma and talked with her. So when Erma and I have been busy or tired, Jim Nobles somehow appears at our door with a basket of food or a cake from the local Giant store. He provides transportation if we need it.

On cold winter days, often to my surprise and my delight, I have looked out the glass windows, and I have seen him out shoveling the snow from the walkway to the mailbox. I find he has already shoveled the snow off my sidewalk.

When he is able, he makes sure that my newspaper is on my porch in the morning. There it is, the Washington Post. There it is, Roll Call. There it is, The Hill. Jim Nobles gets up, comes over to my house, 3 miles from where he lives, and brings the papers off the sidewalk onto my porch. I can always tell that it is Jim Nobles because he also places the newspapers in the same fashion in the same place right there at my door. That is a good neighbor. He comes when my hedges have grown a little taller, he cuts off the hedges. He shapes them up. When there are some dead limbs on the trees in my front yard, he cuts off those dead limbs and hauls them away. That is Jim Nobles.

Sometimes Jim goes on a vacation. He is retired now. He goes on a vacation. He has a place somewhere down in Virginia, perhaps 100 miles away or more from where we live. Sometimes he goes and spends a few days there at that place. Then what am I to do but go out and get the paper. I have to get up, go out and get the paper. It is not a great chore, but it is something.
of the pertinent amendments up, with appropriate timing, and conclude.

As we stand now, as the rules require, there will be a cloture vote sometime tomorrow. I think I understand also that after that cloture vote, moving from the gun liability bill to any of the other provisions in the transportation bill—would require unanimous consent. That is another factor that should be considered. So I hope we can resolve this this evening.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague for that comment. We will be diligent in it. As you know, in the current environment, these conference reports are privileged and they can take us off the floor by the action of leadership for that consideration. That might occur later in the evening tonight. I am not sure that is the case, but that could occur.

Mr. REED. If I may say, my understanding is that once cloture is invoked, to move off the 30 hours of cloture is by a privileged motion, but by unanimous consent.

Mr. CRAIG. I don't dispute that. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank the managers of the bill for keeping the Senate advised. I have an amendment that has been filled. I think at this point I will make the motion and ask for the reaction of the managers.

Mr. CRAIG. This time, I ask unanimous consent that we lay aside the pending amendment such that my amendment No. 1625, which is on file, could be given the status of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. Under the current environment, I will object.

I do so with this concern in mind. I don't think the majority of the Senator from Virginia for the offering of his amendment. I will say that it is similar to but not exactly like the Levin amendment that we have just disposed of. It deals with the issue of negligence or reckless conduct.

There are differences, and the Senator from Virginia may wish to point those out. But it is important for the Senate to know that in their similarities, the Senate rejected overwhelmingly by the vote yet, the Senate, the issue of negligence and recklessness conduct, for it is clearly recognized now by a majority of the Senate that this would drive a major loophole through this legislation and deny the very legislation and its intent. I certainly would not want that to happen. For that purpose, I will object to laying aside the pending amendment and bringing the Warner amendment to the Senate floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my good friend for being absolutely forthright. I am fully aware of the parliamentary situation. The distinguished majority leader and the Democratic leader—to the extent that he has participated—are acting within the rules of the Senate. I do not ascribe any impropriety whatsoever to the actions in any time of the rules of the Senate. But it does put persons like myself who feel very strongly about amendments we have in a unique situation. I would like to support this bill, but I have grave reservations about this relating to the dealers, and I'd like to have my amendment considered. I will express them momentarily. But the parliamentary situation, as the Senator has explained, does not allow me the opportunity at this juncture—although I may persist by other means—to get this amendment to be given the pending status.

I inquire of the Presiding Officer if the Parliamentarian would examine amendments to determine whether it is germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. So I have before me that is clearly germane. I regret deeply that I am not able to bring it up such that I and other Senators could debate it and have a rollcall vote, which I would ask for, and if granted, we could allow each Senator to express his or her views on this amendment.

Now, the manager said that we had a debate on the Levin amendment, and I supported the goal of the Senator from Michigan. And I listened to my distinguished colleague from Ohio as he spoke on this general subject. But my amendment is quite different from the Levin amendment. The Levin amendment would cause the gun industry, as some said, to suffer a death by a thousand cuts because it would essentially gut the bill. The Warner amendment does not come anywhere near to gutting the bill.

I feel very strongly that of the gun dealers across this country, if we were able to make an assessment and evaluation, 99 percent of them are law-abiding citizens. They not only want to stay within the law, but they also do not want to be a part in any way of the use of a firearm that might be involved in a crime.

My amendment is to focus in on those dealers who have, over a period of time, experienced, again and again, the loss of firearms from their inventory. And if it can be factually established that a dealer has a record of practices that for one reason or another—probably due to negligence—enables weapons in that dealer’s inventory to find their way illegally into the hands of criminals, then that dealer should not be granted the benefits afforded this bill. Nor should such dealers be spared from a closer inquiry into why they have an established record of having guns go out of that dealership that they cannot account for.

My amendment does not affect the protection from the frivolous lawsuits that exist under this bill. My amendment only addresses that narrow category of dealers who dispose of, again and again, mismanaging their inventory in such a way that they cannot account for a large number of weapons.

More specifically, my amendment does not take away the protections which 99 percent of the gun dealers should be able to avail themselves of, the honest ones, under this bill. I don’t do that. My amendment is solely directed at those very few—I repeat, very few—dealers who have published a history of lost or stolen weapons as defined by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to regulations that my amendment would call upon the Attorney General to promulgate industry, as I said last night, would enable the industry and, most particularly, the small gun dealers to know exactly what are the regulations that should be followed to maintain that inventory and conduct their business so that weapons cannot disappear, by such disappearance, fall into the hands of criminals. That is what my amendment does. Maybe 1 percent of the dealers would be affected by this amendment. The other 99 percent are accorded the benefits of the underlying legislation.

Why can’t we in the Senate voice our opinions on this concept? Regrettably, the decision has been made that at this time the amendment cannot be, even though germane, brought up in such a way as the entire Senate can focus upon it.

My amendment is not an attempt to gut the bill. Indeed, I recognize the gun industry, as I said last night, would need some reasonable, balanced, measure of tort reform. My amendment is offered in good faith, I say to the Senate. It is not just to protect the possible victims from criminal use of a weapon, but it is to protect the law-abiding dealers.

