



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1999

No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALSH).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 30, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES T. WALSH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Don Borling, Pastor, All Saints Lutheran Church, Orland Park, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

O Lord of all life, we come before You as people of peace. Our tasks are awesome. Our calling to serve is precious and, at the same time, very humbling.

Lord, help us always to walk in the shoes of those who brought us here, the factory worker and the artist, the lawyer and the school custodian, the farmer and the cook.

We are the human family, bound together by a spirit with no boundaries, and yet a spirit as real and as simple as the air we breathe every day.

Our world aches for peace. So help us be the instruments of Your healing.

May we be firm but gentle, just and forgiving, full of resolve, and yet always open to the varied dance of Your many voices.

With Your guidance, Lord, we can serve with joy, come to work each day with the goodness of the human spirit in our hearts.

Help us to see the world we serve with fresh vigor, renewed purpose, and the determination to make a difference. It is an honor to be here.

O Lord of all life, thanks for sharing this journey with us.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MASCARA 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After the first 1-minute speech concerning the guest chaplain, the Chair will recognize up to 15 one-minutes on each side.

WELCOMING REVEREND DON BORLING, PASTOR, ALL SAINTS LUTHERAN CHURCH, ORLAND PARK, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise and take this opportunity to welcome to the Chamber Pastor Don Borling, his wife Jude, son Jeremy, daughter Cassie from Orland Park, Illinois, from All Saints Lutheran Church, my home church where I grew up, starting at age

14. In fact, exactly 25 years ago tomorrow, Pastor Don Borling arrived at All Saints Lutheran Church to guide all of us, to give us inspiration, to provide for us the word of God. I want to thank him today for coming and being our guest chaplain.

Mr. Speaker, we have had debate in this Chamber over the last many weeks since some of the tragedies involving young people in this country. And it comes to mind my own personal journey and, as a young teenager, the inspiration, the guidance, and the love that a pastor such as Don Borling gave to me as a young person. I do not know if that would work for everybody, but I can tell my colleagues that the inspiration that he gave me and the influence that he had on my life is something that has been as profound as any of my immediate family.

And so, as we continue to labor today to figure out ways to solve the problems that face our young people, I would just commend to my colleagues that being a mentor, being an inspiration from one person to another, making the kind of connection that we need to make with young people is something that Don has taught me; and I would commend that to my colleagues.

COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

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

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider landmark legislation amending Depression-era banking laws. This bill will bring the banking, securities, and insurance industry regulations in line with the 21st century marketplace. These changes will create greater efficiency and consumer choices.

However, one element of this industry that does not reform is the Community Reinvestment Act, known as CRA.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5095

CRA has provided for increased loans to distressed communities, expanded homeownership opportunities, and has helped small businesses develop and flourish.

In recent years, two-thirds of all small business loans were made under CRA. It has also provided for a sharp increase in mortgage loans to low and moderate income families.

CRA investments are good investments. Financial institutions recognize the importance of serving their communities. The Community Reinvestment Act is a good, profitable business for banks and the community. I call on my colleagues to support CRA as an important part of financial services reform.

CUBAN RAFTER INCIDENT

(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, the inscription on the Statue of Liberty refers to our great country as the Mother of Exiles, which requests "give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses * * * of your teeming shore."

However, yesterday, the U.S. Coast Guard in South Florida took actions against Cuban freedom seekers which call into question our U.S. commitment to these principles. Not only was it not in the fine tradition of this agency, but it raises grave concern over the treatment of those seeking asylum from brutal dictatorships, such as the Castro regime in Cuba.

The first symbol of liberty these refugees come into contact with is the U.S. Coast Guard. Is their first impression to be unwarranted acts of aggression which violate their human rights?

The Coast Guard has literally saved the lives of thousands of refugees, and yesterday's acts were not in line with that fine history. I have spoken to the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard about this matter, and he has assured me that an immediate investigation of the specific actions is already underway.

I look forward to the briefing that senior officials of the Coast Guard and other agencies will provide us with today to ensure that this will never happen again.

AMERICAN WORKERS ARE GETTING PINK SLIPS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Motors closed its plant in Flint, Michigan. Another 3,600 American manufacturing jobs gone.

Meanwhile, General Motors plants all over the world remain open. Think about it. While foreign workers are building American cars, American workers are getting pink slips. Beam me up.

I do not blame General Motors. I blame our trade policy. Our trade policies are killing jobs and killing investment.

The question I have today: If our trade policy is so good, why does Japan not do it? Why does China not do it? My colleagues, think about that.

I yield back what manufacturing jobs we have left in America.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO GIVE EXTRA MONEY COLLECTED BY GOVERNMENT BACK TO TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, under a Republican Congress, our economy is projecting huge budget surpluses over the next 10 years. And I do not mean liberal Democrat style surpluses. I mean real surpluses that do not count and include the Social Security Trust Fund.

The debate has begun already as to what to do with the extra money now being collected by the Government. The Republicans want to give it back to the people who earned it in the first place—the taxpayers. But the liberals do not see it that way. They want to spend it. As I speak, they are coming up with huge new Washington programs even before the surplus has actually come in.

So that is our choice. Congress can spend it, or we can give it back in form of tax relief to the families that earned it. Republicans want the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off working families' money. This is a battle we will be proud to wage as we go forward in the next few weeks.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud this morning to talk about one of those programs that the President announced yesterday that we need to do, and we should have done it many years ago.

Studies have shown across this country in congressional districts prescription drugs on the average cost twice as much for senior citizens as they do for other most favored customers. It affects people like in my district 85-year-old constituent who relies on Social Security as her primary source of income and she has medical conditions that require her to spend \$260 a month on prescription medication. She has already sold her car, sold her furniture to pay for these prescription drugs; and yet she cannot continue to afford it for \$3,000 a year.

The President yesterday announced a program that will not help as much as

maybe I would like to, but it goes further than what we have today. With the budget as good as it is, maybe we ought to pay something back to those senior citizens who have built this country into what it is and not make them spend \$3,000 a year of their Social Security money for prescription medication.

In her case, it would actually almost cut her prescription cost in half, the President's program would do. And so, that is what we need to do.

Sure, I would like to have tax cuts. But let us take care of those folks who have built this country and made it what it is today.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO KNOW WHAT FICA MAN IS DOING WITH ALL THE MONEY

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, what does the FICA man do with the FICA taxes taken out of a worker's paycheck?

Most workers assume, as I used to, that the taxes collected from the worker's paycheck for Social Security and Medicare were actually spent on Social Security and Medicare. Well, it turns out that is not exactly the case.

The FICA man has been engaging in some very funny business with our seniors' Social Security and Medicare money, and more and more seniors are learning the harsh truth about the way our Government is running the Social Security Trust Fund.

The FICA man collects the money and uses it to fund all kinds of things, things which have nothing to do with Social Security or Medicare. Republicans want to know what the FICA man is doing with all that money. We want to put an end to the practice of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund anytime Washington feels like it.

"But wait," my Democrat colleagues will say, "Social Security was designed to operate like that."

Exactly. And that is what we want to change.

FEDERAL RESERVE DECIDING HOW HIGH, HOW MUCH, HOW OFTEN TO RAISE INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, the Federal Reserve is ensconced in their marble palace downtown meeting in secret, eating a catered breakfast off of fine china, all paid for by the taxpayer.

They are deciding how high, how much, how often to raise interest rates to combat inflation that does not exist.

They are about to raise the rates on credit cards for tens of millions of Americans, auto loans for tens of millions of Americans, mortgages for tens of millions of Americans?

Why? Because they said they are worried about the stock bubble on Wall Street.

□ 1015

But instead of using their awesome power to go directly at the speculators and the rampant speculation on Wall Street, they are going to take a whack at Main Street in the hope that the pain and the message exacted on average consumers filters up to the speculators on Wall Street. This is a bizarre new twist in economics.

It is time to pull back the curtain of secrecy and reveal the profundity of the Federal Reserve working in the interests of the privileged few at the expense of the majority in this country.

HIGHLY INEFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT—THE SEQUEL

(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, today a sequel to the speech I gave the other day about the seven habits of highly ineffective government. Mr. Speaker, there are more habits:

Number one, create programs and regulations which duplicate already existing programs at the State level. Much of what the Federal government does falls into that category.

Number two, make promises that cannot be kept. If we are not careful, Medicare and Social Security could qualify here.

Number three, do not reform programs that could go bankrupt until there is a crisis. We are still waiting for the President's Social Security reform.

Number four, never hold programs accountable for what they fail to achieve. Title I education funding has yet to raise student achievement.

Number five, refuse to reform programs going bankrupt but rather vilify those who attempt to save them. Anyone remember Medicare?

Number six, pretend that only Democrats want to solve problems. No elaboration necessary here.

Number seven, declare that the era of big government is over, yet continue expanding big government as much as possible.

SENIORS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN PAYING THEIR RENT AND BUYING THEIR MEDICATIONS

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent advances in modern medicine, especially in the area of pharmaceutical innovation, have yielded extraordinary benefits for all Americans, but especially for our seniors. In fact, over one-third of all the medicines approved by

the FDA in the last decade have targeted diseases that are common in the elderly; and while these medicines are good and beneficial for our seniors and all Americans as a whole, the fact is that some of these drugs are very expensive. Those seniors that depend on Medicare for their health coverage are especially affected by the high costs of medications because the Medicare program in most cases does not cover the cost of prescription drugs.

This past week I sat in a living room in my district in South Hackensack, New Jersey, and heard from seniors about the financial hardships they must endure to pay for their medications. Mr. Speaker, America's seniors should not have to choose between paying their rent each month or buying the medications that will save or extend their lives. I commend President Clinton for raising the level of national debate on prescription drugs for America's seniors, and I urge all of my colleagues to rise to this challenge for the seniors of today and for the seniors of tomorrow.

THE SURPLUS BELONGS TO THE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the latest government economic report estimates that the budget surpluses over the next 15 years will be larger than expected, much larger than expected. While the other side is busy celebrating the new opportunities to expand the Federal bureaucracy and create new Washington programs, conservatives are asking more fundamental questions about the budget surplus: To whom does it belong? Once that question is answered, it is easier to answer the question about what should be done with it.

The surplus belongs, of course, to the taxpayers. Note the surplus does not belong to all Americans, it belongs to the people who sent the money to Washington to begin with.

Now, if the Democrats have their way, that money will be spent. Many Democrats will talk about using it for debt reduction, but history does not inspire confidence. Anyone who claims that the liberal tax and spenders will not spend the surplus is invited to give me just one example of an instance when it did not happen.

THE COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in support of the Community Reinvestment Act. Since 1977 this act has been instrumental in countering discrimination in lending practices. As we consider H.R. 10 this

week, we should strengthen this successful program.

The CRA requires that financial institutions give back to the communities in which they reside. In the 22 years of its existence loans to African Americans have increased 72 percent, loans to Hispanic families have increased by 45 percent. These impressive statistics along with CRA's track record of assisting low income families participate in the American dream of home ownership and entrepreneurship should be enough evidence to protect and expand it in the House banking bill. Neighborhoods that only two decades ago were in decline are now showing signs of new life.

Mr. Speaker, the CRA encourages fair business practices, reinvigorates communities and creates jobs, all things this Congress should support.

HOWARD COUNTY SUMMER THEATER: 25 YEARS OF GREAT PRODUCTIONS AND WORTHY CAUSES

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this summer will mark the silver anniversary of the Howard County Maryland Summer Theater. This outstanding all-volunteer organization, which annually donates the proceeds from its productions to worthwhile humanitarian causes, was founded 25 years ago by a dedicated group of citizens who wanted their children and others to have a theatrical outlet during the summer. These individuals, Elsie Best, Jean Grenon and Hazel Philbrick, had the vision and commitment to make a wonderful theatrical opportunity available to Howard County residents.

Since its founding, the theater has presented 25 productions and has contributed more than \$17,000 from its family-oriented musicals to local organizations assisting the homeless and the elderly as well as children effected by divorce, abuse and illness. In 25 years more than 15,000 people have attended the Howard County Summer Theater. Hello, Dolly will open this July 16. It is my sincerest wish that the theater will continue to enjoy impressive community-wide support this season and well into the future.

I want to extend my best regards to all those affiliated with the Howard County Summer Theater, especially to the theatrical pioneers who made it possible over the past 25 years and to those who are dedicated to keeping a good thing going. Congratulations and God's blessing.

TOP PRIORITIES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, provide prescription drug coverage for seniors, give middle class tax cuts and eliminate the Federal debt are well-rounded and thoughtful. Saving Social Security and Medicare and extending their solvency needs to be a top priority of this Congress. Prescription drug coverage for seniors is a critical part of any modern health program. Treatment with medication is cost effective when compared to treating late stage ailments with surgery or other in-patient care. Our seniors who struggle every day for their prescription drugs should not have to choose between paying for food and paying for medication. A prescription drug benefit will prepare Medicare and our seniors' health care for the 21st century.

Fortunately, we are in a position to accomplish these goals due to a strong economy and a once in a generation Federal surplus. Providing prescription drug coverage for seniors as well as providing tax relief for working families is sound and responsible. This opportunity must not be squandered; it must not be wasted. We need to provide for seniors for their future.

PUT OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, ask a liberal what he would do to get rid of the budget deficit, and he or she will say: Raise taxes. Ask a conservative the same question, and he or she will say: Cut spending. That in a nutshell is how we got from a huge budget deficit to the current budget surplus we now enjoy. President Clinton choose the liberal way when he raised taxes in 1993, the largest tax increase in history. Republicans took over the majority in Congress in 1995 and have tried to cut spending and limit the amount of new big government spending programs proposed by the liberals. Two different visions, two different paths to achieve the common goal of a balanced budget.

Republicans forced the President to submit a balanced budget after his first two budgets contained \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. We are grateful that the President finally agreed to work with Republicans to put our financial house in order. Lower mortgage interest rates, lower credit card payments and more job creation have resulted from the change from budget deficits to budget surplus. Good fiscal discipline will help save Social Security and Medicare.

THERE WILL NEVER BE A BETTER TIME TO CUT TAXES

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, according to the numbers as we just heard that were released this week, the OMB has decided that there is going to be a surplus of some \$1 trillion over the next 15 years. This is good news, and it provides Congress with an historic opportunity to improve the standard of living of our Nation by giving tax relief.

The President said in a Rose Garden ceremony Monday: Our new budget framework will use part of the surplus to provide substantial tax relief. The average American has to work 129 days or to May 11 before they get through paying their taxes. Last year, tax revenues grew by 9 percent. That is twice, twice as fast as the economy grew.

Now there are several tax cut plans that we could talk about, but the one that I would favor is one I introduced in this House, is to cut taxes across the board. It is the fairest and the simplest way. It stops the proposal, it stops the practice, rather, of picking winners and losers among overtaxed Americans and allows everybody who pays Federal income taxes to keep more of their hard-earned money.

Mr. Speaker, with the economy growing and the Federal Government running a giant surplus, there will never be a better time than now to cut taxes.

IT TAKES A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS TO GET THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton ran an ad in his first presidential campaign back in 1992 in which he said he wanted to end welfare as we know it. Then what happened? Well, he had a Democrat-controlled Congress for the first 2 years of his term, and what did they do on welfare reform? Nothing.

The American people decided it was time for a change in 1994, just 2 years later, and elected a Republican majority in the House for the first time in 40 years. The Republican Congress passed welfare reform; the President vetoed it. And then we passed it again, and then he vetoed it a second time. We finally passed it a third time shortly before the election, and the President finally signed it into law, and then he took credit for it.

The liberals had ranted and raved that welfare reform, because it passed, we would see people starving in the streets. Well, just about everybody now agrees that the welfare reform has been one of the greatest success stories in years. Millions of people who were stuck, who were trapped on welfare are now working and supporting themselves and their own children instead of relying on their fellow taxpayers to support them.

Mr. Speaker, it took a Republican Congress to get the job done.

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is a philosophical difference between the Congress and the White House. It will be difficult to reach any kind of agreement on the size and scope of government.

Republicans want to move in one direction, and the liberals in the White House in another direction. Republicans want a smaller Federal Government. The President is fighting to expand the government. Republicans want to cut unnecessary wasteful Washington spending. The President wants to increase spending, throwing money at any kind of problem. The Republicans want the 2000 census to be conducted in accordance with the Constitution, which states clearly there shall be an actual enumeration because everyone counts. The President wants to rig the census by allowing political appointees to oversee sampling or, in other words, take another poll. Republicans want to pass a tax cut for working Americans. The President is opposed. Republicans want to protect the surplus. The President wants to use it for new Washington spending.

With such sharp differences in vision, it is no surprise that negotiations will be slow and difficult. But here in Congress we will work hard for the Republican vision of lower taxes and less government, giving working Americans more freedom and a little extra room in their family budget.

CLINTON/GORE ACTIONS TO UNDERMINE THE IMPORTANCE OF PARENTS

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when information reached me that the Clinton administration is working hard at the United Nations to undermine and to utterly trash the role of parents throughout the world, I was outraged. Five years ago at the Cairo Population Control Conference AL GORE led an unsuccessful effort to get abortion on demand throughout pregnancy declared an international right. Now Bill Clinton and AL GORE's hand-picked negotiators at this week's 5-year follow-up meeting on the Cairo conference are at it again. They are formally pushing to delete from the proposed implementation document the only two references urging, quote, respect for the rights, duties and responsibilities of parents in the critical areas of sex education and reproductive care for adolescents.

□ 1030

Ironically, while these anti-parent proposals are being aggressively pushed at the U.N., the House is poised to take

up legislation to protect minor children from abortion through parental notification or consent. Despite broad support for the bill and wide recognition of the unique importance of parents, this administration is threatening to veto this legislation.

Now, by their delegates' activities at the U.N., Bill Clinton and AL GORE are demonstrating that they are not satisfied with undermining parental rights at home. They want to impose this policy on foreign nations abroad.

ANGELO BERTELLI BIOGRAPHY

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Angelo Bertelli died on Saturday at the age of 78 years old. Angelo Bertelli was one of the great football players in the history of college football in America, and he played at Cathedral High School in Springfield. He was the son of Italian immigrants, and people like Nick Buoniconti and Joe Scibelli followed in that tradition at Cathedral High School as well. At Cathedral, he not only was a star in football, but he won all-State honors in baseball and hockey as well and served as senior class president.

He entered Notre Dame, became college football's first T-formation quarterback under Frank Leahy.

The T-formation became an immediate success and the legendary sports writer Grantland Rice called him the T-formation magician.

He was voted to all-American teams in 1942 and 1943; and in the year 1943, he won the Heisman Trophy.

He became a captain in the Marine Corps. He fought in Iwo Jima and Guam. He earned a bronze star and the purple heart. After World War II, he became a successful businessman in New Jersey; and he was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to have known Angelo Bertelli and to have known him as a perfect gentleman, a great father, a terrific brother and a wonderful husband, and an extraordinary citizen and a patriot.

Last year, he gave me the opportunity to watch him as he addressed the football banquet at Cathedral High School for a team that had won the State championship. Angelo Bertelli never lost the special qualities that endeared him to America, and we regret his passing.

PRICE CONTROLS DO NOT WORK

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my Democratic colleagues who are demonizing yet another entire industry; this time the pharmaceutical industry, the

companies who produce life-saving drugs and truly miraculous drugs which allow us to live longer and healthier lives. Sometimes one just has to wonder if liberals have worked a single day in the real world, the world of commerce, the world where jobs are created and results are the only thing that count.

For many drug companies, we can break down how much money goes into the manufacture of a pill: 2 percent for ingredients; 5 percent for labor; 3 percent for distribution; 5 percent for profits and the remaining 85 percent research, development, taxes, regulation and litigation.

Price controls have been tried many times. They never work, never work. Every time they are tried, they are a miserable failure. They lead to shortages, inferior products, black market and goods which never make it to the market. I despair at the thought that this lesson has never been learned. Let us not try price controls.

IT IS TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF OUR REFUGEE SYSTEM AND IMMIGRATION POLICY

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I apologize but I just had to come up and make a statement about something that one of my colleagues was addressing, the issue of the Cuban immigrants who were basically forced to be accepted within the United States shores. It was one of the interesting situations where we had a group of people in a boat that were directed to stop by the Coast Guard and a few of them jump overboard and violate the direction and swim ashore and get to stay on U.S. soil permanently under a refugee status, while those who played by the rules, at least took direction, technically were not supposed to stay here. The absurdity of the situation is that then somebody has a demonstration protesting the fact that those who abide by the rules have to go back to Cuba, and they reverse the policy and say all of them can stay.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we address the issue that our refugee system and our immigration policy do not follow common sense. I know this is not politically correct to talk about, but frankly I think that common sense is always politically correct; that we have people that want to come to this country legally, play by the rules, want to enter legally and they are told they cannot, while we reward those who are breaking the rules and coming into our country illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I ask us to correct this issue and address it here on the House floor.

THE B-E-S-T AGENDA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this year the Republican Party has introduced and been pushing for the BEST agenda. B is for best, strongest military; E is for excellence in education, with local control, not Washington control; S is for saving Social Security; and T is for reducing taxes through spending reductions.