If this legislation remains as it is now, without some type of correction, such as mine, there will undoubtedly be unintended consequences. We need look no further than our own backyard, based on the experiences we had here in the nation's capital and in adjoining Maryland and in my State of Virginia, with snipers committing wanton murder. The snipers illegally obtained a kit of a gun shop that the record shows lost over 200 weapons over a period of a year or two. If another such tragic incident were to occur with a gun dealer who had a similar record of irresponsible conduct, and that dealer was immune from lawsuits, that would cast a very negative feeling all across America toward the gun industry and the gun dealers. They would be called to task to explain why they supported a law that is to become law, that would allow that to happen.

My words are one thing, but I want to bring to the attention of the Senate
a document that I find very interesting. In my modest career in the Nation's Capital and in Virginia, I have met a number of lawyers in my time, but one whom recently passed on—I remember working with him on a number of cases, even when I was in private practice in Virginia—far back, knowing Lloyd N. Cutler, Pickering, Mr. Cutler was asked by the Brady organization and Mr. Cutler, as I remember, was President Reagan's private secretary who suffered a frightful injury at the time there was an assassination attempt against our President. He and his courageous wife in the ensuing years have been unremitting in their efforts to try and have a balance across America between the rights of those who acquire guns under the second amendment—and I strongly support the second amendment of the Constitution.

But any event, on January 15, 2004, Mr. Cutler wrote the organization which asked him to diagnose cases and the basic tenets and provisions of the legislation that is pending today. I ask unanimous consent to print portions of this opinion into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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


Mr. WILMER. Where have you requested, I have reviewed the likely effect on litigation brought against a firearms manufacturer or dealer in Johnson, et al. v. Bull's Eye Shooter Supply, et al., No. 03-2-03932-8 (Washington, D.C., January 15, 2004).

Mr. WILMER. This passage, Mr. President, again, I don't know if the Bull's Eye is still in business, but if it is, it is under a new dealer. Why? Here is the reason why. If they have been stolen, then this will be demonstrated, Mr. Craig, I do not. I was only going to respond briefly to the Senator. Mr. WARNER. Please. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, again, I don't question the sincerity or how the Senator from Virginia feels about this issue and the amendment he has offered. But I think it is important to recognize how the current law works.

It does not mean it is perfect, and it does not mean it is always effective. But the Bull's Eye arms dealership in the State of Washington, from which John Muhammad and Lee Boyd Malvo, the two snipers who terrorized Washington, Northern Virginia, and Maryland for a time, stole their firearm, had a record of repeated recordkeeping violations and, as a result of that, their license was pulled. The owner of that dealership no longer has his license.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will read the last paragraph:

Accordingly, I conclude that the Johnson case does not fall within the saving provision of the Dacshle amendment or any other saving provision of S. 1805 which would have been dismissed if S. 1805 were enacted into law.

S. 1805 is legislation from the 108th Congress that is nearly exact to the bill before us today in the Senate. The Johnson case is a case brought by the victims of the DC snipers—I repeat, the DC snipers, the serious murders about which I spoke. Those victims could not have collected had this underlying legislation before the Senate been law at that time.

Is that what this Senate wants? I don't think so. I think I, and possibly other Senators, deserve the opportunity to go into greater length with regard to that provision which does not by any means give the protection that is needed to victims should a dealer again and again have lost or stolen weapons from its inventory utilized for purposes of a crime. The bill as drafted does not give the protection we need, and I simply ask, let us impose on the Attorney General of the United States, if this legislation were to pass and remain on the books for an indeterminate period, let that Attorney General of the United States decide how best to be pulled and published a framework of regulations that would guide them in the conduct of their business such that we hope a weapon would never escape the inventory and find its way into the hands of the criminals.

I fear some day we are going to see another case. I hope not. But if we do, maybe somebody will come back and examine the record of this colloquy and this debate and reflect on the gun industry's desire to get legislation that does not proclaim publicly against the negligence and wrongful actions of a very small percentage of gun dealers, maybe at most 1 or 2 percent. That is all I ask.

I see the manager. Does the manager wish to pose a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I do not. I was only going to respond briefly to the Senator. Mr. WARNER. Please. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, again, I don't question the sincerity or how the Senator from Virginia feels about this issue and the amendment he has offered. But I think it is important to recognize how the current law works.

It does not mean it is perfect, and it does not mean it is always effective. But the Bull's Eye arms dealership in the State of Washington, from which John Muhammad and Lee Boyd Malvo, the two snipers who terrorized Washington, Northern Virginia, and Maryland for a time, stole their firearm, had a record of repeated recordkeeping violations and, as a result of that, their license was pulled. The owner of that dealership no longer has his license.

I don't know if the Bull's Eye is still in business, but if it is, it is under a new dealer. Why? Here is the reason why. If you are a licensed firearms manufacturer in the United States and all dealers keep firearms licensing—whether you are a manufacturer or a licensed dealer, you must report within 48 hours missing weapons.
Mr. WARNER. If I may make a brief reply, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island. I think the managers are working on this situation. I am glad that my amendment is part of the consideration, and I just hope it is granted. As far as this business to the Senate, I trust it to the majority leader and the Democratic leader as to what matters should be taken up at what time in relation to this bill. So I cannot make any comment on that and do not make one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. If I would not offend my distinguished friend from Rhode Island or my dear friend from Virginia, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum will be rescinded.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a vote on the measure without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. If I may make a brief reply, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island. I think the managers are working on this situation. I am glad that my amendment is part of the consideration, and I just hope it is granted. As far as this business to the Senate, I trust it to the majority leader and the Democratic leader as to what matters should be taken up at what time in relation to this bill. So I cannot make any comment on that and do not make one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. If I would not offend my distinguished friend from Rhode Island or my dear friend from Virginia, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum will be rescinded.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a vote on the measure without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, resolving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I appreciate everyone’s patience and courtesy this afternoon as we worked through this matter that took us over to the energy report. It was over to the energy report just a minute ago. It has been very difficult. It is a very contentious issue. Feelings are high on both sides. Everyone acted like ladies and gentlemen. We worked it out, and I think it speaks well of the Senate.

I would ask the distinguished majority leader, having reserved the right to object on his latest request, it is my understanding that immediately upon this request being adopted, we will go to S. 792, is that right?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, that is correct. I have two unanimous consent requests. One is on S. 792, and one is on the energy report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the majority leader, will that vote on CAFTA be a rollcall vote?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will go through the whole schedule shortly, if I can get through the unanimous consent request. Very briefly, we will have a rollcall vote on CAFTA in about 30 minutes, 25 minutes. Whenever we finish, it would be the last rollcall vote of the day. We will begin voting again tomorrow.