Now, part of our planning under Social Security protection is the lockbox concept. What the lockbox says is that Congress will no longer mix Social Security money with general operating money. Just as businesses cannot mix pension plans with operating expenses, the U.S. Government needs to do the same thing. Put Social Security funds in a lockbox so that it will be there for retirement.

That bill passed the House on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, Republicans and Democrats. Now it is in the other body. Hopefully they will bring it to the floor. It has been 70 days that they have drug this thing out. Now the President is in support of it. I ask the other body to please pass the lockbox and protect Social Security for the future.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 233 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 233

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1218) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a closed rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. It provides for consideration of H.R. 1218 in the House with 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled between the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Custody Protection Act is important to any parent who has a teenage daughter. As we all know, the people of several States have recently decided that a parent should know before their child has an abortion. We all hope that our teenage daughters have the wisdom to avoid pregnancy but if they make a mistake, a parent is best able to provide advice, counseling and love. Also, more than anyone else, a parent knows their child's medical history.

For these reasons, my home State of North Carolina requires a parent to know before their child checks into an abortion clinic.

Last month, the House Subcommittee on the Constitution heard chilling testimony about how law-breaking citizens risk children's lives by taking them from their parents for out-of-State abortions. The testimony was chillingly similar to a hearing last year before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, at which Joyce Farley, a mother from Pennsylvania, told the tragic story of her 13-year-old daughter.

Four years ago this summer, a stranger took Ms. Farley's child out of school, provided her with alcohol, transported her out of State to have an abortion, falsified medical records at the abortion clinic and abandoned her in a town 30 miles away, frightened and bleeding.

Why? Because this stranger's adult son had raped Joyce Farley's teenage daughter, and she was desperate to cover up her son's tracks. Even worse, this all may have been legal. It is perfectly legal to avoid parental abortion consent and notification laws by driving children to another State. This is wrong and it has to be stopped.

According to the Reproductive Law and Policy Center, a pro-abortion group in New York, thousands of adults across the country carry children over State lines to get abortions in States without parental notification laws. So-called men in their 20s and 30s coerce teenage girls to have abortions out of State and without their parents' knowledge. The Child Custody Protection Act will put a stop to this child abuse. If passed, the law would make it a crime to transport a minor across State lines to avoid laws that require parental consent or notification before an abortion.

Right now a parent in Charlotte, North Carolina, must grant permission before the school nurse gives their child an aspirin, but a parent cannot prevent a stranger from taking their child out of school and up to New York City for an abortion.

Give me a break. This is nonsense and it has to be stopped. Let us do something to help thousands of children in this country. Let us pass the Child Custody Protection Act and put

an end to the absurd notion that there is some sort of constitutional right for an adult stranger to secretly take someone's teenage child into a different State for an abortion.

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this closed rule for H.R. 1218 offered by my friends in the majority. Efforts on our side of the aisle to obtain an open rule to provide consideration of several thoughtful and important amendments were rebuffed.

The objectionable nature of this process is compounded by the substance of the underlying bill, the so-called Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation creates more danger than it would ever prevent and is an affront to the notion not only of individual liberty but to the issue of States' rights which so many of my friends who support this bill will champion on every other occasion.

The decision made by a young woman whether to terminate a pregnancy is one we all hope would be made in close consultation with family members who love her and care for her, but this is not a perfect world. We cannot ignore the fact that there are homes which lack stability, where decisions of such gravity are not made by a loving and caring environment and, in fact, are often tainted by dread and fear. Often, a young woman who is forced to make this most difficult decision has no parent with whom to consult and has no viable option other than to depend on a trusted figure who is not her mother or father.

Indeed, we are jeopardizing grandmothers, grandfathers, sisters, brothers, spiritual advisors, and anyone from giving this young woman comfort.

For this Congress to attempt to criminalize the actions of the one and perhaps the only individual in that young person's life on whom she can depend is more than unfortunate and should be soundly rejected.

Mr. Speaker, there is no stronger advocate than I for measures to reduce unwanted pregnancies and to give women every assistance that she and the child which she decides to bring into the world will need to be nurtured and cared for. Nor, Mr. Speaker, will one find any stronger advocate for the protection of the health care, safety and confidentiality, nor for the fundamental right of choice which the courts have recognized and upheld.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress not to criminalize the acts of other family

members in an attempt to help someone that they dearly love and who needs them desperately.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as we know, will make it a Federal misdemeanor for a non-parental adult to transport someone else's daughter, underage daughter, across State lines for the purposes of obtaining an abortion.

□ 1045

Presently 24 States in our Union have passed parental consent or notification laws in order to protect minor girls from irreparable harm that can be caused to them. Yet, with complete and total disregard for the law, many adults choose to willingly circumvent those State laws, placing young, vulnerable girls in serious danger as they undergo potentially fatal abortions.

Without the Child Custody Protection Act, rapists, sexual abusers, and other violators can continue to exploit our Nation's underage daughters, help them disobey State laws, and then continue to rape and abuse them.

No one knows the medical history of their child better than a parent. No one can best detect how a child will react to distress but a parent. No one knows how to best provide counsel and comfort but a parent. The Child Custody Protection Act will protect a parent's right to parent, and it will protect and enforce existing State laws that are being violated.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we will hear from the minority in Congress about the ways in which they think this bill violates a constitutional right. But what they do not tell us is that by not passing this law, we will continue to defend and accept violators of local State laws.

Opponents of this bill will also let us know how it was misnamed. They believe that this should be the Teen Endangerment Act because of the supposed risk it places upon young girls, but they will surely not tell us about the serious risks that young girls are placed in when obtaining secret abortions. They will not tell us of the many, many girls who suffer severe complications from abortions or reactions from medications they are receiving, and about the girls who, in rare instances, actually die.

They will argue that a 13-year-old minor girl who finds herself with an unplanned and unwanted pregnancy is perfectly capable and mature enough to make the same decision that her more mature and older counterparts are making. This, of course, is absurd. This bill is commonsense legislation. The Child Custody Protection Act will

protect the inherent right of every parent. It will put an end to strangers taking someone else's daughter across State boundaries.

No one is able to temporarily kidnap your daughter to have her tonsils removed or for any other simple surgery, not even to have her ears pierced. Then why then should a potentially fatal abortion be the exception? I urge my colleagues to consider the many girls who, while in a confused and vulnerable state, will be exploited by opponents of this bill and by the abortion industry today.

On their behalf and on behalf of their parents, I ask my colleagues to seriously consider voting yes to this important pro-family commonsense legislation.

It is true that 85 percent of American families support the Child Custody Protection Act. Whether pro-life or pro-choice, Americans believe that a parent should be involved in major decisions that can have long-lasting consequences on the lives of their daughters. The Child Custody Protection Act will provide grounds for stronger family ties and for family involvement.

By enforcing parental consent or notification laws in the 24 States where they exist, it will stand to demonstrate that we will not tolerate violators of local laws, that we care about the welfare of our children, and that we look to foster parental involvement in all aspects of the lives of our children.

The truth is that more than half of the underage girls who will be affected by this legislation are typically escorted by boyfriends or men who have impregnated the minor.

I would like to call attention to the posters that I have where out-of-State abortion clinics are advertising no parental consent required, no waiting period, no age restriction, and these are advertisements that have appeared in Pennsylvania phone books for an abortion clinic in another State, in Delaware.

There is another abortion clinic that advertises for an abortion clinic in Maryland. They put in big capital letters, "No parental consent."

We remember the Joyce Farley case in Pennsylvania, where her 13-year-old daughter was raped. The mother of the rapist, a complete stranger, took Joyce Farley's daughter out of school one day without permission, drove her to New York City, where she obtained an abortion, and a botched abortion, at that. As a result, the Farley daughter of this 1995 case suffered serious complications, endured many hospital visits, and was subjected to incredibly high medical bills.

The Farley case, Mr. Speaker, is one of many which indicates the legislation is needed for cases like this and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to getting support from my colleagues for this important bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed this morning because it has always been my understanding that the more we can educate both our colleagues and, as well, the American public on the principles of our opposition, and, as well, the more we can help to enhance legislation to make it a responsible legislative initiative in keeping with constitutional provisions, the more we should attempt to do so.

I rise in opposition to the rule because it is a closed rule, and for no other reason I can imagine other than a political reason, amendments of value were kept out of this legislation.

This legislation is called the Child Custody Protection Act, which gives us the impression that it is to protect children or young people or young women. Young women have the same right to choose constitutionally as others. The amendments that would have been offered to this legislation would have protected children, if that is the name of this legislation, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) would have emphasized the exception to this bill that refuses to allow young women to seek an abortion outside of the State in the situation where the life or the serious health of the minor is at stake, similar to that that is constitutionally protected.

It would also have included protection, if we had had an open rule, to exempt ministers and rabbis, grandmothers, aunts or uncles, or an elder sibling to give that young woman someone else in case she is being abused in the home.

It would have then, of course, provided an opportunity, in the Conyers amendment offered as a substitute, it would make it a Federal offense to use force or threat to transport a minor across State lines for an abortion. The penalty would be a fine and imprisonment of 5 years.

None of these amendments were allowed in for an open and full debate, and I am disappointed. This is a serious step that this House might make today. It would be denying or undermining the constitutional privileges of a minor who is in trouble. It would eliminate their opportunity to seek counseling from a variety of people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do a legislatively positive job, we need to be inclusive. We should have had an open rule. I stand in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this closed rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. In its present form, I am strongly opposed to this bill because it would criminalize any attempt by a caring adult to assist a young woman in obtaining abortion services across state lines. By adopting a closed rule, the Committee has allowed a potentially dangerous bill to come to the floor for a vote.

It is still the law of the land that minors may obtain abortion services. This Child Custody Protection Act is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restriction to abortion services.

The people who would help a young woman by offering her transport across state lines are those who are there to lend physical support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. Relatives, close friends, and even clergy members who offer assistance should not be subject to criminal fines and sanctions.

More than 75% of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in their decision to have an abortion. However, there is the population of young women (30%) who cannot go to their parents for fear of violence or for fear of being turned away.

I offered several amendments that would have exempted certain people from the prohibitions of this Act. These people included religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents. I joined my colleague Representative NADLER for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well.

Unfortunately, these amendments were not adopted and now, we will jail these caring adults like grandparents for helping young women or we will see an increase in the number of illegal or unsafe abortions. If this bill passes, we will force young women who seek to get an abortion out of state to go alone.

I offered another amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office Study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. This amendment was also not made in order.

This closed rule does not protect any children—this bill should be called the "Teen Endangerment Act." This bill isolates minors from family members, friends and other responsible adults. I urge my Colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we all know parents would do anything to protect their children from harm. Congress should honor that commitment and help parents by passing the rule for H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. This is a good bill and a fair rule. Both should be passed.

H.R. 1218 would make it a Federal offense for an individual to knowingly transport a minor girl across State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion without her parents' consent, and to circumvent the 20 States which currently have parental notification consent laws.

Evidence shows that a majority of school-aged girls who become pregnant were impregnated by adult males. This by itself is a form of sexual child abuse recognized by statutory rape laws. This child abuse is compounded if unrelated adults seek to avoid rape charges or accountability by manipulating these girls into having an abortion in another State without their parents'

knowledge and in violation of State laws.

This is not a vote about whether we agree with parental consent notification laws. This is a vote about whether we respect existing State law and want to eliminate a loophole which encourages child sexual abuse. It is a good rule. Vote yes on the rule.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the bill (H.R. 1218) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 1218 is as follows:

H.R. 1218

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Custody Protection Act".

SEC. 2. TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 117 the following:

"CHAPTER 117A—TRANSPORTATION OF MINORS IN CIRCUMVENTION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO ABORTION

"Sec.

"2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion.

"§2431. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion

"(a) OFFENSE.—

"(1) GENERALLY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), whoever knowingly transports an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years across a State line, with the intent that such individual obtain an abortion, and thereby in fact abridges the right of a parent under a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, in force in the State where the individual resides, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, an abridgement of the right of a parent occurs if an abortion is performed on the individual, in a State other than the State where the individual resides, without the parental consent or notification, or the judicial authorization, that would have been required by that law had the abortion been performed in the State where the individual resides.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The prohibition of subsection (a) does not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor because her life was endangered by a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life endangering physical

condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

"(2) An individual transported in violation of this section, and any parent of that individual, may not be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this section, a conspiracy to violate this section, or an offense under section 2 or 3 based on a violation of this section.

"(c) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE.—It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution for an offense, or to a civil action, based on a violation of this section that the defendant reasonably believed, based on information the defendant obtained directly from a parent of the individual or other compelling facts, that before the individual obtained the abortion, the parental consent or notification, or judicial authorization took place that would have been required by the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision, had the abortion been performed in the State where the individual resides.

"(d) CIVIL ACTION.—Any parent who suffers legal harm from a violation of subsection (a) may obtain appropriate relief in a civil action.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(1) a law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision is a law—

"(A) requiring, before an abortion is performed on a minor, either—

"(i) the notification to, or consent of, a parent of that minor; or

"(ii) proceedings in a State court; and

"(B) that does not provide as an alternative to the requirements described in subparagraph (A) notification to or consent of any person or entity who is not described in that subparagraph;

"(2) the term 'parent' means—

"(A) a parent or guardian;

"(B) a legal custodian; or

"(C) a person standing in loco parentis who has care and control of the minor, and with whom the minor regularly resides;

who is designated by the law requiring parental involvement in the minor's abortion decision as a person to whom notification, or from whom consent, is required;

"(3) the term 'minor' means an individual who is not older than the maximum age requiring parental notification or consent, or proceedings in a State court, under the law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision; and

"(4) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and any commonwealth, possession, or other territory of the United States."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 117 the following new item:

"117A. Transportation of minors in circumvention of certain laws relating to abortion 2431".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the legislation under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the prime sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time. He has done an extraordinary job in helping to pass this legislation and promoting it, especially in the Committee on the Judiciary last year and again this year. I thank him for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, abortion is perhaps one of the most life-altering and life-threatening, obviously, of procedures. It leaves lasting medical, emotional, and psychological consequences, and, as noted by the Supreme Court, particularly when the patient is immature.

Although *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion in 1973, it did not legalize the right of persons other than a parent or a guardian to decide what is best for a child, nor did it legalize the right for strangers to take the lives of our children and place them in danger, potentially fatal danger.

Many may be familiar with the Child Custody Protection Act, a bill which makes it a Federal misdemeanor to transport an underage girl across State lines, because we had this discussion last year, and we know that it is commonsense legislation because these people want to circumvent State or local parental notification laws for the purposes of obtaining an abortion for a minor girl.

Last year I introduced this legislation. It passed the House with almost a two-thirds majority. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to consider the bill for a vote. This year the bill is up before us again as H.R. 1218. With the support of 130 congressional cosponsors who have spoken in favor of the bill, we are very hopeful that once again we will be able to pass this bill.

In our society, Mr. Speaker, there are many rules and regulations aimed at ensuring the safety of our Nation's youths through parental consent and notification and through parental guidance.

At my alma mater, Southwest Miami High School, for example, as in many of our schools throughout our Nation, a child cannot be given an aspirin to relieve a simple headache or cramp unless the school has been given consent, signed consent, by at least one parent or guardian. In some States a minor cannot operate a vehicle until the age of 18.

Most schools require parental consent in order to take minors on field trips, and in many schools parents have the ability also to decide whether or not their children should be enrolled in sex education class. Both the field trip and these classes require parental notification and consent.

Every one of these principles emphasizes that parents should be the ones

involved in those decisions because they can seriously affect their children. The decision of whether or not to obtain an abortion, a life-altering, potentially fatal, and at all times serious medical procedure, should be no exception to these rules.

I find it ironic how anti-tobacco groups and Members of Congress are outraged over a cigarette ad that entices a young person to smoke, yet remain silent on this issue of whether a minor should be taken across State lines to have an abortion performed. They call for hearings and conferences and they spend millions of dollars on ads and lobbying efforts in order to consumer legislation to keep minors from being harmed by tobacco. Yet, these very same individuals remain absolutely silent when ads such as the ones that I am going to explain in a second are placed in our public yellow pages.

□ 1100

These ads lure young girls to directly disobey the law. They promote civil disobedience and entice vulnerable children with dangerous slogans such as the ones that we see here, "No parental consent needed." This is a Yellow Page advertisement that appeared in the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Yellow Pages for an abortion clinic, not in Pennsylvania, but in Maryland. So they placed this ad in another State because, in that State, there is a parental consent or notification law; and they say, do not worry, no parental consent is needed for another State.

This other advertisement, Mr. Speaker, comes from the Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Yellow Pages. Although the ad appears in Pennsylvania, the abortion clinic is in Delaware. In big capital letters, in bold, they say proudly, "No age restriction. No parental or spousal consent. No waiting period." So the first thing they put there is "No age restriction."

Well, my legislation, the bill before us, the Child Custody Protection Act, would end this exploitation of our Nation's minor girls from violators who recklessly disregard the law.

By making a circumvention of State parental or notification laws a Federal misdemeanor, this bill will not only help uphold the laws of our country, but it will give back the parents the right to parent. It will strengthen family bonds; and, most importantly, it will ensure that America's youth have a safer, healthier, and brighter future.

By ensuring passage of this legislation, we will really prove to the American people that Congress does indeed work hard to protect both parents and children and protect our families.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. This bill criminalizes any good-faith attempt by a caring adult to assist a young woman in obtaining abortion services across State lines.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to again acknowledge the passion which the proponent of this legislation has come to the floor of the House. I think it is important to enunciate the fact that many of us who are pro-choice consider ourselves as well pro-life, to encourage the life of the living and to ensure that there is a recognition that, constitutionally, women have a right to make personal decisions on these very sacred and important issues.

What this legislation does, by calling it the Child Custody Protection Act, is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restrictions to abortion services.

This bill would make it more difficult for minors living in States with parental notification or consent laws to obtain an abortion by making it a Federal crime to transport minors across State lines. More than 75 percent of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in this enormous decision, one which they wish they did not have to make, to have an abortion.

In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion, and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, place one in the position of a young female teenager going into an enormously challenging and frightening circumstance of a courtroom. Mr. Speaker, we have already noted several instances where judges have looked on this young woman and said that they are too immature to ask for a judicial waiver, a bypass. In fact, we have cases where judges repeatedly have denied instances where teenagers have had enough courage to come into the courtroom. This is not the kind of atmosphere where one is going to get the most open decision. Many teens are embarrassed and afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver.

Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of the parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family. This happens frequently.

There are various reasons why a young woman could not go to her parent for guidance. Some family situations are not conducive to open com-

munication, and some situations are violent. For a young woman who needs to turn to someone other than a parent, this law creates severe hardships. In fact, this law may do more damage than it may do helping the young person.

The need to travel across State lines may be necessary in States where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various State restrictions or distance. Some young women may seek services outside of their home State because the closest abortion provider may be across State lines.

I have offered or did offer several amendments that would have exempted religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins, and godparents. I joined the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well, some responsible adult that could counsel that young person and provide comfort for them, to give them the opportunity to make a reasoned and balanced decision, not to be cowering in back alleys using coat hangers of yesteryear and destroying their lives.

For a reason that I hope all of us could understand, these young people are frightened. Something has happened to them that may be they did not want to happen. For all we know, they could have been abused by a parent. This is not unknown that someone in the family has abused them, and, therefore, they could not go to a parent.

Or as in the young woman by the name of Becky, they could have had a loving parental situation where they loved the parent very much, and the parent loved them. They were too ashamed to go and tell their parent that they were pregnant. Because of their shame, they went to a back alley abortionist, became infected and died.

The autopsy report indicated that Becky had died from a botched abortion. Becky was about 17 years old. Her parents testified before the Committee on the Judiciary begging us not to pass this legislation. They would have wanted Becky to have been able to go across State lines and to secure a safe abortion because they would have had Becky with them today.

I also offered an amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. What is going to be the impact of this bill? Are we going to see an enormous increase in aborted or illegal abortions that would bring about the loss of life?

These amendments were not made in order. It is unfortunate because family members such as grandparents and siblings should not be jailed for assisting a scared grandchild or younger sister in time of need. Young women should

be encouraged to involve an adult in any decision to terminate a pregnancy. This is just a federalized chilling effect to inhibit and to deny young women the counseling and comfort of someone whom they have confidence in.

This is not going to diminish abortions, Mr. Speaker. This is only going to take away the rights of young people, young women who could, in fact, start their lives all over again. I hope that my colleagues will defeat this bill. This bill would isolate young women from trusted adults by placing criminal sanctions for providing basic comfort and advice.

I ask my colleagues to not support this legislation. I would ask them to stand on behalf of the young people who are so much involved in this crisis all the time and realize that their lives were in jeopardy by legislation that is well-intentioned but serves no purpose because it takes away from them the very rights that are provided to them by the laws of this land.

I stand in strong opposition to this bill, H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999. This bill criminalizes any good faith attempt by a caring adult to assist a young woman in obtaining abortion services across state lines. This Child Custody Protection Act is simply another effort to undermine the right of choice for a young woman by imposing dangerous and unnecessary restrictions to abortion services.

This bill would make it more difficult for minors living in states with parental notification or consent laws to obtain an abortion by making it a federal crime to transport minors across state lines. More than 75 percent of minors under 16 years old already involve one or both parents in their decision to have an abortion.

In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Many teens are embarrassed and are afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver. Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of their parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family.

There are various reasons why a young woman could not go to her parents for guidance. Some family situations are not conducive to open communication and some situations are violent. For young women who need to turn to someone other than a parent, this law create severe hardships.

The need to travel across state lines may be necessary in states where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various states restrictions or distance. Some young women must seek serv-

ices outside of their home state because the closest abortion provider may be across state lines.

I offered several amendments that would have exempted religious leaders, aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents. I joined Rep. Nadler for an amendment that would have exempted grandparents and older siblings from the criminal penalties as well. I also offered an amendment that would have called for a General Accounting Office Study to keep track of the impact of this bill on the number of illegal abortions and the casualties that result. These amendments were not made in order.

It is unfortunate because family members such as grandparents and siblings should not be jailed for assisting a scared grandchild or younger sister in a time of need. Young women should be encouraged to involve an adult in any decision to terminate a pregnancy.

I hope that my colleagues will defeat this bill. This bill would isolate young women from trusted adults by placing criminal sanctions on providing basic comfort and advice. Please vote against this dangerous bill.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on this legislation and for her thoughtful explanation of the purpose of the bill that is now before the House.

It is important that all the Members of the House understand just how this bill will operate and what it will accomplish. Unfortunately, a great deal of misinformation has been put forth in opposition to this legislation by those who object in principle to any State law providing for parental consent or notification when a minor girl seeks to obtain an abortion. It is important that we cut through all this misinformation and focus on what the bill actually does.

H.R. 1218 amends Title I of the United States Code by criminalizing the knowing transportation across the State line of a girl under 18 years of age with the intent that she obtain an abortion, in abridgement of a parent's right of involvement under the law of the State where the child resides.

Under the bill, a violation of the parental right occurs when an abortion is performed on the minor in a State other than the minor's residence and without the parental consent or notification or the judicial authorization that would have been required had the abortion been performed in the minor's State of residence.

The Child Custody Protection Act gives the parents of the minor girl a civil cause of action if they suffer legal harm from a violation of the bill.

The bill ensures that neither the minor herself nor her parents may be prosecuted or sued for a violation of this bill. It also provides an exception for the life of the mother. In addition, the bill provides an affirmative defense

to any prosecution or civil action where the defendant reasonably believed, based on information obtained directly from the girl's parent or other compelling facts, that the requirements of the parental involvement laws of the girl's State of residence had been satisfied.

Thus, H.R. 1218 only addresses those who covertly take young girls out of their home State for abortions in disregard of protective State laws and parental rights. This bill is a reasonable and carefully drafted solution to a serious nationwide problem that has been carefully documented.

Now, the House will hear arguments today that this bill will endanger the lives of young girls. That is simply false. Indeed, the opposite is true. It is when young girls are secretly taken for abortions without their parents' knowledge that they face serious risk to their health and well-being.

An abortion is a serious and often dangerous medical procedure. When an abortion is performed on a girl without the physician having full knowledge of her medical history, which is usually only available from a parent, the risk to the young woman greatly increase. Moreover, minor girls who do not involve their parents usually do not return for follow-up treatment, which can lead to dangerous and indeed deadly complications.

During the subcommittee's hearing on this bill, we heard from one mother whose daughter was secretly taken away from an abortion and suffered serious complications from the botched procedure. Her daughter required additional surgery after the abortion which could only be performed with her mother's consent. What an irony. What an irony. The law allowed the minor to be taken out of State for an abortion without any parental involvement, but scrupulously required parental consent for the medical treatment that was necessitated by the botched procedure.

As Dr. Bruce Lucero, a prominent abortionist and abortion rights advocate, wrote in a New York Times op-ed piece during the last consideration of this bill by the Congress in the last Congress, teenage girls who have abortions without consulting their patients face greater risk to their health than those who consult with their parents. It is the parents who have fullest access to relevant information concerning the girl's health, and it is the parent who is in the best position to see that any complications are promptly and effectively treated.

The House will also hear arguments that the bill needs a health exception. Once again, that is simply wrong. The bill specifically provides that it would not apply if the abortion was necessary to save the life of the minor.

Now, if the concern is about health risk of a non-life-threatening nature, then the best course of action is involvement of the parents for the reasons I have just expressed. If there is some compelling reason why the girl

cannot tell her parents, then she always has the ability to seek an expeditious judicial review which all valid State parental involvement laws are required to permit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, today the House will hear arguments that the parents are not really the people who should have the right to consent to their minor child's abortion but that such consent ought to be given by the parents, someone standing in stead of the parents, the grandparents, the aunts and uncles, the cousins, siblings, ministers, rabbis, or godparents or anybody else. It is these folks who should have the right to take someone else's child out of the State for the purpose of obtaining an abortion.

Now, these types of arguments against the bill are really objections to the underlying State parental notice and consent laws and the Supreme Court decisions that have upheld those laws. Those who disagree with parental notice and consent laws and the Supreme Court decisions who have validated them ought to take the matter up with the States and the Supreme Court.

Now, the opponents of this bill seek to analyze it as though it were a prohibition on the right of adults to travel to engage in activities that are legal in the State to which they travel but not legal in their State of residence. This analysis widely misses the mark. This is not a bill which is aimed at the right of adults to travel. This is a bill which is aimed at the protection of minors.

It is axiomatic, and the Supreme Court has repeated it time and time again, that the power of the State to control the conduct of children reaches beyond the scope of its authority over adults. The court has also time and again stated that it is, and I quote once more, it "is cardinal with us," that is the courts, "that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first with the parents, whose primary function and freedom includes preparation for obligations the States can neither supply nor hinder."

□ 1115

Thus, as the court has said, constitutional interpretation has consistently recognized that the parents' claim to authority in their own household to direct the rearing of their child is basic to the structure of our society.

Now, this bill squarely fits within this constitutional tradition regarding the rights of parents. It simply seeks to assure effective enforcement of State laws designed to protect the right of parents and the welfare of children. And the opponents of this bill have a problem with those underlying laws. I think it is safe to say that all of those who oppose this bill fall among those who do not like any sort of parental involvement, parental notice or parental consent law.

As the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) has noted, across the country a child cannot even be

given aspirin at school without her parent's permission, yet strangers can take children across State lines for abortions in circumvention of parental protection statutes. While the abortion industry believes anyone should have the right to take minor girls across State lines for secret abortions, the American public disagrees by a margin of roughly 9 to 1. According to a recent national poll, 85 percent of voters questioned said that a person should not be able to take a minor girl across State lines for an abortion without her parents' knowledge.

This bill, thus, reflects the strong opinion of the American people, and I would suggest that the Members of this House should listen to the voice of the American people on this subject, should reject the arguments that come forth from those who want to deprive the parents of any right to involvement in such a critical decision, and we should move forward to pass this important legislation and send it to the Senate. I urge the Members to vote in favor of H.R. 1218.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I just want to say a few words in opposition to this bill, and I do so because it is lacking in some very important qualities that we all would hope to see in legislation that deals with this subject.

First of all, the bill does nothing to prevent young women from having abortions. It simply puts them at risk, higher risk, for physical harm.

Secondly, the bill does nothing at all to educate young women about teenage pregnancy and about the need for responsible family planning.

Furthermore, it does nothing to reduce the overall number of abortions, a shared goal of everyone in this House and on both sides of this debate.

While we in Congress would like to be able to legislate good parent-child relationships in every family, we ought to know that that is simply beyond our reach. We cannot do it. The truth is most minors do, in fact, involve a parent in the difficult decision to end an unplanned pregnancy, and they should always be encouraged to involve them. Many young women, however, live in households where a parent is absent or, in some cases, even abusive. What we are saying to these young women in this difficult time and under these difficult circumstances is that they are on their own; they are prohibited from enlisting the support or counsel of a trusted friend, another adult or relative.

This legislation sends a terrible message to young women that not only is the Congress willing to trample on their constitutional right to medical privacy, it wants to make abortion more dangerous for them. Since the

bill contains no prohibition whatsoever against women traveling across State lines to avoid a State's consent requirement, it will lead to more women traveling alone to obtain abortions or to seek unsafe abortions locally wherever they may live.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply a bad piece of legislation. The bill's intention may be to increase parental involvement in the difficult decision to seek an abortion, but in reality it will not do so. It will only isolate young women who cannot go to their parents during such a difficult time.

Instead of attempting to legislate good family relationships, we here in the House and the Congress should spend more of our time and resources on reducing the necessity of abortions through teenage pregnancy prevention programs and improving access to information and family planning. This is a piece of legislation that is well-intentioned, I am sure, but the effects of it would be counterproductive, dangerous and disastrous to many, many women across our country.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today there are over 20 States that require consent or notification of at least one parent before a minor girl can obtain an abortion, and my home State of Nebraska is one of those, albeit the law is under continuous attack in the courts and our State legislature. The American people overwhelmingly support parental involvement and condemn the practice of taking young girls out of State to get an abortion without informing their parents. This bill is designed to help those States enforce their own laws.

Perhaps it is because of my 8 years as a city councilman on the Omaha City Council that I strongly believe in the rights of local governments and the States to formulate their own policies and support Federal policies that protect State and local rights.

It is important that we understand what this legislation does not do. This bill does not create a new Federal law regulating abortion. This is not a Federal consent law. States have the right to require parental notification, and we can help them protect young minor girls at a time when they most desperately need the help and involvement of their parents. These children need attention prior, during, and after this serious procedure. Parental notification can help and it should be given a chance to work. This bill allows States to protect children, promote strong family values and help young girls make wise decisions.

Yes, I believe in States' rights and the rights of my home State of Nebraska to protect young girls in our State, but I am also, as a father, protective of parental rights and the sanctity of parents' involvement in their children's lives and vice versa. So I urge a "yes" on H.R. 1218.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a passionate defender of the rights of women.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to the bill.

The legislation we are considering today would prohibit anyone, anyone, including a step-parent, grandparent, or religious counselor from accompanying a young woman across State lines for an abortion. In my judgment, my colleagues, this is a dangerous, misguided bill that isolates our daughters and puts them at grave risk. That is why the President has threatened to veto it.

Under this legislation, young women who feel they cannot turn to their parents when facing an unintended pregnancy will be forced to fend for themselves without help from any responsible adult. Some will seek dangerous back-alley abortions close to home; others will travel to unfamiliar places seeking abortions by themselves.

Thankfully, my colleagues, most young women, more than 75 percent of minors under age 16, already involve their parents in this very difficult decision to seek an abortion. That is the good news. And as a mother, as a grandmother of four and about 7/8ths, one is arriving in August, I hope, as we all hope, that every child can go to her parents for advice and support. But, unfortunately, not every child is so lucky. Not every child has loving parents. Some have parents who are abusive or simply absent.

Now, I believe that those young women who cannot go to their parents should be encouraged. We want to encourage them to go to another responsible adult, a grandmother, an aunt, a Rabbi, a minister in what can be a very, very difficult decision. Already more than half of all young women who do not involve the parent in the decision to terminate a pregnancy choose to involve another adult, including 15 percent who involve another adult relative. That is a good thing. We should encourage the involvement of responsible adults in this decision, be it a step-parent, an aunt or an uncle, religious minister or a counselor, not criminalize that involvement.

Unfortunately, what this bill does is impose criminal penalties on adults, like grandmothers, who come to the aid of their granddaughters. We tried to address this problem at the Committee on Rules by exempting close familiar relatives from criminal liability under the bill. But, unfortunately, that amendment, much to my amazement, it was hard for me to believe, was denied. As a result, this bill will throw grandmothers in jail for assisting their granddaughters.

What will the police do? Are they going to set up granny checkpoints to catch grandmothers helping their granddaughters? Will we have dogs and

search lights at State borders to lock up aunts and uncles? I suppose so.

Mr. Speaker, I am a grandmother of four, and I believe grandparents should be able to help their grandchildren without getting thrown in jail. As much as we might wish otherwise, family communication, open and honest parent-child relationships cannot be legislated. When a young woman cannot turn to her parents, she should certainly be able to turn to her grandmother or a favorite aunt for help. Unfortunately, this legislation criminalizes that involvement.

And so this bill tells young women who cannot tell their parents, just do not tell anyone else. Do not tell a grandparent, do not tell an aunt. No one can help them; they are on their own. As a result, young women will be forced to travel out of State by themselves or remain in-State and obtain an illegal abortion.

Parental consent laws do not force young women to involve their parents in an hour of need. We know that it can do just the opposite. Indiana's parental consent law drove Becky Bell away from the arms of her parents and straight into the back alley. Parental consent laws do not protect our daughters, but they can kill them. They do not bring families together, but they can tear them apart. And so I ask, why can we not do more in this body to bring families together, to keep our young people safe?

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we should make abortion less necessary for teenagers, not more dangerous and difficult. We need to teach teenagers to be abstinent and responsible. We need a comprehensive approach to keeping teenagers safe and healthy. We do not need a bill that isolates teenagers and puts them at risk.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and myself on the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Task Force. Let us work with our young people. Let us help them gain self-esteem. Let us see what works out there and try to prevent unwanted pregnancies and prevent teen pregnancies. Let us reduce the need for abortion. Let us work together on this. We can work together, pro-choice, pro-life, Democrat and Republican, to reduce the need for abortion. But my colleagues, let us not put our young people at risk.

□ 1130

I want to say again, I would hope that every mother, every mother, could have a relationship with her child so, number one, there is no need to have an abortion. But if that child should be put in this position, I would hope that child would come to me, would come to a mother, I would hope my granddaughter would come to me, again, let us hope, before it is necessary.

But if it is, I want to be there to help, not to feel that we grandmothers are going to be thrown in jail if we try to

help and leave these children so isolated that they may make an unwise move and get this procedure where it may not be qualified.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

(Mrs. EMERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the Child Custody Protection Act. I want to thank my colleague the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for reintroducing it again this year.

This is an important bill, and it is an important bill that all Members should support regardless of whether they are pro-choice or whether they are pro-life, as I am.

I will tell my colleagues from a personal experience about my daughter, Katharine, who just finished her junior year in high school. Quite frankly, I cannot even begin to tell my colleagues how many parental consent forms I had to sign even just this year. The most recent was for a physics field trip. Then there was the soccer form. Probably my worst experience was trying to get permission for my daughter, Katharine, and my older daughter, Tori, to use their inhalers for their exercised-induced asthma, which comes about simply through playing sports. And it was a nightmare. But I will tell my colleagues, it was a nightmare that I accepted, and that was very important.

Nobody can doubt that this constant flood of consent forms is bureaucracy at its best. But I do not mind because it is just one more way for me to stay involved with my children and involved in their lives, which is to me the most important responsibility that I have in life.

So if we, as parents, are involved in those types of decisions regarding our children at school, how can anyone even question the need for us to be involved in such a potentially life-threatening decision like having an abortion?

The need for this type of legislation is particularly clear, particularly in my home State of Missouri, which already has a parental consent law.

A recent article in the St. Louis Post Dispatch focused on the problem of teens crossing from Missouri into Illinois to obtain abortions without parental consent. I bring the attention of my colleagues to this blown-up ad that was recently in the Yellow Pages in a phone book in St. Louis. But the article in the Post Dispatch points out that one of the larger abortion clinics in Illinois actually does advertise on Missouri radio stations and it says "No parental consent required."

I even went into the home page last night and pulled out a copy of their

home page, which does say right here "Parental consent is not required for a minor to have an abortion at the Hope Clinic."

This is a predatory market, my colleagues, and it targets vulnerable young girls, and it really emboldens those who would impress these young girls into doing something they might live to regret all of their lives.

I am fortunate that my children talk to me, and I realize the need to have support for our young girls. But there is too much pressure from boyfriends and the like to just simply go have an abortion.

It is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we have the Child Custody Protection Act. It is common-sense legislation, and it protects parental rights. But, more importantly, it safeguards the well-being of America's young girls.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the example used by my good friend and colleague on the idea of clinics' advertisements. But that evidences the weaknesses of the legislation.

I would be happy to target unscrupulous abortion clinics if that is the case to narrow their advertising standards and their advertising approaches. I frankly believe, as well, that we do not target teenagers or entice them to do things they would otherwise not do. But the emphasis of this bill is to lock up loving and caring adults who want to be loving and caring to a teenager who finds herself in trouble under legitimate laws of this land of the right to choose, locking up grandmothers, locking up ministers and rabbis, locking up cousins and aunts.

Frankly, this is a cruel scheme to do a back-door curbing of abortion. The bill's backers, as the New York Times says, "can show no compelling justification for giving different treatment to State residents and non-residents seeking medical services."

We are not promoting unscrupulous abortion clinics. What we are trying to do is simply say a young woman who may have been abused by a relative in her family, a stepfather, a father, deserves to have a private way of counseling with someone or a private way of seeking an abortion that does not include going into a cold courtroom and being denied on a judicial waiver.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we can do many things, but this solution is not the best solution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this sadly misnamed Child Custody Protection Act. This bill does not encourage young women to ask a trusted adult for much-needed assistance. Instead, this bill will cause some young

women to face decisions about their pregnancy alone.

Parental involvement in a minor's decision about her pregnancy is, of course, the ideal. For most teens it is the reality. But some teenagers, for various reasons, simply cannot or will not confide in a parent. This bill will make criminals of some grandmothers, aunts, or other relatives that help pregnant teenagers exercise their legal rights. This bill would endanger the health and lives of young women who, for a variety of reasons, including fear of abuse, are unable to involve a parent in their decision-making. This bill is about politics, not sound legislation.

We should be talking today about what we can agree on, how to involve adults in the decision-making process. We should look at policies that work, like the Adult Involvement Law that exists in my home State of Maine.

The Maine Adult Involvement Law recognizes that parental involvement and guidance is the ideal for young women facing decisions regarding a pregnancy. However, when parental involvement is not possible, teens should not be alone. Maine's Adult Involvement Law allows young women to turn to a trusted adult for advice and counsel. A young woman considering an abortion may turn to a parent or another family member, such as an aunt or grandmother or a judge or a counselor. And a counselor would cover a number of different types of people: A physician, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a social worker, a member of the clergy, physicians' assistants, nurse practitioners, a guidance counselor, registered nurse, or a licensed practical nurse.

The counselor must discuss with the young woman all of her options, including adoption, parenting, and abortion. In Maine, all minors seeking an abortion must receive counseling even if that young woman has the consent of another adult. This provides the maximum guidance and support for the young woman.

The Child Custody Protection Act is designed to restrict the young woman's access to abortion, not to ensure the involvement of an adult in her decision-making process. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the so-called Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond briefly to the point that has been made about the assistance that young women might receive from people other than their parents.

Any grandmother, any friend, any cousin, any godparent who wishes to help a young woman in a situation such as has been described where it is impossible to talk with the parents, for whatever reason, can help that young lady go through the constitutionally required judicial bypass process.

That is something the Supreme Court has established. The Supreme

Court has required that all parental involvement laws contain a judicial bypass mechanism that must be made available. That is the way they can render assistance within the framework of the law that provides for the respect for parents and the family unit. That bypass is there; and that is the route that they should follow, rather than taking a girl, without her parents' knowledge, across State lines for an abortion in a State other than her State of residence.

There is a solution to the problem that opponents of this bill keep raising. They want to deny the reality of that solution. But that does not make it go away.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of the Child Custody Protection Act and commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership and the other 130 Members who have cosponsored this legislation. It is time that we speak up for the safety of our young daughters, as well as the rights of their parents.

I served in the Pennsylvania Legislature when we passed the Parental Consent Law. There are about 20 States that have parental involvement laws. Some parental notice, some parental consent. In Pennsylvania, we require consent of one of the two parents. And in case there is a breakdown between the parents and the child, we have a judicial bypass where the child can go before, in a confidential setting, a judge to get a decision.

This law was designed because of a case that happened in Pennsylvania in 1995 where a 12-year-old young girl was impregnated by an 18-year-old male and then the mother of that male took that 12-year-old girl to a neighboring State, New York, without her parents' knowledge or consent, for a secret abortion.

Now, my colleagues, this is outrageous where, in America, a stranger can take a minor child whose parents who know the medical history, know the psychological make-up of their child, without their knowledge or consent.

There was a study in California of 46,500 teenage school-age moms. Guess what they found? Two-thirds of them were impregnated by adult males. The median age was 22 years old. In many cases, it is these males who are taking the young girls across State lines for abortions, not grandmothers. It is adult males who are exploiting young women so that people will not know what happened.

In Pennsylvania, I went to the capital phone books and pulled out a couple of Yellow Pages. Here is one entitled "abortion." Here is a clinic in Maryland advertising, "no parental consent," to get around our State law. Here is one from my district in Lancaster. "Age restriction, parental or

spousal consent, none." That is in Delaware, this abortion clinic.