Mr. DAYTON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. I have two further unanimous consent requests, and then we can review everything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC-CENTRAL AMERICA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3045, the House-passed CAFTA legislation. I further ask consent that the statutory debate time be reduced to 20 minutes, equally divided, and that following the use or yielding of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the measure without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my colleagues and I who have joined
in now and then. Compare that, for ex-
ample, to Martha Stewart, who was let
out of prison but had to wear an elec-
tronic ankle bracelet.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Dorgan sub-
stitute amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read
a third time, passed, and the motions
for reconsideration be laid upon the table.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary
Committee be discharged from further
consideration of S. 792 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate con-
sideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will
please report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read
as follows:

A bill (S. 792) to establish a National sex
offender registration database, and for other
purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my agreement with the majority leader
was that we would pass by consent S. 792 which the Senate passed by consent
last year. We are now passing it once
again to go to the House. This deals
with sexual predators. This legislation
is called 'Dru's Law.'

My colleagues and I who have joined
together to pass this legislation to-
ight do so in honor of this wonderful young woman who was tragically mur-
dered in a parking lot in Grand Forks, ND. The man accused of murdering Dru Sjodin spent 23 years in prison. He was a violent sexual predator who was let
of prison with a wave. So long. Check
in now and then. Compare that, for ex-
ample, to Martha Stewart, who was let
out of prison but had to wear an elec-
tronic ankle bracelet.

Violent sexual predators judged to be
at high risk for committing another
violent sexual act are let out of prison
with a wave. As a result, this young young woman Sjodin was tragically mur-
dered. This is the man who spent 23 years behind bars. The psychiatrists
said before he was released that he was
a high risk for committing another vio-
lent sexual act. Within 6 months, he is
now accused of murdering this young
woman.

It is not only this man. It is Mr. Dun-
can. Remember the last couple of
weeks, the two young children kid-
napped, one murdered. The other is
still alive, with her family dead. We
know about this man. He raped a 16-
year-old boy at gunpoint, a violent sex-
ual predator. Last April, he was put in
the arms of law enforcement and let
out on $15,000 bail. More Americans are
dead because of it.

This is some mysterious illness for
which we don’t know the cure. We
know what causes it and we know how
to stop it. Again, if Martha Stewart
has to wear an electronic ankle brace-
let ordered by a judge, then surely vio-
lent sexual predators, when and if re-
leased, should be monitored by local
governments. Surely, we ought to
declare that if violent sexual predators
are a high risk for reoffending, then

The majority leader.

The majority leader.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL SEX
OFFENDER REGISTRATION DATA-
BASE

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Dru Sjodin National Sex Offender Public Database Act
of 2005' or 'Dru’s Law'.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

In this Act:

(1) CRIMINAL OFFENSE AGAINST A VICTIM WHO IS A MINOR.—The term 'criminal offense
against a victim who is a minor' has the same meaning as in section 1701a(3) of the
Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act
(42 U.S.C. 14072(a)).

(2) MINIMALLY SUFFICIENT SEXUAL OFFENDER REGISTRATION PROGRAM.—The term
'minimally sufficient sexual offender reg-
istration program' has the same meaning as in section 1701a(3) of the
Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act
(42 U.S.C. 14072(a)).

(3) SEXUALLY VIOLENT OFFENSE.—The term 'sexually violent offense' has the same
meaning as in section 1701a(3) of the
Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act
(42 U.S.C. 14072(a)).

(4) SEXUALLY VIOLENT PREDATOR.—The term 'sexually violent predator' has the
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UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 6

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the CAFTA vote, the Senate proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 6, the energy legislation; provided further that there be 3 hours equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of their designees, I further ask unanimous consent that following the war yielding back of time, Senator FEINGOLD be recognized in order to raise a Budget Act point of order and that Senator DOMENICI or his designee be immediately recognized in order to make the point of order. I further ask consent that if the point of order is waived, the Senate then proceed immediately to a vote on the adoption of the conference report with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the unanimous consent agreement, that it be done.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic leader, Mr. REID, Mr. President, I apologize for not raising this with the majority leader a second ago, but I would ask consent that this legislation be known as the Domenici Energy bill. I ask consent. I would ask that we do a correcting resolution, that it be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Mr. PRIST. Mr. President, a quick review of what we have just done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the purpose of clarification of the record—

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will supply forthwith the text for the correcting resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The majority leader's request is agreed to.

Mr. FRIST. All right, Mr. President.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a second? I will be very brief. I know everybody is tired.

Senator DOMENICI kept his word on the Energy bill. It was very difficult. The conference was a real conference. They met until 3 o'clock in the morning. Senator DOMENICI has worked very hard on this bill. There are a lot of people who do not like the bill, but it is not because of him. He did everything he could to please Democrats and Republicans. So that is why the majority leader and I join in the request that has just been granted regarding Senator DOMENICI.

Mr. FRIST. All right, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER, the majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, within several minutes, we will start 20 minutes of debate on CAFTA, equally divided. We will have a rollover call vote. We will go to energy after that. We will complete debate on energy tonight. We will not have a further rollover vote tonight after the CAFTA vote.

We will begin—and we will announce the time a little bit later as to the two votes on energy tomorrow, one on the point of order and one on the bill. Following that, we will be going to the amendments that have been outlined with the time agreements on guns. The highway bill we will expect at some point. I do not think the House will finish with that, but we will deal appropriately with that after it arrives. Since energy arrived, we are going to energy first. That is the general outline. We have the unanimous consent agreements. I would recommend very soon we go to the CAFTA bill.

Mr. REID. Will the leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would ask the distinguished majority leader: We are going to finish the debate on energy tonight?

Mr. FRIST. Right.

ORDER OF PROCEEDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic leader be allocated as follows: Senator SCHUMER, 10 minutes; Senator KERRY, 30 minutes; Senator WYDEN, 15 minutes; Senator BINGMAN, 20 minutes; and whatever time is left over will be allocated to Senator BINGMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise on behalf of my constituents to support the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank my leader.

So the two votes required on the energy conference report will occur after the leader's time tomorrow morning in morning business. Approximately at what time would those votes occur?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, through the Chair, in response, let me work out with the Democratic leader what time those votes will be.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am assuming, then, immediately following those votes, what could be back on the gun liability bill, to complete the work under the UC of that legislation?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, or we could even be before. We could actually come on those amendments before as well.