I say to the people who are outraged about these ads to teens about smoking, where is their outrage about these ads for teens for abortion? This is a medical procedure that could be life-threatening. We cannot even have a child get their ears pierced or an aspirin from a nurse or a field trip without parental consent. Where is the logic?

Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General of Pennsylvania said, "by supporting and protecting the rights of parents across the Nation, those of us in law enforcement will be able to protect vulnerable children." Let us protect them with this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me again emphasize that I am willing to join my colleagues in legislating initiatives against unscrupulous abortion clinics advertising and, as well, any enticement to young people to do something that they would not want to do. This is not this kind of legislation. This is a legislation that undermines a young woman's right to choose and the ability to counsel with someone other than her family for this terribly, terribly important and tragic decision that she may have to make.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics that includes the Society for Adolescent Medicine, dated June 14, 1999, that opposes this legislation. I think these two entities certainly have great involvement with our children.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
June 14, 1999,

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: On behalf of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), representing 55,000 pediatricians nationally, and the Society for Adolescent Medicine (SAM), representing 1,400 adolescent health professionals, we are writing in opposition of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. Assuring adolescent access to health care, including reproductive health care, has been a long-standing objective of the Academy. The problematic nature of this bill is in its potential to restrict a patient's access to care by making it a federal offense to transport a minor across state lines if this circumvents the state's parental involvement laws.

The AAP and SAM firmly believe that parents should be involved in and responsible for assuring medical care for their children. While parental involvement is desirable and should be encouraged, it may not always be feasible, and the Academy and SAM believe it should not be legislated. Adolescents who cannot rely on a parent to help them through the trauma of a pregnancy and who may need to go to an adjoining state for termination are precluded from receiving supportive care during a traumatic time in their lives. It is in these situations that adolescents would be limited in their options for receiving care.

Our ultimate goal is to provide access to health care that is in the best interest of the adolescent. Pediatricians hope and strongly encourage adolescents to communicate with and involve their parents or other trusted

adults in important health care decisions affecting their lives, including those regarding pregnancy or pregnancy termination. Studies show that a majority of adolescents voluntarily do so. However, studies also indicate that legislation mandating parental involvement does not achieve the intended benefit of promoting family communication. It may increase the risk of harm to the adolescent by delaying access to appropriate medical care.

The American Academy of Pediatrics and the Society for Adolescent Medicine urge you to oppose the Child Custody Protection Act.

Sincerely,

JOEL J. ALPERT, MD, FAAP,
President, American Academy of Pediatrics,
LAWRENCE S. NEISTEIN, MD,
President, Society for Adolescent Medicine.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would make the tragic situation of teen pregnancy even worse.

I believe that adolescents should be encouraged to seek their parent's advice when facing difficult circumstances. And when young people do go to their parents in trying times, most often their parents offer love, support, direction and compassion. Most young women do turn to their parents even when faced with something as emotional and private as pregnancy. Even with States without parental consent laws, the majority of all pregnant teenagers do tell their parents.

Unfortunately, though, there are times when a pregnant teenager cannot go to her parents. This is precisely the time when they most need the involvement of a trusted adult. But under this bill, if an adult tries to assist a young woman by traveling with her across State lines, that adult becomes a criminal. It does not matter if the adult is her sister, brother, grandmother, minister, rabbi, they would still be criminals in the eyes of Federal prosecutors. In my home State of Wisconsin, we take into account the fact that young people sometimes cannot turn to a parent and must turn to another trusted adult in trying times. In Wisconsin, young women may obtain consent from grandparents, adult siblings or another trusted adult.

Crossing State lines to obtain an abortion is not uncommon. Women usually seek the medical facility that is closest to their home, but due to a lack of facilities in many areas, the closest facility may be across a nearby State border. Eighty-six percent of all counties in the United States do not have any health care facility at all that provides abortion services. Congress has not made it illegal to cross State lines to buy guns, to gamble or to participate in any other legal activity. Why should we make an exception here?

What if the teenager has been subject to physical or sexual abuse by one of

her parents? What if the pregnancy is the result of incest? There is no exception in this bill for minors who have experienced physical or sexual abuse in their own homes, nor is there an exception for a young woman who might be subject to grave physical abuse if she were to confide in her parent or parents.

Mr. Speaker, we want all children to confide in their parents, we want a society with strong families, but let us not forget those children in our society who are victims of incest or child physical abuse. Let us encourage those children, too, to reach out to an adult rather than deal with a crisis pregnancy without anyone to talk to.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, many, many States—I am particularly proud of my own State of Texas—have laws that protect the children, as they should have. And they have laws that honor the parents' rights with respect to the children.

When mom and dad come home from the hospital and they have got that precious baby in their hands, they bring the baby home, they accept the lifetime commitment, they care for the baby, they hold the baby, they kiss and hug, treat the baby's little wounds, counsel the baby, advise the baby, instruct the baby, pray over the baby and sometimes discipline the baby. And if grandma and auntie, uncle, sister and brother want to visit, honor, enjoy, play with the baby, it is a wonderful experience in a family. But if grandma colludes with the baby to tell mom and dad a lie when the baby has broken mom and dad's rules, grandma is out of line. Grandma should honor the mother and the father as they accept their responsibilities for the baby. If grandma finds the baby in a serious state of distress at the age of 15 because of some foolishness with that pretty boy down the block, grandma has got a responsibility to the baby and to the mom and dad to honor the mom and dad's devotion to that child and to help that child be in the company, honestly confessing their hurt and their wrong to the people who love and care most. Grandma has no right to take that child across the State line, circumvent the State laws and dishonor her own children. No, grandma does not get a dispensation here. Grandma should have the decency to love that baby and honor her own children as that baby's parents. It is wrong. It is wrong to believe that I have the right to intercede against mom and dad's love and devotion because I want to get the child off the hook.

We have taught our children, "You will do wrong, you will make mistakes, you will put yourself in harm's way, you will bring harm to yourself. Bring your hurts to me. I will care for you."

In my own case when my little baby Kathy was born, my dad looked on me and said, "Dick, when you start that

parenting, you'll do it all your life." I do that. Most of us do. Some parents unhappily are not kind to their children. Incest does occur. There are laws about that and grandma would have the decency to take the child and the errant parent to the proper authorities within the State and get it corrected and protected. Do you think grandma taking her across State lines to abort that wrong is going to protect that child in the future?

It is not right to love yourself or love somebody more or love some abstract devotion to abortion rights more than the safety and security of that child and the honor of the parents. This is a good bill. It is a good bill that keeps the only commandment with a promise, that commandment that says honor your father and your mother so your lives may be good on this earth.

Let us vote this bill up and let us honor the parents and let us protect the babies.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to emphasize that this country has many familial situations and many of our young people live with their grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague for her leadership on this critical issue. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act. Last year we addressed this bill. And although it passed this House, it died in the Senate. Further, the President has made his position very clear. He will veto this legislation if it crosses his desk.

There are so many other issues that we could be working on to truly help children and strengthen America's families. I urge my colleagues to work together to make a real difference in the lives of our youth instead of focusing on this bill which is not needed and would only serve to weaken the child-parent relationship.

This bill as we know it, the Child Custody Protection Act, would make it a Federal crime for anyone other than the parent to transport a minor across State lines with the intent to obtain an abortion. It also punishes the so-called violators of this bill with a fine of up to \$100,000 and 1 year in prison. With almost 50 States already requiring parental notification or adult notification through the legal system, if a minor seeks an abortion, there is no need for H.R. 1218.

Regardless of whether the parent-child relationship is abusive or not, most States have already required that a child tells a parent if she wants to obtain an abortion. H.R. 1218 does not improve the parent-child communication. It only serves to create a greater divide between the parent and children and that child on an incredibly personal and difficult decision that remains legal in this country.

H.R. 1218 also ignores the blended and nontraditional families that have become the norm in America today. More than half of all marriages today are remarriages. Children with different parents are often a part of that mix. We are seeing more and more minority children being raised by grandparents. In fact, when I hold district events for parents, the room is filled with grandparents.

This legislation offers no language recognizing the important parental role that grandparents are playing in the absence of parents. It would punish grandparents and members of the clergy who often serve as an invaluable counselor for young adults faced with such important decisions.

H.R. 1218 would isolate these young women during a period when the advice and kind understanding of an adult is most needed. As a mother and grandmother who cares deeply about strengthening families through good communication and loving support of children regardless of the mistakes that they make in their effort to grow into mature and independent adults, I ask my colleagues to vote against this piece of legislation. It will not help women, it will not help families, and most certainly it will not help anyone to prevent unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in favor of the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill would make it unlawful to transport a minor across State lines to circumvent a State law requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision.

South Carolina is one of several States that have laws requiring one parent to approve an abortion of a minor. Let me make it clear that this law does include any legal guardian. It is not excluding grandparents who are legal guardians. The Child Custody Protection Act would not impose a similar parental consent law on States neighboring my State but, rather, would simply ensure that the laws of my State would be respected.

Laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision confirm the essential role of parents in key decisions for our children. For the sake of children, these laws should not be circumvented. The Supreme Court has observed, "The medical, emotional and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting. This is particularly true when the patient is immature."

All across this country our children cannot take an aspirin at school without parental notification or authorization. They have to have a signed permission slip to go on a simple field trip. Yet in many places in our Nation, a young girl does not have to tell a family member before she has an abortion. Some States have rightfully acted to give parents the responsibility for decision-making for their minor chil-

dren. The parental consent notification laws of States like South Carolina should not be bypassed. This bill would simply enforce our laws and reassert the importance of children.

Mr. Speaker, I have two daughters. It is very hard for me to believe that some in this room think that they should have the right to secretly take one of my daughters across the State line to get an abortion without telling me. We cannot tolerate that in this country. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the Child Custody Protection Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself 30 seconds, I listened to the previous proponent on the floor. I just raise the question that we have often been chastised for federalizing laws in this country. He has already argued that States have laws. That is why I find the folly in this legislation. It is not helping; it is hurting.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act, making it a Federal offense for anyone other than a minor's parents to transport that minor to another State so that that minor may obtain an abortion. This legislation prohibits anyone, including grandparents, stepparents, religious counselors or any other family member from accompanying a young woman across State lines for such a procedure.

Parental involvement is obviously ideal and currently some 75 percent of minors under age 16 seek the advice and help of their parents when faced with an unintended pregnancy and the prospect of obtaining an abortion. These young ladies are fortunate enough to have loving, understanding parents that they can talk to. But not all teenagers are that fortunate.

For those teenagers who believe they cannot involve their parents, they are left with no one else to turn to, no one to counsel them, including consideration of alternatives to an abortion. Should this bill pass, young women would be forced to make such a difficult decision alone, for fear of putting a family member or a trusted adult in danger of committing a Federal crime. We owe it to these young women to allow them the opportunity to involve someone they can trust in making that important decision.

□ 1200

Most teenagers who do not involve their parents do involve an adult in such a decision, with some 15 percent talking with a stepparent, grandparent or sibling. It is far more preferable to

teach our young people to practice abstinence and to be responsible, making abortions unnecessary. That would be far better than passing legislation which holds concerned family members and trusted adults criminally responsible for helping these young women who are confronted with a very difficult decision.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the argument by my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle in opposition to this bill. They use words like: "Let's get together." However "let's" never includes parents. And, "We need to help young ladies." However "we" never includes parents. Clearly, this is not about adult women, it is about young girls and, in some cases, children.

As my colleague said, it is illegal for a school nurse to give a high school student two aspirin without parental consent. Schools obtain permission slips for parents to take students on field trips. It is even illegal for high school students to participate in many high school sports without parental permission, but it is not illegal for a complete stranger to transport a teen-aged girl or even a 12-year-old girl across State lines to circumvent State laws so that she can have an abortion without her parents' knowledge.

There has been a lot of talk about loopholes over the last weeks. If this is not a loophole, there is no such thing as a loophole. The Child Custody Protection Act will close a Mack-truck-sized loophole by prohibiting anyone from transporting someone else's daughter across State lines for the purpose of circumventing a State parental consent notification law.

Many want us to believe this is about a nice little grandmother. This is not. It is about an employee of an abortion industry or a sexual predator who wants to cover up the rape of a young girl under the age of 18. No one should be able to make mockery of legal State parental consent laws.

This is not whether or not a woman has a right to choose. This is about a young girl's rights to be involved with her parents and the parents' rights to be involved with their children.

Anyone who opposes this loophole I believe is an extremist, and anyone who does not support this is out of touch with the American people. If my colleagues do not like parental consent laws, they should go to the State capitals where they live and fight to repeal them, but do not oppose a common-sense measure such as this. I urge all my colleagues to support families, to support children and to support women in fighting this measure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a member of our leadership.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

I rise today in strong opposition to this bill. We all believe that young women should turn to their parents for guidance and for support, and do my colleagues know what? Most do. Unfortunately, Congress is unable to legislate strong and healthy family relationships, and there are times in some families where a young person cannot turn to her parents for fear of physical abuse, and the so-called Child Custody Protection Act would leave those young women with nowhere to turn.

The Republicans claim that they want to protect young women from sexual predators forcing them across State lines. This is a worthy goal. We all share this goal. But nowhere in this legislation does it specify that it is illegal to use force or threat of force to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion and avoid parental consent laws. This is a key omission, and without that distinction the bill would make it illegal for any adult other than a parent from taking a young woman out of State for an abortion, which I would like to point out is a legal medical procedure.

It means that a young woman who is in a time of tremendous emotional need would be unable to turn to a stepparent, a grandmother, an aunt, an older sister, or even a trusted member of the clergy, without placing that person at risk for breaking the law.

I might add that the Republicans in the committee would not make an exception for the case of incest. They voted down a waiver or an exception for incest. Now do my colleagues want to tell me that an incestual relationship is one with a loving parent and that is the person that a young woman ought to turn to? My God, what are we trying to do here? The Child Custody Protection Act would only isolate a young woman in time of greatest need.

Let me just say that do not play out, and I say this to some of my colleagues, do not play out your own personal philosophies which people respect, but do not do that at the risk of jeopardizing the health, the safety of young women. This is not our job. Do not turn grandmothers, trusted adults into criminals in this country. I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a practicing physician for many years, I have always been aware of the fact that if a minor child came to see me in the emergency room with an illness or an injury, I could not treat that child without the consent of a parent, I could not give pain relieving medications, I could not stitch a laceration. Indeed, I could be prosecuted for assault by treating a child without the consent of a parent.

But, amazingly, in many States those same minor children, a minor female who cannot get basic medical care without their parents' consent, can have an invasive surgical procedure legally, an abortion, a surgical procedure with the attendant risks of hemorrhage, infection, sterility and, yes, even death can legally be obtained in some States. What is even more disturbing is that in the majority of cases these minor children have been impregnated by men over the age of 18, a crime called statutory rape in most States.

Now many States have correctly addressed this problem by passing legislation requiring the consent of a parent, and those laws have been upheld in the courts, but, unfortunately, many States have not passed these types of legislation, and what has developed is the unconscionable situation where minor females are being carried across State lines without the knowledge or consent of their parents for the purpose of obtaining an abortion. This bill correctly addresses this problem by making it illegal to circumvent State laws by carrying a minor child across State lines, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation and vote for its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Child Custody Protection Act. Last year, the far right majority here in this Congress wanted to make it a crime to help a pregnant young woman, and now it is the same story over again. What we really should be doing is helping our teens. Teens need people that they can count on when they are really in a serious situation. In situations where parents are abusive or absent this bill would make it criminal for a young woman to turn to a trusted adult, a family member, for help.

Let us face it. Some teenagers will have sex without parental consent, and we all know that teenagers can continue a pregnancy, receive prenatal care and deliver a baby without parental consent. Teens can also give the baby up for adoption without parental consent.

The only thing that is prevented from doing is deciding to end a pregnancy. This bill does one thing. It seeks only to further isolate young women who dare not or cannot involve their parents. Remember, one-third of our young women who do not notify their parents of a pregnancy have been victims of family abuse and violence. This bill is all wrong. Instead of criminalizing freedom of choice, we should be providing our teens with better education, better health care and support services.

Mr. Speaker, this bad legislation died in the Congress last year because it was not good for young women. Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) in support of the legislation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama; and I am proud to stand here today with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and my other colleagues who have done an admirable job promoting the Child Custody Protection Act.

There is a great injustice taking place as we speak. In 28 States minor girls are being taken across State lines for abortions just so parental consent or notification laws can be avoided. For a child to receive an aspirin at school or to be involved in a class field trip, they must gain prior consent from a parent. But for a dangerous and sometimes fatal procedure a child, yes, a child, can be transported across State lines without a simple notification of their parent.

This is criminal, and this practice has to stop. We must remedy this injustice against States who have decided that parents have a right to know when their child's health is threatened. To add insult to injury, literally, the abortion industry actually encourages such interstate activity and most definitely profits by it. In many States, abortion clinics even advertise in the phone book of these nearby States, and they advertise no parental consent required. If that is not a criminal act, then I do not know what is.

So I urge my colleagues today to vote for the Child Custody Protection Act. A vote for this bill is a vote to respect State law. A vote for this bill is a vote to ensure that parents living in those 22 States get to maintain their right to know about their child's welfare; and, most importantly, a vote for this bill is a vote for the safety of our children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me just say to my good friend from Texas, Becky Bell is dead. Becky Bell is dead because Indiana had a parental consent law, and Becky Bell did not have the resources and the nurturing, comforting familial situation, a loving family and loving parents, did not have the resources to go and get a safe abortion. She is dead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act which could more appropriately be called: The Teen Endangerment Act.

Specifically, I rise to speak against the criminal sanctions this bill would impose on grandmothers, aunts and

clergy, responsible adults a child might turn to if they feel uncomfortable talking to their parents or they have a reason they cannot talk to their parents. This law punishes the 1 million American teenagers who become pregnant each year, and it punishes the adults who seek to assist these children in their time of need.

Proponents of this bill would say these teens could go to a judge for a judicial bypass. To this I say, if they cannot tell their parents, how can they tell a judge? Can my colleagues imagine how intimidating this would be to a young woman? How would she even know where to find a judge?

The fact is, young women who do not and cannot tell their parents have important reasons such as their parents are alcoholics, they are emotionally or physically abusive, or the pregnancy is the result of incest. If we pass this bill, what do we tell people like Keishawn, an 11-year-old who was raped by her father? What do we tell the family of Becky Bell, who died from an illegal abortion because a State law prevented her receiving the help? I know what we can tell Keishawn's Aunt Vicky: "We should have sent you to jail for helping this child." And we should tell Becky Bell's family: "We know that a similar law killed your child, but we are going to make it Federal anyway."

□ 1215

We who oppose this bill encourage young women to involve their parents when they face this monumental crisis, when we consider the fact that most young people will talk to their parents but then there are those who cannot. So if we pass this law, what we are doing is making the most difficult decision that a young person would ever have to make more painful, more lonely and more difficult for them.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

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

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank most especially the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) who has brought forth this bill, which I think is a very good one. I think it is one that we ought to pass, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

It seems like we can agree on an awful lot of things today. We all want more education, better health care for our young people and we all want to make sure that there are fewer abortions out there, but yet we cannot agree on this, I think, very simple issue.

Frankly, I have sat here and listened to the debate and I hear a lot of talking around in circles and I still cannot understand why we do not agree on this amendment.

We have a problem here. We have State laws that set higher standards in

some cases than other States on abortions. They require parental consent. Right now we have a problem situation where there are older people taking school-aged children, girls that are 12, 13, 14 years old, across the State lines into those other States and having those abortions done, all without parental consent.

I think for the most part we agree that should not happen, but we are hearing this circle talk today that well, maybe in some cases it is appropriate that we can take these young teenagers across State lines because they are involved in an incestuous relationship.

Let me get this straight. There is a parent in an incestuous relationship with a young girl. So their answer is they want to be able to secretly take that young girl across the State line and get an abortion and act like nothing happened. They do not go to a parent but they go to a trusted friend, an aunt, somebody in the religious area; but nothing happens.

That does not make sense. What should occur in that case is that they ought to go to that trusted friend, that grandmother, that aunt and then follow the law, follow the process, go to court and get a bypass, get a court to approve that, go to a judge that that person would know about. If they know enough to get across State lines, they would know enough to go to a judge and go in the private chambers, not in public court and get that bypass.

By the way, while there, tell that judge that the father is abusing that child in a sexual relationship so that that will not happen again. To me, that makes a lot of sense here.

We hear about grandmothers and aunts and trusted friends going to jail. We hear terms like spotlights and roadblocks and back alley abortions, things that really are not appropriate to this level in this debate, I hope. Those trusted friends, those grandparents and those aunts and uncles are protected under this law by that bypass procedure. The grandparents, even if they are occupying the status of a parent, if they are a guardian or standing in the status of loco parentis under the law, they serve as a parent. So a parent is a much broader definition than just simply mother and dad. If there is no mother and dad, there is the guardian out there that has this ability under the law to take that child across State lines to obtain that abortion, if that is necessary.