Mr. CRAIG. That is so that yet to be determined?

Mr. FRIST. That is correct. We will determine that before we close down tonight.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I rise on behalf of my constituents to oppose the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. This bill would be called the Special Interest Protection Act because it puts one industry's bottomline ahead of the families and victims of gun violence. It also slams closed the courthouse door to those seeking justice for victims of gun violence.

Remember when—not to long ago—the citizens of Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia were terrorized by a sniper. Remember when 10 innocent families were killed while they were going about their daily routines, mowing the lawn or getting gas, shopping, and getting ready to drive a bus. Their families have experienced tremendous loss and the Nation mourned with them.

Now, Congress is considering legislation that inflict further pain on families like those of the sniper victims. This legislation will literally slam the courthouse door on the families of gun violence victims and on all Americans who believe they were harmed by negligent actions related to guns. It gives gun dealers and manufacturers a free pass. And it will prevent families and survivors from holding irresponsible gun stores accountable. If they are negligent. It actually would prohibit families from going to court, from letting a jury of their peers decide if the gun store or manufacturer was negligent.

If this legislation passes you could still go to court over a toy gun but not a real gun. That is wrong.

Let me tell you about one of these families who have been victimized by gun violence. Conrad Johnson was the sniper's last victim. Do you remember hearing the news that he was shot at a bus stop in Montgomery County? Killed by the sniper getting ready for his route.

He was beloved by his family, friends and community. Two thousand people attended his funeral.

He worked hard as a bus driver. He drove 35 miles before dawn every day for work. He was known for his friendly smile and can-do attitude.

He loved his family—his Jamaican immigrant parents, his wife Denise—his high school sweetheart, his two sons and his big extended family. Over 30 members gathered at the hospital after he was shot. He was full of life. He was always finding ways to take care of his family and help his community. He was a volunteer coach for the boys and girls clubs of Fort Washington. He loved being a DJ for functions thrown by his family and friends and he was always washing the family car on the weekends.

Conrad Johnson was the snipers last victim. Conrad's family is one of many
Maryland families still grieving because of the snipers’ reign of terror. Five Maryland families lost loved ones in the sniper’s first 24 hours.

Today, I stand here for the rights of families like those of the sniper victims. It is now over three years since the horrific sniper attacks, which terrified our citizens and we sought redress in the courts. Gun violence terrorizes our citizens and we owe them nothing less.

Let me be clear. I do not believe Congress should stand in the way of offering special protection, by offering blanket protections for the negligent actions of the gun dealers, sellers and manufacturers. It is my duty to my constituents to fight with them and to fight against passage of this bill. It would be irresponsible for the Congress not to allow these victims of terror to seek redress in the courts. Gun violence terrorizes our citizens and we owe them nothing less.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise to express my support of S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, introduced by my colleague Senator Craig of Idaho.

The number of frivolous lawsuits against gun manufacturers has significantly increased in recent years. Since 1998, dozens of municipalities and cities have filed suit against America’s firearm industry, falsely alleging that manufacturers are responsible for the unforeseen acts of criminals. Firearms manufacturers have already spent more than $200 million in legal fees yet have not been found liable by a single court for the criminal misuse of their highly regulated products. Unfortunately, these lawsuits appear to be designed as a political agenda that 33 State legislatures have already rejected. Lawsuits against manufacturers who have nothing to do with the crime at hand thwart the will of the people by bypassing their elected representatives and attempting to impose novel legal theories by judicial fiat. Worse, these suits—even while unsuccessful—drain significant resources from these companies that are the backbone of supplying our military and police forces.

Pennsylvania alone recognizes over 3,000 federally licensed firearm dealers. The number of frivolous suits with novel legal theories by judicial fiat has increased in recent years. Since 1998, dozens of municipalities and cities have filed suit against America’s firearm industry, falsely alleging that manufacturers are responsible for the unforeseen acts of criminals. Firearms manufacturers have already spent more than $200 million in legal fees yet have not been found liable by a single court for the criminal misuse of their highly regulated products. Unfortunately, these lawsuits appear to be designed as a political agenda that 33 State legislatures have already rejected. Lawsuits against manufacturers who have nothing to do with the crime at hand thwart the will of the people by bypassing their elected representatives and attempting to impose novel legal theories by judicial fiat. Worse, these suits—even while unsuccessful—drain significant resources from these companies that are the backbone of supplying our military and police forces.

Pennsylvania alone recognizes over 3,000 federally licensed firearm dealers. The number of frivolous suits with novel legal theories by judicial fiat has increased in recent years. Since 1998, dozens of municipalities and cities have filed suit against America’s firearm industry, falsely alleging that manufacturers are responsible for the unforeseen acts of criminals. Firearms manufacturers have already spent more than $200 million in legal fees yet have not been found liable by a single court for the criminal misuse of their highly regulated products. Unfortunately, these lawsuits appear to be designed as a political agenda that 33 State legislatures have already rejected. Lawsuits against manufacturers who have nothing to do with the crime at hand thwart the will of the people by bypassing their elected representatives and attempting to impose novel legal theories by judicial fiat. Worse, these suits—even while unsuccessful—drain significant resources from these companies that are the backbone of supplying our military and police forces.

Pennsylvania alone recognizes over 3,000 federally licensed firearm dealers. The number of frivolous suits with novel legal theories by judicial fiat has increased in recent years. Since 1998, dozens of municipalities and cities have filed suit against America’s firearm industry, falsely alleging that manufacturers are responsible for the unforeseen acts of criminals. Firearms manufacturers have already spent more than $200 million in legal fees yet have not been found liable by a single court for the criminal misuse of their highly regulated products. Unfortunately, these lawsuits appear to be designed as a political agenda that 33 State legislatures have already rejected. Lawsuits against manufacturers who have nothing to do with the crime at hand thwart the will of the people by bypassing their elected representatives and attempting to impose novel legal theories by judicial fiat. Worse, these suits—even while unsuccessful—drain significant resources from these companies that are the backbone of supplying our military and police forces.

Many families recognize a threat to their way of life when they see one. The numbers are telling. Pennsylvania has 227 companies involved in firearms manufacture. There are over 3,000 federally licensed firearms dealers. According to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, there are approximately 34,000 jobs and generating approximately $119 million in Pennsylvania State tax revenue. Additionally, these Pennsylvania sportmen spend about $2 billion in the State, generating approximately $119 million in Pennsylvania State tax revenue.