It just seems to me we agree on most of the issues that we are talking about today and it is just this one issue of incest or a parent that someone cannot talk to, but the bypass procedure very clearly provides a regular order or process to have this done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this deceptively titled Child Custody Protection Act. This bill pits desperate young women against responsible, caring adults. This bill drives young women into isolation at a time when they are most in need of help. This bill not only violates teens' constitutional rights but also seriously endangers their lives.

The last speaker said that it would not really be true that we would have back alley abortions, and people could simply go to a friendly judge.

I submit most of the speakers on the other side of this aisle have never stood in the shoes of being a vulnerable and scared young woman who is the victim of incest or who is the victim of child abuse. I submit that that is a decision that is very, very hard for them and it is a decision that has led many young women like Becky Bell, who we have heard of, like Spring Adams who we have heard of, and others to go to back alley abortions because they are scared.

We want them to go to trusted adults. We want them to report incest and we want that to be prosecuted, but in the meantime we do not want to deny safe and legal abortions to young women who for whatever reason, we may not even know it, cannot go to the adult. We do not want to criminalize bus drivers or grandmothers or others who have legitimate reasons for taking these young women across State lines.

Many of us ran for Congress on platforms of States' rights, and we are all in favor of States' rights all the time here in Congress, unless, of course, they violate our personal social agendas and then we are all for the Federal Government usurping those States' rights.

This bill is unconstitutional. It removes the rights of States to legislate around a safe and legal procedure, and that is abortion. Lawrence Tribe, the preeminent legal scholar, has opined that this bill is unconstitutional, and here is what he has said. This amounts to a statutory attempt to force this most vulnerable class of young women to carry the restrictive laws of their home State like the bars of a prison that follow them wherever they go. Such a law violates the basic premises upon which our Federal system is constructed and therefore violates the Constitution of the United States.

I urge a no vote on this ill-conceived legislation and I urge everyone in this chamber not to put their own values and views on these vulnerable young women. Have some compassion. Understand some of them may not, for whatever reason, be able to go and do what we would all hope they would do, which is to talk to their parents and talk to their parents before they undertake a decision like this. Please vote no.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 22 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there was an emotional plea to have some compassion and understanding for the young ladies who find themselves in this horrible spot. I would also encourage my colleagues to have that same compassion and understanding for those young ladies, but also for the parents and for the law because the best way to handle hard problems in society is to have laws that make some sense and have a procedure.

Every State law that requires parental notification has a procedure to have the young ladies' needs addressed and that people can, in fact, go to a judge and seek relief.

I have stood with victims, I have not been in their shoes, of people who have been raped by their parents, who have been abused by their parents, and as a prosecutor I felt a real desire and need to prosecute those people. As a Congressman, I feel a real desire and need to uphold the law where the law has been passed in a duly constitutional fashion.

What the other side is doing is they do not like parental notification statutes. Well, just go back home and lobby the legislature. If they do not like the law back home, go home and change it; but when a law that is passed by a State that affects a minor's interest, whether it is abortion or anything else, do not let people conspire, regardless of the family relationship or the business interest, to cheat the State out of a law that they duly passed. If we do it here, where is it going to stop? Because someone has a view of abortion different than the State in question, do not allow people to go around and cheat the States out of the laws that were duly passed. If one does not like it as a Member of Congress, go home and talk about it.

This statute addresses a real problem. There are ads being run in this country to lure people across State lines to perform abortions, and they talk about the fact that a person does not have to get parental notification. Avoid that State law; go find somebody to bring them over here and we will do something that the State has a different view of across the border.

For those of us in Congress who really do respect the role of the States and really do respect State rights and parental rights, we need to come to the aid of the people who find themselves in this dilemma. What good does it do for a State legislature to pass a law if people can avoid it and Congress remains silent?

Stand up for people who are trying to follow the law.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for yielding me this time, and also for her consistent leadership on behalf of America's families.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1218. This bill, as we have heard, makes it a Federal crime for anyone, other than a parent or a guardian, to transport a minor across State lines. This is another attempt to limit the choices available to young people in crises. This bill closes doors rather than opens doors of opportunities for young people and their families, a general support system.

Also, it closes the opportunity to consider possible options. Of course it makes sense for a child, a girl, to consult with her parents about something as momentous as sexual activity and the surprising pregnancy that sometimes follows. In States that have no mandatory parental involvement, 60 percent of the parents know about their daughters pregnancy. We could only wish that all parents had the trust of their children and that the remaining 40 percent could turn to their parents for counsel. However, we know that sadly not all children feel that they can safely turn to a parent, especially where sexual activity is concerned.

Many young girls are being raised by their grandparents, their aunts and their uncles. Why should we criminalize extended family members or members of the clergy or a trusted adult when they try to help young women facing crisis pregnancies? Under this legislation, grandparents, aunts and uncles and members of the clergy could be prosecuted and jailed for traveling across State lines to obtain reproductive health services for young women. This is wrong.

The fact is, many young girls do not have a mother or a father at home to talk to. Those who support this bill do not value extended families which so many girls are part of. Why do the supporters of this bill feel that it is right to discriminate against such a large number of young girls in this country?

It is amazing to me that the majority of those speaking on behalf of this bill are men who really do not have the experience of a young girl's trauma.

This legislation really does limit reasonable options. It would force young people in a period of turmoil, with the clock relentlessly ticking, to turn to illegal or self-induced abortions or to pretend or wish away their pregnancies with sometimes horrendous results, as we constantly learn from news reports.

So I urge my colleagues not to legislate relationships, not to legislate personal behavior. Please vote against this Child Custody Protection Act. It is bad policy and it is discriminatory.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all struggling to do the right thing, and we are confronted with a case where we have a 14- or a 15-year-old girl. She is pregnant, unwanted pregnancy, as she would say, as we would say, and she is considering an abortion.

Who do we involve? Well, the First Lady of the United States has said it takes a village to raise these young ladies. But do we go out and choose anyone in the village? That is what the critics seem to be saying: Anyone will do. It does not have to be the parents. It can just be anyone that happens along.

We have heard that a compassionate bus driver might be the person.

□ 1230

We have been told that the grandmother is usually the person. We are told about these aunts. But in fact, who is this so-called trusting adult that is taking this young 14- or 15-year-old girl across lines? What member of the village is it that we are substituting for the parent and their involvement and their love?

Quite simply, it is the boyfriend. We do not have to speculate on that. The Department of Health and Human Services reported to this very Congress in 1995 and said in two-thirds of the cases when 15- and 16-year-old girls are pregnant it is a male adult, and the medium age of that male adult is 22 years old. It is not the grandmother that is impregnating them, it is not the loving aunt, and it is not the compassionate priest, it is the boyfriend.

There is a study of 46,000 schoolchildren in California. Two-thirds of them were impregnated by adults; again, average age 22. Let me tell the Members what that study said. It said the differences in ages between the young girl and the father who impregnated her at the very least suggest very different life experiences, and bring into question issues of pressure and abuse.

Another study a year earlier said, "Obviously, these males are vulnerable to statutory rape charges and have a strong incentive to pressure the young girl into obtaining an abortion." That is what the California study said. That is what our own Health and Human Services study said. It is not about the grandmother, it is about the boyfriend.

Finally, the study said that 58 percent of these so-called trusting adults who we are all concerned about today, 58 percent of them who take the young girl across State lines, who are they? Who in the village are they? They are the boyfriend. We have a choice to make. Do we choose the parents or the boyfriend?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not for one moment grant what one of the speakers said a few moments ago, that we are agreed on most things, that we are only disagreeing on incest. I do not grant that the real purpose of this bill is to help anybody.

The real purpose of this bill is to make it as difficult as possible for young women to get an abortion. The real purpose is to make it as impossible for young women to exercise their legal rights as we can possibly make it. That is the real motivation. It is what is driving this bill, and not any supposed concern about parental involvement.

As the New York Times this morning said, the bill is "a cold-hearted piece of legislation that would jeopardize the health of desperate young women seeking abortions, and potentially imprison adults who help them." Realize what this bill would do. A 19-year-old sister who helped her 17-year-old sister to an abortion clinic or to a hospital across the State line could go to jail.

The bill is clearly unconstitutional because it violates the constitutional principles of federalism. The bill violates the rights of States to enact and enforce their own laws governing conduct within their own boundaries, and it violates the rights of residents of each of the United States to travel to and from any State of the Union for lawful purposes, a right strongly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in its recent landmark decision in Saenz versus Roe only last month.

The fact of the matter is that each State is free, notwithstanding Article IV, to make certain benefits available to its own citizens. A State's criminal laws may not be replaced with stricter ones for the visiting citizen from another State, whether by that State's own choice or by virtue of the law of the visitor State, or by virtue of a congressional enactment.

This bill seeks to export the laws of one State to another. We cannot constitutionally make it a crime to do something that is legal in the State where you do it because it is illegal in a different State.

I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) will cite a 1978 case in which a Mann Act prosecution for transporting a woman across State lines for the purpose of prostitution was upheld, despite the fact that prostitution is legal in the State to which she was transported.

But all that case says is that of course there can be a Federal law and a Federal crime without a State law. The Federal government can prosecute a spy in New Jersey, even if New Jersey has no laws against espionage.

But this bill is very different. It would only be a crime to transport a young woman to another State for the purpose of obtaining an abortion if she had not met the legal requirements to get an abortion in her own State, in

the State she left. In other words, the bill would, in effect, for purposes of abortion, imprison her within the laws of the State that she left, and this we cannot constitutionally do.

So the bill is clearly unconstitutional, and the bill is cruel. It would force a young woman to drive by herself for long distances both before and after an abortion, greatly increasing her own health risks, rather than allow a responsible adult to accompany her to and from the clinic. This is dangerous, it is unnecessary, it will cause deaths.

The American Medical Association has noted that women who feel they cannot involve a parent often take drastic steps to maintain the confidentiality of their pregnancies, including running away from home, obtaining unsafe back alley abortions, or resorting to dangerous and sometimes fatal self-induced abortions.

The AMA has reported that "the desire to maintain secrecy has been one of the leading reasons for illegal abortion deaths since 1973." This bill is a death sentence for many young women. Actually, it is not, because the Supreme Court will throw it out. But if it were ever enacted into law, until the Supreme Court throws it out, it is a death sentence for young women. Like all parental consent laws and required waiting period laws, the bill further risks women's health because of delayed abortions. We should be taking actions to ensure that abortions are as safe as possible, rather than delaying it to make it as difficult as possible.

The bill also invites family members to sue one another for damages. Who gets to sue? Parents, even parents who have been abusive or have abandoned their children; fathers who have raped their daughters are allowed to sue for damages from the prison cell. Whom can they sue? The bill entitles parents to sue doctors, clinics, relatives.

The litigation could bankrupt clinics just by the discovery process, which I am sure delights the supporters of this bill. If the intent is only to sue the transporter, the bill should be amended to say so.

What about the criminal penalties? The bill would force a grandmother to go to jail for coming to the aid of a grandchild, or a 19-year-old sister for coming to the aid of her 17-year-old sister.

I offered an amendment which would exempt grandparents and adult brothers and sisters of the minors, but the Committee on Rules would not even allow the amendment to be considered on the floor. It would criminalize almost any adult relative of a child who tries to help a young woman.

Proponents of the bill ignore these concerns and wave around a judicial bypass as a panacea, but we know the judicial bypass option of many parental consent laws have been ineffective. Again, my amendment to improve this bill by allowing individuals subject to prosecution to appeal to a Federal court

for a judicial bypass was blocked from consideration by the Committee on Rules.

We know that many local judges refused to hold hearings or are widely known to be anti-choice, and refuse to grant bypasses, despite rulings of the Supreme Court that they cannot withhold the bypass.

This bill further limits the options of young women who, for whatever reason, cannot obtain parental consent. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this unconstitutional and cruel bill.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for this excellent human rights pro-woman pro-family legislation, and thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY), the chairman of the subcommittee, for his expert guiding of this legislation through committee and for his commitment.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of Americans now more fully understand that abortion is violence against children, that it is a horrible dismemberment or perhaps poisoning, one of the other methods frequently employed. It is an execution of children before birth. Americans want it stopped. The polls clearly show that.

A recent survey by the Center for Reproductive Gender Equality, which is run by Faye Wattleton, the former president of Planned Parenthood, found that 70 percent of women want more restrictions on abortion; just women, that was their only universe, their only population polled, 70 percent want more restrictions.

A recent CNN-Gallup poll found that a majority of Americans want most abortions made illegal. That is not what we are dealing with today, but a majority of Americans want to protect the lives of unborn children from this violence, dismemberment, poisoning, and partial birth abortion.

In 1998 in the New York Times a survey was issued on point on what we are talking about today, parental consent. This would apply, of course, and provide integrity for the laws of States on both parental notification and parental consent, but on parental consent, the stronger of the two, it found that a whopping 78 percent of Americans want parental consent laws in their States.

I think Americans adopt a reasonable standard when they say and when they report back with this. They understand that this legislation is very, very reasonable. Secretly transporting teenagers across State lines to procure abortions in a State with no parental notification or consent compounds the violence of abortion by exploiting the vulnerable minor.

Mr. Speaker, when the partial birth abortion ban was debated in the last

few years, many pro-abortion organizations said there were "fewer than 500 partial birth abortions per year in the entire country." We now know that was an outright lie. It was repeated on this floor by one speaker after another. We know it is a lie now.

That statement, like other statements, was proven to be false, and interestingly, it was a New Jersey newspaper, the Bergen Record, which has a very strong editorial slant in favor of abortion, that broke the story that one clinic, Metropolitan Medical Associates in Engelwood, did about 1,500 partial birth abortions every year. That is three times the number in the entire country in this one clinic.

Now we also know that Metropolitan Medical Associates and other abortion mills in New Jersey advertise and market their business in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, and use the fact that until just a couple of days ago, and that has changed, thankfully, we just got a parental notification law in New Jersey, but for many years they used the fact that we did not have such a thing to say, look, young teenagers, come across the State line and get your secret abortion.

If Members look at this ad, abortions up to 24 weeks on demand, these are not rape abortions, these are on demand, because the baby is construed to be unwanted. These ads are telling young teens, we can end your baby's life and your parents need never know. It is a secret abortion.

What happens when the complications set in, Mr. Speaker? There is a group called Mothers Against Minors' Abortions. It is not unlike MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, a group of women who have come together to say, enough is enough. We need to protect our daughters from those who would exploit, this so-called trusted adult who can exploit their young daughter.

A woman by the name of Eileen Roberts who testified, and perhaps members of the committee might remember her testimony, pointed out that, and this is her quote, "Wondering why my daughter had become depressed, over the next 2 weeks my husband and I thought perhaps her boyfriend had introduced her to drugs, so we searched for answers." She goes on to say, "Words cannot adequately communicate the Orwellian nightmare of discovering that your child has undergone an abortion."

She said her daughter was depressed, and there were all kinds of consequences. Interestingly enough, as she points out in her testimony, when she went to get reparative surgery because of what happened in this legal abortion, but there were complications, she had to sign on the bottom line and give her permission. But when the baby was destroyed and when this intrusive surgery was done, she did not have to give either her consent and she was not notified.

She asked no more secret abortions in her testimony. This legislation

again does not impose, although perhaps it should, but it does not, a nationwide or Federal parental notification or consent. It just preserves the integrity of those State laws that say we want to protect our children from the exploitation of those who would do them harm. Please vote in favor of this legislation. Again I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her courageous leadership in offering this bill today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

A 15-year-old pregnant girl, perhaps with no parents to care for her, perhaps even worse, parents that harm her, what crime has she committed? Why do we seek to punish her more by making a criminal out of someone that would try to help that girl? She is already a victim, and this bill would victimize her a second time.

I understand the passion of my colleagues, and the previous speaker in particular, in their opposition to abortion. But what purpose do we serve by forcing an exquisitely lonely young girl to go it alone? What is the political gain that my colleagues see in forcing her into an unsafe abortion? What crime has she committed that is so egregious that she would then be forced to turn away or not turn to someone that might help her?

As we posture about our love and respect for America's parents, I would hope in our zeal we are tempered a little bit by love and understanding for the young victims that we also represent.

□ 1245

I do not ask my colleagues, any of my colleagues, who oppose a woman's right to choose to abandon their principles. But I do wish that supporters of this measure would not use the plight of the most helpless to make their points.

I dare say that no one who speaks today and perhaps no one in this Chamber wants there to be even a single abortion. But this bill, all it does is make sure that someone who is in that unfortunate position is forced to be in that position all alone.

Some who have spoken here today have said, oh, this is an issue of federalism; this is an issue of due process; this is an issue of respect for local courts. But someone in a position faced with these excruciating choices, is it not also an issue of compassion? Should we not also remember that?

Why do my colleagues insist on mocking the idea that perhaps a grandmother is a person who can show great love for that victim? Why do we scoff at the notion that all families are not like those we are blessed to come from? Why do we celebrate our churches, our

synagogues, and our mosques, yet we would make criminals out of a pastor who would help a young victim?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1218. I have listened to this type of testimony for a long, long time. I rise without any ill will toward those who differ with me.

I have heard testimony on abortion for the last 50 years. I started my public service in 1951. I have listened to fathers, and I have listened to mothers. I have listened to girls in trouble, to pastors. I have listened to medical testimony.

I am not among those who want to push anybody off on a sidewalk or fire on anyone who is trying to enter into an abortion clinic. I hope I am not a part of the far right or the far left. I believe I am a part of what they might call the far middle, because the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) testified from the record that 78 percent of the people want parental rights. I have listened to all that testimony.

I voted many, many times. While I have compassion for those who differ with me, I come down on the side of life. I can come down on no other side. By voting in favor of this bill, I think I am not just voting to protect young women. I think I am voting in support of States' rights, and I am voting in support of parental rights.

All of us want the best for our children. We want to help them make very difficult decisions. We want to be there to support them through this process. This bill allows parents to be a part of that very trying time physically and emotionally by enforcing State laws which require parental involvement in a decision bearing serious consequences for our daughters.

In a time when our children cannot even, as has been testified to here time and time again, so much as even receive an aspirin at school without parental permission, it certainly seems illogical to allow our minor daughters to travel across State lines to have an illegal abortion.

This bill gives us the chance to tell our daughters that we care about their health and well-being and we want to prevent other adults from taking our place.

I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership, and I am pleased to vote in support of States, of our parents, and of our children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a long-time advocate for protecting children.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman

from Texas for yielding me this time and for her leadership on the Children's Caucus and so many other important issues.

This bill sounds like a good idea. In an ideal world, parents would always be the first person that teenagers would go to with their problems. But, unfortunately, we do not live in an ideal world. Some parents abuse their kids. Some parents kick them out of the house. Some parents are not capable of taking care of their own children.

This bill is not about protecting young women. It is about anti-choice politics. I would like to put this vote in perspective. This is the 121st vote against a woman's right to choose since the beginning of the Republican-led 104th Congress. I have documented each and every one of those anti-choice votes in a Choice Report which is available on my web site.

The Republican-led Congress has acted again and again to eliminate the right to choose, procedure by procedure, restriction by restriction. Today we are debating a bill to criminalize the act of taking a minor across State lines for an abortion without parental consent if the State in which the person resides requires it.

As the mother of two daughters, I know that this is not a simple issue. Of course, I would hope that my daughters would include me in making such an important decision. Unfortunately, many young women do not live in normal families. They are in severely dysfunctional families.

I would hope that any young woman who refuses or cannot involve her parents would have another trusted adult from whom to seek guidance and support. However, this bill would make criminals out of such adults. It would make criminals out of loving grandparents, siblings, counselors, friends, aunts and uncles who have nothing but the safety and well-being of the young woman in mind.

If a young woman refuses to involve her family and the law prohibits her from looking to another responsible adult for support, then essential parental support and adult support is stripped away from this young person.

This bill does not protect young women from undue influence. On the contrary, it strips them of essential support. This bill is not about protecting our young women. It is driven solely by the divisive nature of abortion politics.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and put the safety and well-being of America's young women before the political agenda of anti-choice legislators. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

It sure sounds like a good idea. In an ideal world, parents would always be the first person their teenagers would go to with their problems.

Unfortunately, we don't live in an ideal world.

Unfortunately, some parents abuse their kids.

Unfortunately, some parents kick their kids out of the home.

Unfortunately, some parents are not capable of taking care of their kids.

I'd like to put this vote in perspective. This is the 121st vote on choice since the beginning of the 104th Republican Congress.

I have documented each of these votes in a Choice Report, which is available on my website: www.house.gov/maloney/choicereport.htm

Congress has acted again and again to eliminate procedure by procedure, restriction by restriction.

I find it particularly ironic that at the same time when some are trying to restrict access to contraception for young people through Title X—which will prevent unwanted pregnancies—they are also restricting access to abortion.

Today we are debating a bill to criminalize the act taking a minor across state lines for an abortion without parental consent, if the state in which the person resides requires it.

As a mother of two daughters, I know that this is not a simple issue. Of course, I would hope that my children would include me when making such an important decision.

Unfortunately, many teens live in severely dysfunctional families.