Many families’ lives are negatively impacted by these reckless lawsuits. While many of the personal tragedies behind these lawsuits are horrific, the individual responsible is—as it has always been in our system of justice—the criminal not the gun manufacturer company. If a lawsuit is based on a defective firearm, a knowing violation of the law or the breach of a contract, that suit should proceed—and S. 397 would allow it to proceed. However, the frivolous suits with novel legal theories and invented liability have already cost jobs, including here in Pennsylvania, and they will cost more jobs if they continue. They will force company closures and they will close families and businesses. Such lawsuits against firearm makers and dealers for the acts of criminals is like suing automobile makers for the damage caused by reckless drivers. It is wrong and goes against the entrepreneurial and industrial spirit of this country.

I agree there is a need to reduce violent crime, and I share the concerns of gun control advocates with the number and severity of violent acts occurring within our Nation. During a June 13th field hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee, we learned about the many factors that contribute to the problem of youth violence including poverty, broken families, a
My constituents have no shortage of suggestions and ideas for what Congress should be doing, but I can honestly say that none of them are saying, "Senator, please go back to Washington and make sure that gun companies aren’t being sued by victims of gun violence." I haven’t heard that one yet.

And that is why I have chosen to speak on the floor today to—highlight the misplaced priorities of the Senate’s leadership. Even though we have 139,000 troops fighting a losing battle in Iraq, and a $440 billion Defense bill that could help these troops, we are here debating gun liability instead of talking about how to strengthen our national defense.

That is regrettable, and that is one of the reasons why so many Americans are disillusioned with their Government. Because we are not focusing on the problems that truly matter to them. Because some are more interested in special interests, points, or catering to a special interest.

I believe—as do my Democratic colleagues—that the first priority of the Senate should be to provide for our men and women who are in harm’s way. To give them the necessary time to debate the Defense bill. If that takes us the rest of the week—or even next week—then that is what we should do.

How can we go home to our constituents in August and tell them that we left Washington, DC without finishing a bill to help our military because we spent too much time protecting gun manufacturers? That is shameful.

I have talked to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and many of them were planning to offer good, commonsense, bipartisan amendments to the DOD bill—amendments that would have helped our military and strengthened our national defense. I also have filed several amendments that I would have offered, and I believe that many of my colleagues would have supported them as well.

One of my amendments would have protected members of the National Guard and Reserve against employment discrimination. This amendment is supported by the Reserve Officers Association and is cosponsored by Senator SALAZAR.

I have heard that there have been instances in August recess interviews only to be summarily dropped from the process upon disclosing the fact that they are members of the Guard and Reserve.

My amendment would have gotten to the heart of this problem by preventing employers from forcing members of the Guard and Reserve to disclose their military service during the interview process. However, my amendment would not have prohibited them from disclosing their military status if they thought it would be beneficial during an interview process.

But instead of helping members of the Guard and Reserve, we are talking about gun manufacturer liability. That is unfortunate.

Another amendment I would have offered relates to the medical records of our servicemembers.

For years, the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs have attempted to organize their medical records to create a two-way exchange of patient health data to better care for our Nation’s service members. This would decrease costs and improve the flow of information when active members of the military leave the DOD system and move to the VA system. Greater use of technology would also reduce medical errors, which kill up to 98,000 people a year.

Unfortunately, the DOD has not managed to create a fully functional electronic medical records system. Last year, a GAO report found that one of the primary reasons for the delay in developing this system is the lack of congressional oversight.

My amendment would have helped push some of that oversight. I wanted to get some answers from DOD on why this project is being delayed and how the Department is proceeding with this important project.

I debate over these amendments, and many others, is being silenced in favor of the one we are having now—about helping gun manufacturers.

This is why the American people are tired of what goes on in this town. Because there are real issues they sent us here to debate—real problems they expect us to solve. But even when we have a chance to do this—even when we have a defense bill where we could add amendments that could help our troops and care for our veterans—the Senate passes on that chance and diverts directly into another fight singed with more politics and more ideology.

We can do better than that. We owe ourselves better—and we certainly owe the American people better.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from Army Times, criticizing the Senate leadership’s decision to stop consideration of the DOD bill, be included in the RECORD.

Without objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army Times, July 26, 2005]

SENATE DELAYS ACTION ON DEFENSE BILL
(By Rick Maze)

Senate Republican leaders decided Tuesday that a gun manufacturers’ liability bill is more important than next year’s $411.6 billion defense authorization bill.

With Democrats expressing amazement that there could be any higher legislative priority in a time of war than the annual defense authorization, Senate leaders decided Tuesday that Democrats aren’t ready to come to the defense of gun manufacturers.

Senate Majority Leader Sen. Bill Frist of Tennessee, the Senate Republican leader, decided Tuesday that a bill protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits...
ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 29, 2005

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9 a.m. on Friday, July 29; I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2961, the Interior appropriations bill, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will complete consideration of the conference reports to accompany the Interior appropriations bill, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill, the Energy bill, and the highway bill. The Senate will also complete action on the gun liability bill with an agreement that was reached this evening. As my colleagues can see, we will have a very busy day tomorrow with rolcall votes throughout. We should be able to complete our business tomorrow, except that we will. Again, it will be a very busy day. Senators should remain close to the Chamber throughout the day so that we can proceed in an orderly way for what could be up to 13 votes during tomorrow’s session.

A PRODUCTIVE SEVERAL MONTHS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we will be closing tomorrow afternoon, hopefully not too late in the afternoon. This has been a very productive several months. If you look back and reflect upon the issues that have been discussed and the bills that have been passed, there have been many. We are governing in a way that meets the expectations of the American people, governing with meaningful solutions to their everyday problems. We passed a budget which was the fifth fastest in history. We passed a bankruptcy bill, a class action reform bill to rid frivolous lawsuits. We had six circuit court nominations, judges that had been either filibustered or threatened to be filibustered in the past. Now we will continue all of that work tomorrow with an Energy bill, a highway bill, a legislative conference report, and the Interior conference report. So it has been a very productive Congress and one that we will continue to work very aggressively on as we come back after the recess.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 225, the adjournment resolution; provided that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 225) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 225
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), in conformance with section 132(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, July 28, 2005, Friday, July 29, 2005, or Saturday, July 30, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, September 6, 2005, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Friday, July 29, 2005, through Friday, August 5, 2005, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 6, 2005, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:57 p.m., adjourned until Friday, July 29, 2005, at 9 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations and the nominations were confirmed:


KEVIN P. SULLIVAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.