I would hope that any young women who refuses to involve her parents would have another trusted adult from which to seek guidance and support.

However, this bill will make criminals of those loving grandparents, siblings, counselors and friends who have nothing but the safety and well-being of the young woman in mind.

It sends the message to young women that an abortion is something they must go through alone.

This is a dangerous bill, and should perhaps be called the Teen Endangerment Act.

It will succeed only in making it more difficult for a young woman to get a safe, legal abortion. If she refuses to involve her family and the law prohibits her from looking to another responsible adult for help, then essential support is not there.

This is also an unnecessary bill. For those who worry about young women being forced or coerced by an adult into having an abortion against their will, let me remind them that we already have laws, such as informed consent laws or prohibitions against kidnaping and statutory rape, which protect against this.

This bill doesn't protect young women from undue influence. On the contrary, it strips them of essential support.

This bill is not about protecting our young women. It is driven solely by the divisive nature of abortion politics. I urge you to oppose this bill and put the safety and well-being of America's young women before the political agenda of anti-choice legislators.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. I would like to add my voice of thanks to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her excellent leadership on the issue and to the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. CANADY) for his strong work on the subcommittee and for yielding me this time.

Involving parents in a child's life is crucial in the healthy development of a child. Sometimes, however, a decision comes up in a child's life that seems too large for that child to handle. Sometimes it seems like no one, not even parents, would be a good person to help with their decision. Whether it is a problem at school, with friends or even the complicated decisions surrounding an abortion, children, I acknowledge, sometimes feel that relatives, even parents, cannot be relied upon.

But the fact is the parents are often, if not always, the best place to turn for a child in times of crisis. Parents loving and nurturing is complemented by their wisdom and their experience. This bill simply ensures that State laws requiring parental involvement will continue and that no one will be able to short-circuit or circumvent the productive and healthy system of communication that these laws lay out between the parent and their child.

Because of what this bill represents and protects at its core, a strong family bond, I am proud to stand up here today and show my support for the Child Custody Protection Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill on its merits, and I again thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this bill and showing America how important the family bond really must be.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Most teenagers do involve their parents when making major life decisions like the one we debate today. However, in situations where the young woman cannot share her decision with a parent, she should not be isolated from other sources of counsel and support. Whether it is a grandparent, clergy member, or some other trusted adult, young women are better served by talking through the decision and having someone to lean on rather than being all alone.

While most young women do involve a parent in their decision, not every young woman has that choice. Whether a parent is absent or abusive or worse, we know that not every family is a model family.

This law would endanger some young women who have the misfortune of difficult family circumstance. This law would make criminals out of people whose only crime is to help a young person in distress. H.R. 1218 isolates young women, puts them at risk, and restricts access to reproductive choice.

Let us stop building walls and barriers around our children and let us start having a real discussion about how we can best nurture them, educate

them, and raise them to be responsible and productive citizens.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I inquire once again of the Chair concerning the amount of time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her tireless efforts to bring this important legislative effort to the floor for consideration.

In light of all that has happened over the past few months, our Nation has had a growing concern about the moral fabric of our society. We have felt an increasing need to do everything that we can to protect our children, as they are our most precious resource. We must provide them with a safe environment so that they may thrive as they move into adulthood.

One of life's harsh realities is that some young women become pregnant at too early an age. H.R. 1218 does not terminate a person's right to an abortion but does provide important protections for young children who become pregnant.

This legislation will make it illegal for any person to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion without first consulting a parent or a judge. It will make it a Federal crime if an individual knowingly circumvents the laws of their State to seek an abortion for any mother under the age of 17.

It is most often an older male who preys on a young girl, impregnates her, and then takes her illegally across State lines to have an abortion without the knowledge and consent of the parents. We should all find this manipulative behavior disgusting and disheartening.

Not only is this a crime for an older male to be sexually active with a young girl, but it can be dangerous for that child to receive an abortion. Only a parent knows that child's health history, including allergies to medication. A parent should be informed, and the older male should be prosecuted.

Laws in an increasing number of States, now numbering more than 20, including my home State of Michigan, require parental notification or consent by at least one parent or authorization by a judge before an abortion can be performed.

This legislation will not mandate parental consent in the States which do not currently have parental consent laws but will protect those in States which do require parental consent.

Many of my colleagues are concerned that this bill will prohibit young girls from confiding in a close family member or a friend if they feel they cannot talk to their parents. This is absolutely wrong. There is a provision in the legislature which will allow a judge to relieve the parental notification requirement in certain circumstances. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1218.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1300

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 121, the Child Custody Protection Act. Let me tell my colleagues a story about a functional family, in many ways a picture-perfect family.

A few years ago, I had lunch with Karen and Bill Bell, who had a 17-year-old daughter named Becky, and a son that lived in a suburb. They had a wonderful life, they were a close family, and they supported, Bill and Karen did, parental notification requirements. That is until Becky lay dying in the hospital.

As Karen sat next to her, holding her hand, she said, "Becky, tell mommy what happened." Well, what happened to Becky is that she had an illegal abortion in a State that required parental notification, and she did not want to disappoint her loving parents.

Bill and Karen took a year out of their lives and went State to State to try to oppose parental notification laws. Not because they do not want close families but because they do not want young women like Becky, beautiful young women with their full lives ahead of them, to die.

And so I submit to my colleagues, who in all good faith support this legislation, that the consequences of this law will be that young women will die. It will be women from dysfunctional families and women from middle class and functional families alike, young women who have their entire lives ahead of them, and I would suggest that this should be soundly defeated.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time and I wish to add my voice of congratulations to the others for the good work of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of reasons to support this legislation. Let me focus on just two. Number one, it reinforces existing State laws; number two, it helps parents play a more active role in their children's lives.

More than 20 States have laws requiring the consent of one parent before a minor can have an abortion. Nonetheless, too many organizations and too

many businesses seek to avoid those laws. Now, each speaker today has been talking about his or her own experience back in their home State. Every one of those speakers should support this bill because this bill reinforces the laws back in their home State.

Let us also be very clear about something. This bill does not punish a grandparent or an aunt if a pregnant child turns to them for counseling or support. It does, it does, when that adult seeks to evade the existing law of their home State.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all understand how great the need is for the other goal of this bill, helping parents to be more actively involved in their children's lives. This bill does so by reinforcing State requirements of parental consent. And I know my colleagues have heard it before, but it is worth repeating. Under current law it is easier for a child to get an abortion than it is for that child to get an aspirin.

Today, children need a parental consent waiver to attend a field trip, to join the basketball team or to get an aspirin. For goodness sakes, why should a child not be required to receive parental consent before they undergo major surgery for abortion?

Once again I want to congratulate and thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her work. We need to allow parents to have this opportunity to parent their children.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate about the merits or lack of merits of abortions. I want to turn the attention of the Members to another issue, and that is the legal issue that resulted in this matter coming to the Committee on the Judiciary, not the policy issue of abortion versus nonabortion. We deal with legal issues in the Committee on the Judiciary, and I would submit to this body that this is an unprecedented legal maneuver that is taking place here.

There are a number of States that allow lotteries, but we do not prosecute somebody who goes from a State that does not allow a lottery to a State that does allow a lottery for doing that. There are a number of States that allow gambling. We do not prosecute a person that goes from one State that does not allow gambling to a State that allows gambling to engage in that legal activity in that particular State. This proposal would prosecute somebody for going to a State to engage in conduct that is legal in that State.

So I do not think we need to be misled about this protection of States' rights. The States' rights that the proponents of this legislation are protecting are the rights of the States who have parental consent laws, not the rights of the States who do not have

parental consent laws. We ought to be free to exercise the legal rights in the State in which those rights are available.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of this bill, I have heard often during the debate on this particular piece of legislation, refer to the procedure that we call abortion as being both safe and legal. I have heard this now two or three times. It is indeed legal, but it is anything but safe, for inevitably in this procedure one person ends up dead and another oftentimes wounded emotionally and/or physically harmed. It is anything but a safe procedure.

It is for that reason that I rise in support of the Child Custody and Protection Act and in support of the rights of parents across this country. Because these decisions that a girl will make in this regard will live with her for the rest of her life and they are the ones with which parents should be involved.

Just 2 weeks ago, we stood in this chamber talking about the importance of family and the need for parents to play a greater role in the lives of their children. A vote for this bill today is a step in that direction.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues what we are talking about are young girls, young girls in trouble, young girls who are unmarried, young girls who invariably, according to the statistics, have been impregnated by older men exploiting them. We are talking about situations that are not common. It is common for parents to be responsible, to be nurturing, not to be punitive, but that is not always the case.

I do not think we should be legislating morals when we do not know the individual circumstances that may apply. I think we should leave this to the States. We should not have legislation that is as punitive as this. I think it is regressive, and I would hope we would vote against it.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this minute to talk about two things that are very near and dear to my heart, child protection and parental rights. As a mother of two sons, I think I know a lot about both of those things.

This bill and those issues come together on the floor of the United States House today in the form of the Child Custody Protection Act.

I think it is a frightening reality that thousands of adults of every year take minor girls across State lines for the purpose of getting an abortion, in secret, behind the backs of their parents, in direct violation of parental involvement laws of a minor girl's home State.

Eighty-five percent of Americans agree it is wrong to take a minor across State lines for an abortion without their parents' knowledge. No one, not friends, not relatives, not a counselor at a clinic should be allowed to take our children across State lines for an abortion.

Let us support laws that bring families together, not tear them apart. We must do what the American people want and what is best for our children, and that is pass the Child Custody and Protection Act.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up any misconceptions. This bill is not about partial birth abortions, this bill is not about advertising of unscrupulous abortion clinics or anyone else. This bill is about endangering the lives of teenagers, teenagers who may be suffering from a different kind of family life than most of us would like.

My colleagues on the other side kept using the example that we seek parental consent forms to take aspirin in schools. I beg to differ with them. We seek consent forms. Grandmothers and aunts and those who may have custody of the child can do so. And when I say custody, I am stretching the word. It may not be a legal term.

This act, perceived to be protecting a child, endangers a young woman's life, because it denies her the opportunity for a nurturing person to help her make a terribly important decision.

This country's laws give us the right to choose. This endangers the lives of young women just because they are teenagers. It eliminates the privacy right. It throws them into a courtroom that is cold and impersonal. And if they cannot tell their parents and they cannot tell others, how can they go into a courtroom and ask for a waiver.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that we not politicize this issue; that we think about the lives of our children; and that we stand for educating young women; we stand for stopping the numbers of abortions in young women by educating them and preparing them for adult life; and we stand away from this kind of legislation that endangers the lives of innocent young women who seek only, seek only, to be able to live their lives and to not continue the mistake that they may have thought that they have made and they do that seeking the nurturing and loving and caring attitudes of those who may want to help them.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, my 13-year-old daughter had a slight head wound that required

stitches. My husband and I were in D.C., so my parents took Amanda to the hospital. But because the injury was not life-threatening, the hospital refused to give her stitches until Dexter and I gave permission. Yet, incredibly enough, Amanda could be taken to another State and undergo an abortion without my husband and me knowing about it. Would the abortionist know what medicines Amanda is allergic to? Of course not. Parents know, parents can help.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment to ponder on the infamous Joyce Farley case. Let us remember the way in which her underage daughter was taken advantage of and raped. Let us not forget about the pain and the suffering she endured, the severe complications, the bleeding, the multiple hospital visits and the astronomical medical bills that her parents were forced to pay, all because one stranger, the mother of the rapist, who is now a litigant in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, thought that she could take the life of Joyce Farley's daughter into her own hands.

Joyce's 12-year-old was raped then later driven to another State by the rapist's mother. She underwent a botched abortion and was dropped off 30 miles from her home. And, of course, she had to have another hospital visit to correct the damage done by the abortionist.

Cases such as Joyce Farley's must not be repeated. Now more than ever it is evident that children need their parents. Society needs to do everything within our power to help parents assume responsibility for our children. We need to try to secure the right of parents to become involved in the lives of our children and to help them, not to pull families apart.

The opponents of this legislation have sought ways in which to defy this child-parent relationship. They have tried to place grandparents, brothers, sisters on par with the parents. But let me ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, what well-meaning sweet old grandmother would not feel the need to let a child's parent know? What well-meaning minister would drive a child to an abortion clinic and advise the child to keep the pregnancy and the abortion a secret from her parent?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have expressed support for more parental involvement. They support a parent's right to know, and they support the Child Custody Protection Act.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of The Child Custody Protection Act. This bill will help to enforce parental involvement laws that are implemented to protect the physical and emotional health of children.

Parents know their child's medical history, as well as other health factors that a minor child might not even know about themselves. When parents aren't involved in major medical decisions, such as abortion, risks to the minor's health increase dramatically. In fact, in his H.L. versus Matheson decision (1981), the

Supreme Court expressed its concern that abortion can be harmful to minors, "The medical, emotional, and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting; this is particularly so when the patient is immature."

Why in the world would we not want parents to be involved in these decisions? Parents have to sign permission slips for their kids to go on field trips at school, and they have to sign a medical slip that allows them to take over the counter medication at school. But abortion advocates would have you believe that parents shouldn't have to sign off on major decisions like abortion. That just doesn't make sense.

This bill does not in any way require states to create new parental consent or notification laws, nor does it interfere with existing state laws regarding abortions for minors.

This bill would make it a federal misdemeanor to transport a minor across a state line for an abortion, if that action circumvents state law requiring parental or judicial involvement in that minor child's abortion decision. This legislation ensures the rights of parents, protects the health of minors, and enforces state law.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my strong support for H.R. 1218, The Child Custody Protection Act. As a father of seven and a grandfather to 34, the thought of a stranger taking one of my grandchildren to another state to receive an abortion absolutely sickens me.

The Child Custody Protection Act would make it a federal offense for someone who is not the parent or guardian, to knowingly transport a minor across state lines so that she can receive an abortion.

H.R. 1218 is plainly an issue of parental knowledge and state laws. It is alarming to think that our children are required to receive parental consent to take aspirin at school, yet a stranger can make critical decisions about their health and well-being.

Mr. Speaker, more than twenty states currently require parental consent or notification as a precondition to receive an abortion. In supporting this legislation we are respecting state rights, and upholding the family relationship as the center for moral values and guidance. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Transportation Committee, I am concerned about the broad impact H.R. 1218 could have on our citizens' right to travel safely. We are considering taking away the right of young women to move freely between states with family or friends to seek legal medical care.

Now, suppose citizens were locked into the laws of their home state as they travel across country. This would mean that the speed limits, marriage regulations, restrictions on adoption, and all other controls over behavior would in fact follow the citizens.

This would be absurd. In fact, the premise of "federalism," is our entitlement to travel and be subject to the laws of the state we are in.

The principles of this bill obliterate that right. The strict provisions—with no exceptions for travel with family or clergy—discourage free interstate travel and subject young women to perilous travel alone. This violates our federal system, is unconstitutional, and frankly, unacceptable.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1218. There is nothing more important in parent-child relationships than for parents to be involved in the healthcare decisions of their children.

The basic parental right and responsibility is perhaps most critical in the case of pregnancies of young woman.

In most American homes, no one cares more about the welfare, health, and safety of a child than her parents.

Although a young woman may be frightened or feel or ashamed to share with her parents, parents are usually best able to provide support for these most personal decisions.

Unfortunately, not all young women are able to confide in their parents should they become pregnant. A victim of family violence or incest is often not in a position to share her pregnancy with her parents for fear of further abuse.

This bill, although laudable for its intention to encourage communication between parents and children, does not provide alternatives for a young woman who is unable, for fear of physical or emotional abuse, to involve her parents in her decision.

In addition, the bill would criminalize the actions of close family members who might seek to assist a young woman who is struggling with this monumental decision. For troubled American households, grandparents, estranged parents, aunts, uncles, or siblings often serve in the parental role.

The bill unfortunately does not make provisions for such circumstances. In fact, it may put these young women in a more dangerous situation should they feel compelled to turn to illicit providers of abortion services or travel alone.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the need for more parental involvement in their children's lives, but for these reasons, I must vote "no" on H.R. 1218.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give my support to the Child Custody Protection Act and I commend Representative ROS-LEHTINEN for working so diligently to protect children and the rights of their parents.

Today we live in a nation bitterly divided over the debate of abortion. As horrifying as abortion is, this bill really deals with another issue, that of States rights. Two weeks ago, you joined me to pass the Ten Commandments Defense Act, another piece of legislation securing the rights of States to establish their own laws. Both of these pieces of legislation protect the Tenth Amendment of States rights.

Representative ROS-LEHTINEN's act argues that citizens and businesses of one state should respect the laws of another state. If the people of Alabama have voted for the rights of the parents to know if their children want an abortion, this is the law within the borders of Alabama. No one, not even a well-meaning friend, has the right to break this law by taking a child away from their home and into another state for what could be the most terrifying and traumatic experience of their life.

Abortion clinics are enticing people to break the law by advertising in the phone books of neighboring states with parental notification laws. We are constantly hearing of the tobacco industry being sued for illegally targeting minors in advertising. Using the same logic, these abortion clinics may be setting themselves up for a few lawsuits.

We convict and sentence adults for engaging in sexual relations with a minor, yet we don't even slap the hand of an adult who aids a minor in destroying their unborn child. Unfortunately, right now, without this law in place, a statutory rapist can conceal the evidence of his crime by taking his young victim across state lines to abort the child he fathered.

As a parent and a defender of the Constitution, I am calling on you, my fellow lawmakers, to respect the autonomous powers of States to allow parents to parent.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Custody Protection Act. This legislation will make it a federal misdemeanor for a person to transport a minor across state lines in order to circumvent state law so that the minor may obtain an abortion.

In North Carolina—Parental consent is required. A Physician cannot perform an abortion on a minor unless they have the consent of a parent or legal guardian. The Child Custody Protection Act is designed to give parents input in one of the most serious and lasting decision a child could make. While North Carolina parents are guaranteed a voice in our state, there is still an enormous federal loophole in this effort. The fact that someone else could transport that same young woman to another state with more lenient parental laws completely undermines this common sense measure.

I hope that we will work for policies that keep young women from having to make this type of decision in the first place. Abortion should not be a decision that a school aged girl has to make. The pressures in our society are so great on young women to have sexual relations before marriage. We need to go one step further in our schools and communities by teaching abstinence until marriage as the correct and healthy method of sex education. This would be a life saver for our children—keeping them from ever having to make the decision of whether or not to have an abortion.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, for the record I strenuously object to H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill would make it illegal for a trusted adult who is not a parent to bring a minor to another state for an abortion.

Although I think young women should be encouraged to seek their parents' guidance when facing difficult choices regarding abortion and other reproductive health issues, it is not appropriate or possible for the government to legislate family involvement in this important and highly personal decision.

Many minors do not seek advice from their parents because they have experienced violence in their family or fear violence if they tell a parent of their abortion. H.R. 1218 presumes incorrectly that most young women are part of a loving, supportive and healthy home, but in reality it will force many young women to face this situation in isolation rather than trusting a close adult, such as a grandparent, clergy member or sibling.

It is my fear that this measure will force young women to seek illegal dangerous medical treatment rather than tell their parents of their pregnancy. As a result, this would completely undermine a woman's right to choose guaranteed by *Roe v. Wade*.

In fact, I can argue that this legislation is irresponsible because it does nothing to address the need for education. It is critical that we emphasize the importance of educating

our youth about family planning in order to reduce the number of abortions in this country.

Finally we must remember that most young women go to their parents for guidance, but we have an obligation to protect young women who cannot turn to a supportive parent by voting against H.R. 1218.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Child Custody Protection Act. I believe this legislation takes the wrong approach to the problem of teen pregnancy and could turn a young woman's fear into desperation.

Minors should consult their parents before seeking an abortion, and more than 75 percent of young women already involve one or both parents in their decision, but some teens fear family violence if they talk to their parents; other teens are deeply afraid of disappointing their parents. This bill does not address the reality of dysfunctional families in which so many children exist.

Instead of increasing parental involvement, this bill could harm young women by further isolating them at a time when they are already facing the crisis of an unwanted pregnancy, leading them to turn to illegal or unsafe abortions or to travel alone to other states. As drafted, even a step-parent, aunt, or grandmother could not accompany a minor unless the parent had been notified or had consented, depending on the state law. The Supreme Court has decided that the Constitutional right to privacy includes a minor's right to terminate a pregnancy. Although states are given the option of enacting their own laws on this issue, H.R. 1218 would federalize a process that many states have chosen not to enact.

The Child Custody Protection Act intends to make it a federal crime to assist a minor by crossing state lines to obtain a legal abortion. The desire to maintain secrecy has been one of the leading reasons for illegal abortion deaths. Building roadblocks for a pregnant teenager can cause her to feel more alone and alienated in a fearful situation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1218, the "Child Custody Protection Act" which would make it a federal offense to transport a minor across a state line for an abortion if this action circumvents a state law requiring parental involvement in that minor's abortion or circumvents a requirement of a judicial waiver. This legislation does not mandate parental involvement but requires obedience to state law. This bill deals with the narrow but important question of the interstate transportation of minors to circumvent existing state laws which places pregnant girls at risk and ignores parental rights.