The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 225) was agreed to, as follows:...
The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations and the nomination was confirmed:

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, July 28, 2005:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

MARCUS C. PEACOCK, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DAVID R. BELL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

JILL L. SLEDGE, OF WYOMING, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RICHARD L. SKINNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JAY B. TASKER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JOHN S. REID, OF GEORGIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

KEVIN F. SULLIVAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.
HENRY LOUIS JOHNSON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.
TERRELL HALASKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION


LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION


DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RACHEL BRAND, OF IOWA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.
Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 3045, CAFTA Implementation.

Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 225, Adjournment Resolution.


The House agreed to the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2985, Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for FY 2006.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 225, providing for a conditional recess of the House and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

Senate
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Measures Introduced: Thirty-two bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1521–1552, S.J. Res. 22, S. Res. 218–223.

(See next issue.)

Measures Reported:


S. 449, to facilitate shareholder consideration of proposals to make Settlement Common Stock under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act available to missed enrollees, eligible elders, and eligible persons born after December 18, 1971. (S. Rept. No. 109–112)

S.J. Res. 15, to acknowledge a long history of official depredations and ill-conceived policies by the United States Government regarding Indian tribes and offer an apology to all Native Peoples on behalf of the United States. (S. Rept. No. 109–113)

S. 1280, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the United States Coast Guard, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 109–114)

S. 103, to respond to the illegal production, distribution, and use of methamphetamine in the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (See next issue.)

Measures Passed:

National Sex Offender Database: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 792, to establish a National sex offender registration database, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

Frist (for Dorgan/Dole) Amendment No. 1643, in the nature of a substitute.

CAFTA Implementation: By 56 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 209), Senate passed H.R. 3045, to implement the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, clearing the measure for the President.

Pages S9245–46

Honoring Tour de France Participants: Senate agreed to S. Res. 222, honoring the victories of Team Discovery and American cyclists Lance Armstrong and George Hincapie in the 2005 Tour de France.

(See next issue.)

National Life Insurance Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 223, supporting the goals and ideals of “National Life Insurance Awareness Month”.

(See next issue.)
National Citizens' Crime Prevention 25th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 208, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign, and the resolution was then agreed to. (See next issue.)

Women Suffragists: Senate passed H.J. Res. 59, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to women suffragists who fought for and won the right of women to vote in the United States, clearing the measure for the President. (See next issue.)

Purple Heart: Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 39, to express the sense of Congress on the Purple Heart, and the concurrent resolution was then agreed to. (See next issue.)

Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act: Senate passed S. 1375, to amend the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 to modify provisions relating to criminal proceedings and civil actions. (See next issue.)

Psoriasis Awareness Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 206, designating August 2005 as "Psoriasis Awareness Month", and the resolution was then agreed to. (See next issue.)

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 225, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. (See next issue.)

Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act: Senate continued consideration of S. 397, to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages, injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Adopted:

By 70 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 207), Reed (for Kohl) Amendment No. 1626, to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the provision of a child safety lock in connection with the transfer of a handgun. Pages S9217–44 (continued next issue)

Rejected:

Levin Amendment No. 1623, to clarify the prohibition on certain civil liability actions. (By 62 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 208), Senate tabled the amendment.) Pages S9217–22

Pending:

Frist (for Craig) Modified Amendment No. 1605, to make clear that the bill does not apply to actions commenced by the Attorney General to enforce the Gun Control Act. Pages S9222

Frist Modified Amendment No. 1606 (to Amendment No. 1605), to make clear that the bill does not apply to actions commenced by the Attorney General to enforce the Gun Control Act and National Firearms Act. Pages S9222

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for the consideration of certain amendments to be proposed to the bill; that the cloture vote be vitiated and following the disposition of the amendments, the pending Frist (for Craig) Modified Amendment No. 1605 (listed above) and Frist Modified Amendment No. 1606 (to Amendment No. 1605) be agreed to; the bill be read a third time, and the Senate then vote on final passage of the bill.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Friday, July 29, 2005.

Energy Policy Act—Conference Report: Senate began consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 6, to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy. (See next issue.)

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Feingold be recognized to raise a Congressional Budget Act point of order, and that Senator Domenici, or his designee, be immediately recognized in order to make a motion to waive the point of order; that if the point of order is waived, the Senate then immediately vote on adoption of the conference report. (See next issue.)

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the conference report on Friday, July 29, 2005, with 30 minutes equally divided for closing remarks. (See next issue.)

Department of the Interior Appropriations Conference Report—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Friday, July 29, 2005, at a time determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, Senate begin consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2361, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006; that there be 20 minutes of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority, and that the Senate then vote on adoption of the conference report. (See next issue.)

Legislative Branch Appropriations—Conference Report: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Friday, July 29, 2005, at a time determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, Senate begin
consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2985, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006; that there be 20 minutes of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority, and that the Senate then vote on adoption of the conference report.

(See next issue.)

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Report to accompany Protocol of Amendment to the International Convention on Simplification and Harmonization of Customs Procedures (Treaty Doc. 108–6) (Ex. Rept. 109–2). (See next issue.)

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Thomas A. Fuentes, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2005. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Bernice Phillips, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2005. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Rachel Brand, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

David R. Hill, of Missouri, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.


Kevin F. Sullivan, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Outreach Department of Education. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Jill L. Sigal, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Janice B. Gardner, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury.

Marcus C. Peacock, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Henry Louis Johnson, of Mississippi, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

Terrell Halaska, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.)

John S. Redd, of Georgia, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Donetta Davidson, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for the remainder of the term expiring December 12, 2007. (Prior to this action, Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration.)

Pages S9250–51 (continued next issue)

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

John J. Young, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Emil W. Henry, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

William E. Kovacic, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of seven years from September 26, 2004.

Kathryn Higgins, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2009.

Edward McGaffigan, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2010.

George M. Gray, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Barry F. Lowenkron, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

William Paul McCormick, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Samoa.

Roland Arnall, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Christine M. Griffin, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2009.

James F. X. O’Gara, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Timothy Mark Burgess, of Alaska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska.

Joseph Frank Bianco, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Harry Sandlin Mattice, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

Routine lists in the Air Force.
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Messages From the House: (See next issue.)