In a widely publicized 1995 case, a 12-year-old Pennsylvania girl became pregnant after involvement with an 18-year-old man. Pennsylvania law requires parental consent or judicial bypass for an abortion to be performed on a minor. However, the man's mother took the pregnant girl for an abortion in New York, which has no parental involvement law. The girl's mother did not even know that she was pregnant. When Pennsylvania authorities prosecuted the woman for interfering with the custody of a child, she was defended by a pro abortion group which argued that the woman's action were like those of "thousands of adults who each year aid young women in exercising their constitutional right to an abortion". The

fact is that many abortion advocates advertise and refer young girls to neighboring states to avoid these laws. This reality is not in the best interests of these children.

Exceptions already exist when the pregnant girl's health is genuinely at risk and judicial bypass procedures exist for situations where abusive parents or guardians are involved. The fact is that for the vast majority of cases it is the parents or legal guardians—not the boyfriends, strangers, or meddling in-laws—who are generally best able to weigh the risks of various courses of action in the light of their often unique knowledge of the girl's medical history, psychological makeup, and other crucial factors.

Schools require parental involvement for field trips, medications, early school release, and academic decisions such as sexual education classes, yet with reckless disregard for state laws, a stranger can legally transport a minor across state lines and have her undergo a potentially life-threatening procedure.

Parental notification laws were signed into law this month in both Florida and Texas. Twenty other states already have these laws on the books. The Child Custody Protection Act is supported by a vast majority of Americans since it works to strengthen the rights of parents to raise their children as they see fit by enforcing state laws which require parental involvement in a decision bearing serious medical and emotional consequences to their daughters. The legislation passed the House with a vote of 276–150 last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this critical legislation and request that the President sign it into law.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is a member in this House who is against supporting and reinforcing family values. We all know that the family is under assault in this country. Efforts to counter this assault and foster good public policy, have occurred in 34 states that currently have laws requiring consent or notification of at least one parent or court authorization before a child can obtain an abortion. These states have expressed their public policy that when a child is going to have an abortion, the parents of the child, the mother who bore her, the father who supports the family unit, know about it, know that their daughter is going to be treated by an abortionist who is going to perform a very serious surgical procedure with potentially serious consequences.

These states have decided by passing these laws that parents are entitled to be part of that decision. This bill reinforces those state laws. It is good legislation, designed to support the family and prevent the evasion of state laws that require parental consent before a child can have an abortion.

I can think of nothing more destructive to the family unit than back door efforts to evade the inclusion of a parent in a child's decision to have an abortion. Some have said grandparents, siblings or others should have the right to take a minor child for an abortion without parent's knowledge. This would create a situation where the grandparents are pulling in one direction and the parents, who have the primary responsibility for the child's well-being and her unborn child, are pulling in another. I say, leave it to the parents. Yes, you can have parents who are intolerant, absent, abusive, or involved with drugs, but the law recognizes these situations and provides for a judicial by-

pass of a parental consent requirement. This bill recognizes the humanity of the unborn and reinforces the structure of the family. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1218, the "Child Custody Protection Act of 1999."

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1218 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, after line 11 insert the following:

"(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by an adult sibling or grandparent, or by a minister, rabbi, pastor, priest, or other religious leader of the minor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion to recommit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor with a very heavy heart, because I had hoped that in deliberations on dealing with something as, if you will, sacred and challenging as the very private and terrible decision of having to decide whether to terminate a pregnancy could be done in a bipartisan manner.

I indicated earlier in my remarks, we are not debating partial-birth abortion; we are not talking about advertising that may be too solicitous and too open; we are really talking about a life that, unfortunately in America, may be somewhat different than we would like.

I loved to watch the T.V. Show Ozzie and Harriet, and I really enjoyed the fact that children lived in two-parent families in a loving and nurturing environment. I enjoyed those television programs. But, Mr. Speaker, that is just not today's reality.

We live in a different time. We come from mixed and different cultures. So many Americans have had to grow up without parents or without the traditional family structure. This is a day, Mr. Speaker, when many young people have to live with their grandparents. I represent communities who have extended families and who have to reach out to take care of someone who may have been abandoned.

Poverty strikes in this Nation, and sometimes parents go off because they are frustrated and cannot take care of their family. This overemphasis on parents, Mr. Speaker, is unfair. The motion to recommit responds to the dire circumstances of young people who do not have parents who are there to nurture and care for them.

We offered this amendment in committee. We offered it in the Committee on Rules, and we were denied. So that means that a young woman who has been raped, who has been involved in incest or child abuse through the family situation cannot seek to have their grandparent, their grandmother, their adult siblings, their aunts, their religious advisors like ministers and rabbis to provide them the guidance that would help them to make the right decision. These loving people under this bill will now be put in jail if they attempt to help and counsel this young female teen-ager who has nowhere else to go.

I am confused as to why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep talking about States' rights and then we want to alter States' rights by federalizing this particular activity. States already have these provisions and yet now we want to take away the rights of those who are in States who do not have them. This bill endangers the lives of teens who may have to make the worse decision in their life.

Let me share with my colleagues the story of Keishawn, 11 years old, and her Aunt Vicky. Keishawn, 11 years old, was raped by her father. Mr. Speaker, is that the parent that Keishawn should have gone and gotten consent from? Therefore she sought help from her aunt, her aunt under this bill would be jailed under this legislation.

And what about Becky Bell, who was dating her older brother's boyfriend, who had loving parents, who was in a State with parental consent, who was frightened to go to the courts and ask for a judicial bypass or waiver and went to a back-room abortionist, where her young life was snuffed out because of the inadequate medical care. And, yes, she died due to a terrible infection of which the medical examiner confirmed that she died due to a botched abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we should be able to resolve. We should leave it to the States. But, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to put this bill on the floor, how can we deny grandparents the right to counsel these young teens, where no viable parent is involved.

We are not asking for grandparents to intrude into the relationship of loving families who can talk and generate the decisions that need to be made within the privacy of their home. But, Mr. Speaker, are we here so blinded by the fact that we do not realize what kind of world we live in, that we are living in a world with broken homes? Are we to indict those families who are doing the best they can to raise their children by grandparents or aunts—are they now to go to jail? Are our ministers and rabbis to go to jail too?

I just heard on this floor yesterday how important it is to turn our eyes toward our heavenly Father. But yet we want to deny religious leaders the right to give counsel to these suffering teens.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that my colleagues support a motion to recommit that recognizes the world in which we live has changed and we all don't come from two-parent families. We live in a Nation that has a diverse population that finds many different family structures to guide a teen-ager. Although we should encourage families to stay together we must also accept the fact that young girls can be raped, there is incest, there is child abuse. Sometimes families are not the kind of families that we would like.

I understand the reality of Keishawn and Becky Bell. Becky Bell is now dead. She is dead because we forced upon her the laws of parental consent, and we denied her the right to counsel with other family members to help her in her terrible time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote down the bill and to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion to recommit to exclude grandparents, older siblings, trusted relatives, and the clergy from H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act of 1999.

Although many young women would involve their parents when seeking an abortion, not every young person can do so. Parents may be abusive, or even absent. In those cases where a young woman cannot involve her parents in the decision, there are others who would help by offering physical and emotional support during a time of crisis, confusion and emotional pain. A minor should be able to turn to a relative, close friend, and even clergy members for assistance.

In those cases, this law would endanger minors who cannot talk with their parents and would make criminals of those people the minor turns to for people help.

Supporters of this bill claim that judicial bypass, a procedure which permits teenagers to appear before a judge to request a waiver of the parental involvement requirement, is a preferred alternative. However, many teens do not make use of it because they do not know how to navigate the legal system.

Many teens are embarrassed and are afraid that an unsympathetic or hostile judge might refuse to grant the waiver. Also, the confidentiality of the teen is compromised if the bypass hearing requires use of the parents' names. In small towns, confidentiality may be further compromised if the judge knows the teen or her family.

The need to travel across state lines may be necessary in states where abortion services are not readily available. This may be because of various state restrictions or distance. Some young women must seek services outside of their home state because the closest abortion provider may be across state lines.

When a young woman must travel these distances, we do not want her taking this difficult and tumultuous step alone. Therefore, I offer this motion to recommit to exclude grandparents, older siblings, trusted relatives, and the clergy, so an adult can assist a young woman who is facing an arduous choice.

Grandparents play an important role in the lives of young people. Grandparents act as counselors for children who cannot speak with their parents. In many cases, grandparents act as parents to children who are abandoned or neglected by their own parents. The relationship between a child and a grandparent should be viewed just as sacred as the relationship between a parent and a child.

Older brothers and sisters also form a unique bond with children who cannot communicate with their parents. There are so many instances where an older brother or sister acts as the parents. We should reward these outstanding members of the family who have taken on such responsibility; we should not punish them with threats of criminal sanctions.

This motion to recommit also would exclude aunts, uncles, first cousins and godparents from the prohibitions of this bill. We should not punish caring relatives for providing support to a scared young woman.

In a time of crisis, a member of the clergy is an important counselor. The advice and assistance of the clergy should not be compromised for fear of criminal sanctions. In its present form, this bill would criminalize any efforts by a religious leader to assist a young woman in her efforts to obtain an abortion.

I hope that my colleagues will accept this motion to recommit. It is vital that we allow our young people to turn to responsible adults when facing abortion. We want trusted members of society bonding with the young woman seeking their help; we do not want these members taken away in bonds.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all the Members of the House to oppose this motion to recommit for the simple reason that in its four lines it sweeps aside the whole concept of parental involvement. It sweeps aside the notion that it is the parent who should have the primary responsibility for the nurture of children.

Now, this is a concept that has been recognized time and time again by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a concept that has been recognized by the Supreme Court in the very cases where the Supreme Court has dealt with the various State laws calling for parental involvement in a minor's abortion decision.

Now, what does the amendment provide for? The amendment says that a grandparent can substitute for the parent, an adult sibling, a minister, a rabbi, a pastor, a priest, or other religious leader of the minor.

Now, I love my in-laws and my parents, but they have no business taking

my daughter across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion. And I have a great deal of respect for my pastor, but I will guarantee my colleagues that he has no business taking my daughter across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion. It is the parents who have the primary responsibility, and we should recognize that along with the States who have passed laws which recognize that and along with the Supreme Court, which has recognized that in opinion after opinion.

Now, the truth of the matter is, if there are difficult circumstances such as we have heard about in the debate where it is not possible for a young girl to go to her parents concerning such a decision, the courts have required that there be made available a judicial bypass procedure. That is there. In all the laws that are in effect across the land, there is a judicial bypass procedure.

We have heard an example of a child that was raped by the father and an effort was made to take the child for an abortion without the knowledge of the authorities. Well, that is exactly the kind of case where the judicial bypass should most certainly be utilized so there will be a certainty that the authorities are aware of this parental abuse that is taking place.

Why that sort of thing should be handled in some other manner secretly makes no sense to me. I do not think the child's interest is being protected unless the authorities are involved. That is how the child is going to be protected against future abuse by a father who would commit such a heinous crime.

The opponents of the bill and the supporters of this motion to recommit contend that judicial bypass procedure is not meaningful, that it does not work. Well, I would suggest to the Members of the House that that is a fallacious argument. In case after case, the Supreme Court of the United States has imposed requirements on the judicial bypass procedures to make certain that they do work in a way that protects the interest that the court has found must be protected.

The Supreme Court said that the judicial bypass must allow for consideration with sufficient expedition to provide an effective opportunity for abortion to be obtained. That is what the Supreme Court said back in 1979.

In subsequent cases, they have struck down laws where it has been shown that there was a systematic failure to provide a judicial bypass option in the most expeditious practical manner. The cases are there. The judicial bypass mechanism works as the Supreme Court intended it to work.

The problem that the opponents of this bill have is that they do not like any parental involvement law. They do not believe that there should ever be a requirement for parental involvement. They believe that the decision to have an abortion is a decision that the minor should be able to make on her

own, without any input from anybody other than from the abortionist. That is the bottom-line position of the people who oppose this bill.

I would suggest to my colleagues that that is the wrong position. That is the position that is overwhelmingly rejected by the American people. It is a position that has been rejected by the Supreme Court. And it is a position that this House should, once again, reject as we reject the motion to recommit and move forward to the passage of this important legislation.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) for her outstanding leadership on this. I urge the Members of the House to vote against the motion to recommit and in favor of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 164, nays 268, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—164

Abercrombie	Cummings	Hinchey
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Allen	DeFazio	Hoefel
Andrews	DeGette	Holt
Baird	Delahunt	Hooley
Baldacci	DeLauro	Horn
Baldwin	Deutsch	Hoyer
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Inslee
Becerra	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Bentsen	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Doggett	(TX)
Berman	Dooley	Jefferson
Biggart	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Bishop	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Kennedy
Boehlert	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boucher	Farr	Kind (WI)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lampson
Brown (FL)	Filner	Lantos
Brown (OH)	Ford	Larson
Campbell	Frank (MA)	Lee
Capps	Frost	Levin
Capuano	Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Gephardt	Lofgren
Carson	Gilchrist	Lowe
Castle	Gilman	Luther
Clay	Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)
Clayton	Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Clyburn	Greenwood	Markey
Conyers	Gutierrez	Matsui
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)
Crowley	Hilliard	McCarthy (NY)

McDermott	Pickett	Strickland	Skeen	Tancredo	Walsh	Lewis (KY)	Pickering	Snyder
McGovern	Porter	Tauscher	Skelton	Tanner	Wamp	Linder	Pitts	Souder
McKinney	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)	Smith (MI)	Tauzin	Watkins	Lipinski	Pombo	Spence
Meehan	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Smith (NJ)	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)	LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Spratt
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thurman	Smith (TX)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Portman	Stearns
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Tierney	Snyder	Terry	Weldon (PA)	Manzullo	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Towns	Souder	Thomas	Weller	Mascara	Quinn	Strickland
Millender-	Rush	Udall (CO)	Spence	Thornberry	Weygand	McCollum	Radanovich	Stump
McDonald	Sabo	Udall (NM)	Spratt	Thune	Whitfield	McCrery	Rahall	Stupak
Miller, George	Sanchez	Velazquez	Stearns	Tiahrt	Wicker	McHugh	Ramstad	Sununu
Minge	Sanders	Vento	Stenholm	Toomey	Wilson	McInnis	Regula	Sweeney
Mink	Sandlin	Visclosky	Stump	Traficant	Wolf	McIntosh	Reyes	Talent
Moore	Sawyer	Waters	Stupak	Turner	Young (AK)	McIntyre	Reynolds	Tancredo
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Watt (NC)	Sununu	Upton	Young (FL)	McKeon	Riley	Tanner
Morella	Scott	Waxman	Sweeney	Vitter		McNulty	Roemer	Tauzin
Nadler	Serrano	Weiner	Talent	Walden		Metcalf	Rogan	Taylor (MS)
Napolitano	Shays	Wexler				Mica	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Olver	Sherman	Wise				Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Terry
Owens	Sisisky	Woolsey	Brown (CA)	Martinez		Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Pallone	Slaughter	Wu				Minge	Roukema	Thornberry
Pastor	Smith (WA)	Wynn				Moakley	Royce	Thune
Payne	Stabenow					Mollohan	Ryan (WI)	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Stark					Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

□ 1347

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 270, noes 159, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—270

Aderholt	Forbes	McCollum						
Archer	Fossella	McCrery						
Armey	Fowler	McHugh						
Bachus	Franks (NJ)	McInnis						
Baker	Frelinghuysen	McIntosh						
Ballenger	Galleghy	McIntyre						
Barcia	Ganske	McKeon						
Barr	Gekas	McNulty						
Barrett (NE)	Gibbons	Metcalf						
Bartlett	Gillmor	Mica						
Barton	Goode	Miller (FL)						
Bass	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary						
Bateman	Goodling	Moakley						
Bereuter	Gordon	Mollohan						
Berry	Goss	Moran (KS)						
Bilbray	Graham	Murtha						
Bilirakis	Granger	Myrick						
Bliley	Green (WI)	Neal						
Blunt	Gutknecht	Nethercutt						
Boehner	Hall (OH)	Ney						
Bonilla	Hall (TX)	Northup						
Bonior	Hansen	Norwood						
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Nussle						
Borski	Hayes	Oberstar						
Boswell	Hayworth	Obey						
Boyd	Hefley	Ortiz						
Brady (TX)	Herger	Ose						
Bryant	Hill (IN)	Oxley						
Burr	Hill (MT)	Packard						
Burton	Hilleary	Pascrell						
Buyer	Hobson	Paul						
Callahan	Hoekstra	Pease						
Calvert	Holden	Peterson (MN)						
Camp	Hostettler	Peterson (PA)						
Canady	Houghton	Petri						
Cannon	Hulshof	Phelps						
Chabot	Hunter	Pickering						
Chambliss	Hutchinson	Pitts						
Chenoweth	Hyde	Pombo						
Clement	Isakson	Pomeroy						
Coble	Istook	Portman						
Coburn	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)						
Collins	John	Quinn						
Combust	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich						
Condit	Jones (NC)	Rahall						
Cook	Kanjorski	Ramstad						
Cooksey	Kaptur	Regula						
Costello	Kasich	Reyes						
Cox	Kelly	Reynolds						
Cramer	Kildee	Riley						
Crane	King (NY)	Rivers						
Cubin	Kingston	Roemer						
Cunningham	Kleczka	Rogan						
Danner	Klink	Rogers						
Davis (FL)	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher						
Davis (VA)	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen						
Deal	Kucinich	Roukema						
DeLay	Kuykendall	Royce						
DeMint	LaFalce	Ryan (WI)						
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Ryun (KS)						
Dickey	Largent	Salmon						
Doolittle	Latham	Sanford						
Doyle	LaTourette	Saxton						
Dreier	Lazio	Scarborough						
Duncan	Leach	Schaffer						
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner						
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Sessions						
Ehrlich	Linder	Shadegg						
Emerson	Lipinski	Shaw						
English	LoBiondo	Sherwood						
Everett	Lucas (KY)	Shimkus						
Ewing	Lucas (OK)	Shows						
Fletcher	Manzullo	Shuster						
Foley	Mascara	Simpson						

NAYS—268

NOES—159

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Gilchrist	Morella
Allen	Gilman	Nadler
Andrews	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Baird	Green (TX)	Olver
Baldacci	Greenwood	Owens
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bass	Hinchee	Paul
Becerra	Hinojosa	Payne
Bentsen	Hoefel	Pelosi
Berkley	Holt	Pickett
Berman	Hooley	Porter
Biggert	Houghton	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Rangel
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rivers
Boehlert	Jackson (IL)	Rodriguez
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Rush
Brown (OH)	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Campbell	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez
Capps	Jones (OH)	Sanders
Capuano	Kaptur	Sawyer
Cardin	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carson	Kilpatrick	Scott
Castle	Kind (WI)	Serrano
Clay	Lampson	Shays
Clayton	Lantos	Sherman
Clyburn	Larson	Sisisky
Conyers	Lee	Slaughter
Coyne	Levin	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Stabenow
Cummings	Lofgren	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Tancredo
DeFazio	Luther	Tauscher
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Markey	Thurman
Deutsch	Matsui	Tierney
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Towns
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (CO)
Doggett	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Dooley	McGovern	Velazquez
Edbards	McKinney	Visclosky
Engel	Meehan	Waters
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Watt (NC)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Farr	Menendez	Weiner
Fattah	Millender-	Wexler
Filner	McDonald	Wise
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Woolsey
Frost	Mink	Wu
Gejdenson	Moore	Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1400

Brown (CA) Lewis (CA) Martinez
Ford Lucas (OK)

□ 1355

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall vote No. 261, and, if I had been present on final passage H.R. 1218, the Child Custody Protection Act, I would have voted "yes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 66, ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 230

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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. Speaker, H. Res. 230 would grant H.R. 66, the Route 66 Corridor Act, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment by section. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 230 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

H.R. 66, the Route 66 Corridor Act, would permit the Secretary of the Interior to support and collaborate with the State and local and private institutions to preserve one of the most famous highways in the United States. The bill, introduced by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), would further the preservation and restoration of portions of the highway, businesses and sites of interest during this period of outstanding historic significance.

In its heyday, Mr. Speaker, Route 66 extended from Chicago to Los Angeles, helping businesses to move their products and millions of Americans to move their families westward, primarily between 1933 and 1970.

It also opened up the southwestern landscape to tourism, has been mentioned in books, television, movies and songs. H.R. 66 was reported by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote and there is no controversy surrounding this legislation.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding the customary amount of time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule and, as my colleague has described, this rule will equally divide and control the de-

bate of the chairman and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Resources.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process that we use here in the House. All Members will have the chance to offer germane amendments.

The bill authorizes \$10 million to help preserve historic buildings and sites and highway portions along old Route 66 from Chicago to Los Angeles. The Federal share of any project is limited to 50 percent.

A Federal study completed in 1995 found that Route 66 is nationally significant and that the cultural resources along the road are disappearing.