Measures Referred: (See next issue.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Lieutenant General Norton A. Schwartz, USAF, for appointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, and 4,070 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 705, to establish the Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 804, to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the national flood insurance program;

S. 1047, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of each of the Nation’s past Presidents and their spouses, respectively to improve circulation of the $1 coin, to create a new bullion coin;

S. 190, to address the regulation of secondary mortgage market enterprises, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Christopher Cox, of California, Roel C. Campos, of Texas, and Annette L. Nazareth, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, John C. Dugan, of Maryland, to be Comptroller of the Currency, and John M. Reich, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, both of the Department of the Treasury, Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be a Member and Vice Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 1516, to reauthorize Amtrak, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

S. 1408, to strengthen data protection and safeguards, require data breach notification, and further prevent identity theft, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine issues related to MGM v. Grokster and the appropriate balance between copyright protection and communications technology innovation, focusing on balancing the protection of copyright and technological innovation, after receiving testimony from Adam M. Eisgrau, Flanagan Consulting, on behalf of P2P United, Inc. and the Electronic Frontier Foundation, and Mitch Bainwol, Recording Industry Association
of America, both of Washington, DC; Gregory G. Kerber, Wurld Media, Inc., Saratoga Springs, New York; Mark G. Heesen, National Venture Capital Association, Arlington, Virginia; David N. Baker, EarthLink, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia; and Fritz E. Attaway, Motion Picture Association of America, Encino, California.

NATIONAL PARKS/MEMORIALS
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 584 and H.R. 432, bills to require the Secretary of the Interior to allow the continued occupancy and use of certain land and improvements within Rocky Mountain National Park, S. 652, to provide financial assistance for the rehabilitation of the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the development of an exhibit to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, S. 958, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Star-Spangled Banner Trail in the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia as a National Historic Trail, S. 1154, to extend the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission, to provide improved visitor services at the park, S. 1166, to extend the authorization of the Kalaupapa National Historical Park Advisory Commission, and S. 1346, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of maritime sites in the State of Michigan, after receiving testimony from Stephen P. Martin, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Steve Belko, Michigan Lighthouse Project, Oxford; Dennis M. Wint, The Franklin Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Ralph Eshelman, Lusby, Maryland; and Betty H. Dick, Grand Lake, Colorado.

NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT
Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee held an oversight hearing to examine the implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101–601), focusing on the impact of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit decision in Bonnichsen v. United States, and the proposed amendment to the definition of “Native American” under the Act, receiving testimony from Paul Hoffman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks; Paul Bender, Arizona State University College of Law, and Keith W. Kintigh, Society for American Archaeology, both of Tempe, Arizona; Walter R. Echo-Hawk, Native American Rights Fund, Boulder, Colorado; Patricia M. Lambert, Utah State University, Logan, on behalf of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists; Paula A. Barran, Barran and Leibman, LLP, Portland, Oregon; and A. Van Horn Diamond, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
S. 103, to respond to the illegal production, distribution, and use of methamphetamine in the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Michael J. Garcia, of New York, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, and Peter Manson Swaim, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Indiana.

Also, Committee resumed markup of S. 1088, to establish streamlined procedures for collateral review of mixed petitions, amendments, and defaulted claims, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Veterans Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:
S. 1234, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2005, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans;

S. 1235, to amend chapters 19 and 37 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the availability of $400,000 in coverage under the servicemembers’ life insurance and veterans’ group life insurance programs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, (as approved by the Committee, the substitute amendment incorporated related provisions of S. 1235, as introduced, S. 552, S. 917, S. 151, S. 1259, S. 1271, and S. 423); and

The nominations of James Philip Terry, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans’ Appeals, Department of Veterans’ Affairs, and Charles S. Ciccolella, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training.
House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced will be found in Book II.

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Conference report on H.R. 3, authorizing funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs (H. Rept. 109–203);

H.R. 889, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with an amendment referred sequentially to the House Committee on Homeland Security for a period ending not later than July 29, 2005 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(i) of rule X. (H. Rept. 109–204, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3207, to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to make grants to eligible entities for the development of peer learning opportunities for second-stage small business concerns, amended (H. Rept. 109–205);

H.R. 2981, to amend the Small Business Act to expand and improve the assistance provided by Small Business Development Centers to Indian tribe members, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians, amended (H. Rept. 109–206);

H.R. 527, to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a vocational and technical entrepreneurship development program, amended (H. Rept. 109–207);

H.R. 230, to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, amended (H. Rept. 109–208);

H.R. 1065, to establish the United States Boxing Commission to protect the general welfare of boxers and to ensure fairness in the sport of professional boxing, with an amendment referred sequentially to the House Committee on the Judiciary for a period ending not later than Sept. 30, 2005 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and the amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(l), rule X. (H. Rept. 109–209, Pt. 1);

H.R. 3084, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue regulations requiring testing for steroids and other performance-enhancing substances for certain sports associations engaged in interstate commerce, amended (H. Rept. 109–210, Pt. 1);

H.R. 921, to establish a digital and wireless network technology program (H. Rept. 109–211, Pt. 1);

H. Res. 399, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 3, Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (H. Rept. 109–212);

H. Res. 400, waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to the same day consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Rules Committee (H. Rept. 109–213); and

H. Res. 401, providing for consideration of H.R. 3514, to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law authorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (H. Rept. 109–214).

Pages H7033 (continued next issue)


Pages H7013–23, H7030–31

H. Res. 392, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 4 nays with 23 voting “present”, Roll No. 446.

Pages H6941–43, H6973


Pages H6949–73

H. Res. 394, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report, was agreed to by voice vote.

Pages H6943–48


Pages H7023–30, H7031
H. Res. 396, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 375 yeas to 270 nays with 24 voting “present”, Roll No. 447. Pages H6948–49, H6073–74

Help Efficient, Accessible, Low-Cost, Timely Healthcare (HEALTH) Act of 2005: The House passed H.R. 5, improving patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, by a recorded vote 230 ayes to 194 noes with 2 voting “present”, Roll No. 449. Pages H6974–H7013

Rejected the Conyers motion to recommit the bill to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 193 yeas to 234 nays with 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 448. Pages H7007–12

H. Res. 385, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to on Wednesday, July 27.

Summer District Work Period: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 225, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 404 yeas to 16 nays, Roll No. 452. Pages H7031–32

Recess: The House recessed at 6:25 p.m. and reconvened at 6:40 p.m. Page H7033

Recess: The House recessed at 6:41 p.m. and reconvened at 6:59 p.m. Page H7033

Recess: The House recessed at 7:00 p.m. and reconvened at 10:45 p.m. Pages H7033–34

Recess: The House recessed at 10:58 p.m. and reconvened at 12:15 a.m. Page H7035


Recess: The House recessed at 12:19 a.m. and reconvened at 1:07 a.m. Page H7036

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H6974, H7013, H7034 and H7036.

Senate Referrals: S. 302 and S. 655 were referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; S. 447 was referred to the Committee on Resources; S. 1517 was referred to the Committee on Small Business; S. 792 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and S.J. Res. 19 was referred to the Committee on International Relations. Page H7036

Quorum Calls—Votes: 7 yea-and-nay vote and 1 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H6972, H6973, H6973–74, H7011–12, H7012–13, H7030–31, H7031 and H7031–32. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 1:09 a.m. on Friday, July 29.

Committee Meetings

FINANCING IRAQI INSURGENCY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Financial Services held a joint hearing on the financing of the Iraqi insurgency. Testimony was heard from Daniel Glaser, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury; and the following officials of the Department of Defense: James Roberts, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Special Operations and Combating Terrorism; and Caleb Temple, Director, Operations, Joint Intelligence Task Force for Combating Terrorism, Defense Intelligence Agency.

DATA SECURITY


D.C. METRO—GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing entitled “Keeping Metro on Track: The Federal Government’s Role in Balancing Investment with Accountability at Washington’s Transit Agency.” Testimony was heard from Katherine Siggerud, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, GAO; the following officials of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority: Dana Kauffman, Chairman of the Board; and Richard White, Chief Executive Officer; and public witnesses.

RESOLUTION—COMMENDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMPLOYEES FOR DEDICATED SERVICE IN WAR AGAINST TERRORISM

Committee on Homeland Security: Ordered reported H. Res. 398, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the employees of the Department of Homeland Security, their partners at all levels of government, and the millions of law enforcement agents and emergency response providers nationwide should be commended for their dedicated service on the Nation’s front lines in the war against terrorism.
AVIATION SCREENING WORKFORCE—IMPROVING MANAGEMENT
Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity held a hearing entitled “Improving Management of the Aviation Screening Workforce.” Testimony was heard from Thomas Blank, Acting Deputy Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; James Bennett, President and Chief Executive Officer, Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority; John Martin, Director, San Francisco International Airport; William DeCota, Director, Aviation, New York-New Jersey Port Authority; and public witnesses.

NATIONAL BIODEFENSE STRATEGY
Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack, hearing entitled “Implementing the National Biodefense Strategy.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Julie Gerberding, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and Anthony Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH; BG Eric B. Schoomaker, USA, Commanding General, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, Department of Defense; and John Vitko, Jr., Director, Biological Countermeasure Portfolio, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security.

ASSESSING HANDICAP ACCESS TO HOUSE COMPLEX
Committee on House Administration: Held a hearing on Accessibility of the House Complex for Persons with Special Needs. Testimony was heard from Representative Langevin; Chief Terrence Gainer, U.S. Capitol Police; James M. Eagen, III, Chief Administrative Officer, House of Representatives; Alan Hantman, Architect of the Capitol; and public witnesses.

LEBANON DEMOCRACY
Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on Lebanon Reborn? Defining National Priorities and Prospects for Democratic Renewal in the Wake of March 14, 2005. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: C. David Welch, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs; and James R. Kunder, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia and the Near East, U.S. Agency for International Development; and public witnesses.

CHINA’S INFLUENCE ON AFRICA
Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, hearing on China’s Influence in Africa. Testimony was heard from Michael Ranneberger, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; Carolyn Bartholomew, Commissioner, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN MINING COMMUNITIES
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Minerals held an oversight hearing on Sustainable Development Opportunities in Mining Communities, Part II. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—WESTSIDE REGIONAL DRAINAGE PLAN
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held an oversight hearing on Implementation of the Westside Regional Drainage Plan as a Way to Improve San Joaquin River Water Quality. Testimony was heard from John Keyes, III, Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS
Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 3, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Chairman Young of Alaska Representatives Petri and Oberstar.

HIGHWAY, HIGHWAY SAFETY, MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY, TRANSIT, AND OTHER PROGRAMS EXTENSION
Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing ten minutes of debate in the House on H.R. 3514, to provide an extension of administrative expenses for highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration. The rule provides one motion to recommit.
SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee. The rule applies the waiver to any special rule reported on the legislative day of July 29, 2005, providing for consideration or disposition of any measure related to funding for transportation programs.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 3 and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. The rule provides that the Clerk shall not transmit to the Senate a message that it has adopted the conference report to accompany H.R. 3 until the House has received a message that the Senate has agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 226 as adopted by the House.

TAX REFORM/MEMBERS PROPOSALS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing on Member Proposals for Tax Reform. Testimony was heard from Representatives Neal, English of Pennsylvania, Linder, Emanuel, Kucinich, Bishop of New York, and Burgess.

BRIEFING—GLOBAL UPDATES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to receive a Briefing on Global Updates. The Committee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

DNA STATUS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on DNI Status. Testimony was heard from MG Michael V. Hayden, USA, Director, National Security Agency/Contract Security Services, Department of Defense.

Joint Meetings

ALTERNATIVE AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine alternative automotive technologies to develop energy efficient vehicles, after receiving testimony from David K. Garman, Secretary of Energy; Mark Chernoby, DaimlerChrysler Corporation, Auburn Hills, Michigan; Mary Ann Wright, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan; Tom Stricker, Toyota Motor North America, Inc., Torrance, California; and Joe Loper, Alliance to Save Energy, Washington, DC.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D 846)


H.R. 3453, to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. Signed on July 28, 2005. (Public Law 109–40)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 29, 2005

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9 a.m., Friday, July 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will begin consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2361, Department of the Interior Appropriations with a vote on adoption of the conference report; following which, Senate will begin consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2985, Legislative Branch Appropriations, with a vote on adoption of the conference report; following which, Senate will continue consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 6, Energy Policy Act, and vote on a motion to waive a point of order relative to the Congressional Budget Act, and if the point of order is waived, Senate will vote on adoption of the conference report. Also, Senate will continue consideration of S. 397, Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act and vote on certain amendments; following which, Senate will vote on final passage of the bill. Additionally, Senate expects to consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 3, Transportation Equity Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Friday, July 29

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (closed rule).

(Senate and House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)