This is an open rule. It was adopted by voice vote of the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 791, STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY ACT OF 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 232

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the national trails system. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the

Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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 distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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, H.Res. 232 would grant H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trails Study Act of 1999, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment at any point.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, H.Res. 232 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 791 would amend the National Trails System Act to designate for study as a potential addition to the National Trails System the route of the British invasion of Maryland and the District of Columbia during the War of 1812. Such designation would give recognition to the patriots whose determination to stand firm against enemy invasion and bombardment preserved this Nation for future generations of Americans.

H.R. 791, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), would authorize studies

which the Congressional Budget Office estimates would cost the Federal Government approximately \$250,000 over the next 2 years. The bill contains no unfunded mandates and thus would not affect pay-go procedures.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 791 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote and there is no controversy surrounding this legislation. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for yielding me this time, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 791. This rule provides 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule. This is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have a chance to offer amendments if they are germane.

H.R. 791 authorizes a study of the route British invaders and American defenders followed between Baltimore and Washington during the War of 1812.

The study is the first step to declare the route part of the National Trails System. This is an open rule and it was adopted by a voice vote in the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 592, WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 592) to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as "World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills". The first

reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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 distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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, H. Res. 231 would grant H.R. 592, the World War II Veterans Park at Miller Field Gateway National Recreation Area, an open rule providing 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

□ 1415

The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open to amendment at any point. In addition, the rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI prohibiting non-germane amendments against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, House Resolution 231 provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 592 was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), and would redesignate the Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as the World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 592 would have no significant impact on the Federal budget. The bill contains no unfunded mandates, and thus would not affect pay-go procedures.

H.R. 592 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources on a voice vote, and there is no controversy surrounding the bill.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. It will allow for full and fair debate on H.R. 592. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have their opportunity to offer germane amendments.

Miller Field is a 64-acre section of the Gateway National Recreation Area on Staten Island, New York. The bill designates that section as the World War Veterans Park at Miller Field to honor the veterans who fought in the world wars to protect democracy and freedom.

This is an open rule. It was adopted by a voice vote on the Committee on Rules. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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.

ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 230 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of

the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 66.

□ 1418

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance, with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 66, introduced by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), will preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor.

Route 66 was a nationally significant part of American history, and was foremost among the early highways that helped change and shape America throughout the early and mid 20th century.

Extending from Chicago to Los Angeles, Route 66 was nonetheless important to the entire country. It enabled American businesses to move goods, individuals to seek better lives, and the government to move troops and war supplies. It also opened up the West to tourism, and allowed the post-war migration of families to the booming job market of California.

Route 66 has become an enduring part of America's culture through books, television, songs, and movies. As Americans became increasingly mobile, the two-lane roadway known as Route 66 could not handle the increased traffic volume. The Interstate Highway system came into existence, new roads were built, and traffic was diverted away from the former route.

Route 66 eventually became so fragmented and confusing that in 1979 it lost its official U.S. Highway Route 66 designation. The remaining portions of the former Route 66 have been incorporated into State and local highway systems.

H.R. 66 would preserve the cultural resources along the historic Route 66 by allowing the Secretary of the Interior to support and collaborate with State, local, and private institutions to preserve these resources.

The preservation of Route 66 would include the preservation or restoration of portions of the highway, businesses and sites of interest and other contributing resources along the highway. The Secretary could provide cost-share grants, information services, and technical assistance to local entities.

H.R. 66 would also authorize the appropriation of \$10 million for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to carry out the purposes of the bill. Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 66.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and thank him for all the hard work he has done on the Committee on this bill, and I really appreciate very much the time and attention the gentleman has given to this.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for her leadership and hard work on this bill. I can tell the Members, I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Route 66 began in the early 1920s as a vision, a paved highway that would link the great American heartland with the Pacific Ocean. Starting in Chicago, Route 66 winds its way through eight States, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, before ending at Santa Monica, California.

At a time when most roads were unpaved, not to mention unpassable in inclement weather conditions, Route 66 stretched 2,400 miles and was one of the country's first paved interstate highways. In New Mexico, Route 66 wound its way through the towns of Tucumcari, which is located in my district, Santa Rosa, Albuquerque, Grants, and Gallup, which is also in my district.

Also during the early 1920s, the automobile was gaining in popularity. Prompted by lower prices as a result of Henry Ford's innovative assembly line manufacturing, the automobile was in reach of many Americans. Farmers and ranchers no longer lived in isolation for long periods of time, as they could now drive to town and still tend to their fields and animals all in the same day. Workers in urban areas could now live outside the cities and commute to work. American life was changing, and Route 66 chronicled these changes.

Michael Wallace wrote a book called "Route 66, the Mother Road," and I would recommend to any of the Members or any of the public this book. It is an excellent history of Route 66.

He wrote in the book, "Route 66 was the road of dreamers and ramblers, drifters and writers, the road of John Steinbeck, Woody Guthrie, and Jack Kerouac. A ribbon of American highway that transported the Oklahomans driven from their land as storms of dust swept across their farms to the promise of California. It was also the highway of commerce—of automated

ice cream stands and old 'no-tell' motels, salty truck stops, and the neon allure."

H.R. 66 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to preserve or restore historic sites along the route; to cooperate with public and private entities in developing local preservation plans; to develop a technical assistance program in the preservation of Route 66; to coordinate a program of historic research, curation, and preservation; to make available cost-share grants; and to provide information about existing cost-share opportunities.

Route 66 started out as a vision. Today it is a fond memory, an important piece of Americana that should be preserved for current and future generations. This legislation will enable the preservation of this historic landmark, and will also provide a lift to the economies of every community along its route.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, for his kind words, and I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), the author of this piece of legislation, who has done a substantially great job in getting to this point.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) for their support of H.R. 66.

I would also like to commend the staff who have worked so hard on this, Allen Freemyer and Gary Griffith, David Watkins and Rick Healy.

I would also like to recognize the hard work of Mrs. Susie McComb, the President of the New Mexico Route 66 Association, and Mr. David Knudson, who is the executive director of the National Historic Route 66 Federation, for their support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 66, a bill to preserve and protect the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor, is important to my State and to many others. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and Senators DOMENICI and BINGAMAN of New Mexico and others who live along this historic route have been working on it for more than 5 years now.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from northern New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his joining on as an original cosponsor of H.R. 66 this year.

This version of H.R. 66 addresses the concerns raised by both the majority and the minority on the Committee on Resources. It passed by voice vote in both the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and on the full Committee on Resources.

At a March 11, 1999, subcommittee hearing, the administration testified in support of the bill. H.R. 66 is substantially similar to a bill that the House considered on the floor last year in the waning days of the 105th Congress. The Senate companion to my bill, which was H.R. 4513, garnered a majority of support, but there were some objections because it did not go through the normal hearing process.

The bill is supported by the National Parks and Conservation Association and the National Park Service, and enjoys bipartisan support in both the House and Senate.

H.R. 66 authorizes the National Park Service to support efforts of State and local, public and private persons, nonprofit Route 66 associations, Indian tribes, State historic preservation offices, and others for the preservation or restoration of structures or other cultural resources, of businesses and sites of interest along Route 66.

The Park Service would act as a clearinghouse for communication among Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as nonprofit entities, and would participate in cost-sharing programs and make grants not to exceed \$10 million over 10 years. That is what the bill is about. I think it is more important what Route 66 is about.

Route 66 is 2,448 miles long. It crosses eight States and three time zones stretching from Chicago all the way to L.A. It is firmly rooted in Americana.

□ 1430

Almost every child in America who studies English in high school reads "The Grapes of Wrath", where John Steinbeck writes, "Highway 66 is the migrant road. 66—the long concrete path across the country, waving gently up and down on the map, from the Mississippi to Bakersfield—over the red lands and the gray lands, twisting up into the mountains, crossing the Divide and down into the bright and terrible desert, and across the desert to the mountains again, and into the rich California valleys.

"66 is the path of a people in flight, refugees from dust and shrinking land, from the thunder of tractors and shrinking ownership, from the desert's slow northward invasion, from the twisting winds that howl up out of Texas, from the floods that bring no richness to the land and steal what little richness is there. From all of these the people are in flight, and they come into 66 from the tributary side roads, from the wagon tracks and the rutted country roads, 66 is the mother road, the road of flight.

"Two hundred and fifty thousand people over the road. Fifty thousand old cars—fifty thousand wounded, steaming. Wrecks along the road, abandoned. Well, what happened to them? What happened to the folks in that car? Did they walk? Where does the courage come from? Where does the terrible faith come from?

"The people in flight from the terror behind—strange things happen to

them, some bitterly cruel and some so beautiful that the faith is refired forever."

Route 66 is a part of our history and a part of our literature and a part of our culture. Even though it was decommissioned in 1985, it continues to be a part of our lives from Chicago to L.A.

There are Route 66 associations in almost every State. In New Mexico, the Route 66 Association is alive and well and a strong supporter of this bill.

There is a little elementary school in Moriarty, New Mexico, in the East Mountains of my district. It is called Route 66 Elementary School. Last year, I showed the House a hubcap that the students of Route 66 Elementary School had given to me. After that speech, I received several letters from the students who were at Route 66 Elementary School about their school and how it is designed around the Route 66 theme.

I would like to read one of those letters from Kelsey Byrne in Ms. Trujillo's fourth grade class. It says, "Honorable Congresswoman Wilson, our principal told us about the hubcap. It is an honor to have had you show it on television. I am very glad to get part of my education here at Route 66. It is historical, you know. I believe that this school will go on for generations. People use their school education all the time, even us kids. That is why I think everyone deserves a good education. Route 66 is very important to me. It is old, but it is in very good shape. I would like to thank you for supporting us and good luck."

Unlike today's interstate highways, Route 66 is a collection of roads tied together by highway signs. It is a collection of stories, stories about migration and war and the automobile and the Depression and the Dust Bowl. But it is also a story about dreams and about courage and about strength and sadness and faith.

It is a means to an end and an end in itself. It is now decommissioned, but it remains a preferred means of travel for those who want to get off the beaten path.

When America entered World War II, traffic on Route 66 slowed to a trickle because of gas rationing. Military convoys began to travel across the highways with men and machines, renewing the need for a fast, complete corridor from the heart of the country to the coast.

It starts in the home of the 1933 World's Fair in Chicago, Illinois; passes the Chain of Rocks Bridge in Missouri; the Jesse James Wax Museum in Missouri; in Galena, Kansas, the site of the 1935 United Mine Workers strike that erupted into violence; the Will Rogers Museum in Oklahoma and on into Texas; and then of course into New Mexico through Tucumcari and Santa Rosa to Moriarty, the home of Route 66 Elementary School, and into Albuquerque, my hometown, where Route 66 is no Central Avenue.

One can drive it from one end to the other looking at old motor courts and

the curio shops, most of which still operate, and have lunch at the Route 66 Diner.

Finally, it goes on into California, the home of Ray Crock's first McDonald's in San Bernardino, and then on down the long route to Pasadena along the route of the Tournament of Roses Parade.

The year 2000 will mark the 75th anniversary of Route 66.

H.R. 66 will help all the States through which Route 66 passes to celebrate this anniversary, to preserve its unique culture, and to preserve this corridor that is so much a part of America and American history.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of additional points. First of all, on the point of bipartisanship, the reason that we have reached this point in terms of legislation and having it here on the floor is the Democrats and Republicans have signed onto this bill, Democrats and Republicans have worked in the subcommittee, in the full Committee on Resources, to make sure that this bill was fully heard. I think this bill is a good example of how the Congress should work in a bipartisan way to bring forward legislation that we all agree on and that we can move forward with. So I would like to thank all sides for doing that.

Secondly, this legislation is very important to business owners. I just wanted to pick one example, because there is a wonderful man in New Mexico by the name of Armand Ortega. He grew up with my father over in a small little town called Saint John's, Arizona, which is near the Arizona-New Mexico border.

Mr. Ortega owns a wonderful place along Route 66 called the El Rancho Hotel, and that hotel used to be a hotel where movie stars would come and stay. As a result of that, he has captured on that idea, and he has on each of the doors on his hotel the name of the movie stars. Ronald Reagan, many others are listed on the doors of that motel.

Now, as a result of this bill, this business owner, Mr. Ortega, will be able to apply for a grant, will be able to restore and make sure that the El Rancho Hotel is a place that is there for future Americans to see and it will be there for a future part of our history for all to observe.

In concluding here, I would just like to thank all of the Members of the Committee on Resources that have worked so hard on this, especially on the Democratic side.

The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), our ranking member, has done a great deal to see that this legislation has come to the point it has today.

We have had other hard-working staff members on the Committee on Resources' side, Rick Healy, Dave Watkins, and also my staff member Bob Scruggs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, as a representative of Route 66, and as a Member privileged to represent a district which exists only because of the growth that Route 66 made possible, I rise in support of this legislation, which recognizes the central role that Route 66 played at a critical point in American history.

Mr. Chairman, the foothill communities of the San Gabriel Valley which I represent grew up in the post-World War II era, and are populated by the families of tens of thousands of people who came to Southern California on Route 66. My district is home to Monrovia's famed Aztec Hotel, a well-known symbol of the architectural distinctness of many landmarks along Route 66. I have had the pleasure of participating in the City of Duarte's annual parade in salute to Route 66, which travels down a stretch of this famous road. This unique heritage is a major reason that Route 66 has been immortalized in writing and in song.

Although we all recognize the importance of interstate highways today, the significance of a highway link to California was initially shown by the First Transcontinental Motor Convoy of 1919, which included then-Lieutenant Colonel Dwight David Eisenhower. As President, of course, Eisenhower oversaw the creation of the modern interstate highway system. The Convoy which took two months to travel from Washington to San Francisco and encountered numerous problems along the way, demonstrated the inadequacy of existing surface roads to California. It made clear that it would be essentially impossible to supply the West Coast overland from the East in wartime. Even more important at that time and in the decades to follow, it highlighted the difficulty in moving soldiers and materiel from the West to the East in times of war. Considering the central role that California's defense industry would come to play in our national defense in World War II, it was critical to address this weakness.

Besides enhanced national security, the creation of Route 66 is a watershed in American history for a number of reasons. For Salinas, California's John Steinbeck for example, Route 66 was the "Mother Road"—it enabled more than 200,000 Americans to escape the despair of the Dust Bowl and seek better fortunes in California. The migration to California that began during the Great Depression along Route 66 was to continue for decades.

Route 66 was key to the expansion of international commerce as well. By linking the port cities of Los Angeles and Chicago with points throughout Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, Route 66 linked the heartland to America's major ports, helping to make the breadbasket of America the breadbasket of the world as well.

Route 66 permitted the greatest wartime manpower mobilization in United States history. Between 1941 and 1945 the government invested about \$70 billion in capital projects in California, a large portion of this in the defense sector in and around Los Angeles and San Diego. This enormous capital outlay created new industries and thousands of new jobs. With the end of the Cold War, as employment in defense has declined in California, the advanced technologies and skilled workforce that were developed in California along with the defense sector have been an essential contributor to the development of California as the world's leader in high-technology products.

Perhaps most importantly, by making the onset of the automobile era, the designation of Route 66 in 1926 symbolizes the mobility revolution that enables Americans to go where they want, when they want. Route 66, and other highways such as the Lincoln and the Dixie created at the same time, mark the beginning of a national effort to enable people to move quickly and efficiently around this vast country. This unparalleled ease with which we move people and goods across this country is central to our flexible and vibrant economy. I believe it has been absolutely essential to empowering Americans to pursue their dreams.

Mr. Chairman, I ask all my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the special connection that the Seventh District of Missouri, and especially Springfield has to a highway known both as the Main Street of America and as The Mother Road—Route 66. We will be voting later today on an act to preserve portions of this unique part of our history.

Traversing almost 2,500 miles, 8 states and three time zones from the windswept shores of Chicago on the north and east to the sun drenched shores of Santa Monica on the south and west, route 66 cut across America's heartland beginning an era of transcontinental automobile and truck travel that has continued for 75 years.

Although conceived by Congress with legislative action in 1925 as a national highway and commissioned in 1926, Route 66 began with only 800 miles of paved road. Almost 1,700 miles of the trip was over gravel and dirt roads. It was not until 11 years later that paving was completed.

Route 66's connection to Southwest Missouri is far more than it's strategic geographic placement across the breadth of the district. It is far more than linking this strong agricultural market in the 1920's and 30's with expanded outlets throughout the nation.

The dream of an inter-regional link between Chicago and Los Angeles is ascribed to Cyrus Avery of Tulsa Oklahoma and John Woodruff of Springfield Missouri. These two men understood the importance of transportation of this country and were willing to invest of themselves in this effort. Historians say that as result of Woodruff's work the decision to name this new route—Route 66 was actually made in a meeting in Springfield. Woodruff later served two terms as President of the Route 66 association.

Woodruff was also a promoter of Springfield and the Ozarks who understood the importance of public and private partnerships. He raised funds to buy the land so that the state of Missouri would create what is now Southwest Missouri State University. He traveled to New York City and secured a grant from Andrew Carnegie to help fund Drury College. Years later he also raised funds to purchase the land for the U.S. Federal Medical Center. And the former railroad attorney was instrumental in getting the city's first airport.

Route 66 is not just a story of creating a unified ribbon of concrete and asphalt from one great metropolitan center to another. It is the story of linking urban, suburban and rural together. It is the story of making travel accessible to millions. It is the story of what we sometimes refer to as an American dream—a country where two men with a vision and who

worked hard enough, can literally change the course of a country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 66, the Route 66 Preservation Act. Mr. Chairman, Route 66 is the premier historic trail of the automobile age. The automobile has changed America forever and Route 66 played a large role in this revolution of mobility. Route 66 ran over 2,000 miles from Chicago to Los Angeles, linking the east and the west in our great Nation more closely than ever before.

Barstow, California, in my own 40th District, is an original stop on the crossroads of opportunity known as Route 66. In fact, Route 66 traces a path through my District all the way from Needles on the Colorado River to San Bernardino, California. Route 66 served as the crossroads of opportunity for the great flow of traffic across the broad middle of our Nation and into America's land of promise, California.

This legislation before us today will ensure that the contributions of Route 66 to American history will not be forgotten. Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 66 and vote to preserve the cultural resources of historic Route 66.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise again in strong support of this legislation and appreciate the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and her inspired remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) **ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR.**—The term "Route 66 corridor" means structures and other cultural resources described in paragraph (3), including—

(A) lands owned by the Federal Government and lands owned by a State or local government within the immediate vicinity of those portions of the highway formerly designated as United States Route 66; and

(B) private land within that immediate vicinity that is owned by persons or entities that are

willing to participate in the programs authorized by this Act.

(2) **CULTURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS.**—The term "Cultural Resource Programs" means the programs established and administered by the National Park Service for the benefit of and in support of preservation of the Route 66 corridor, either directly or indirectly.

(3) **PRESERVATION OF THE ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR.**—The term "preservation of the Route 66 corridor" means the preservation or restoration of structures or other cultural resources of businesses, sites of interest, and other contributing resources that—

(A) are located within the land described in paragraph (1);

(B) existed during the route's period of outstanding historic significance (principally between 1926 and 1970), as defined by the study prepared by the National Park Service and entitled "Special Resource Study of Route 66", dated July 1995; and

(C) remain in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Cultural Resource Programs at the National Park Service.

(5) **STATE.**—The term "State" means a State in which a portion of the Route 66 corridor is located.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with the entities described in subsection (c), shall facilitate the development of guidelines and a program of technical assistance and grants that will set priorities for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor.

(b) **DESIGNATION OF OFFICIALS.**—The Secretary shall designate officials of the National Park Service stationed at locations convenient to the States to perform the functions of the Cultural Resource Programs under this Act.

(c) **GENERAL FUNCTIONS.**—The Secretary shall—

(1) support efforts of State and local public and private persons, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, Indian tribes, State Historic Preservation Offices, and entities in the States for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor by providing technical assistance, participating in cost-sharing programs, and making grants;

(2) act as a clearinghouse for communication among Federal, State, and local agencies, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, Indian tribes, State historic preservation offices, and private persons and entities interested in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor; and

(3) assist the States in determining the appropriate form of and establishing and supporting a non-Federal entity or entities to perform the functions of the Cultural Resource Programs after those programs are terminated.

(d) **AUTHORITIES.**—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary may—

(1) enter into cooperative agreements, including (but not limited to) cooperative agreements for study, planning, preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration related to the Route 66 corridor;

(2) accept donations of funds, equipment, supplies, and services as appropriate;

(3) provide cost-share grants for projects for the preservation of the Route 66 corridor (but not to exceed 50 percent of total project costs) and information about existing cost-share opportunities;

(4) provide technical assistance in historic preservation and interpretation of the Route 66 corridor; and

(5) coordinate, promote, and stimulate research by other persons and entities regarding the Route 66 corridor.

(e) **PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall provide assistance in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor in a manner that is compatible with the idiosyncratic nature of the Route 66 corridor.

(2) **PLANNING.**—The Secretary shall not prepare or require preparation of an overall management plan for the Route 66 corridor, but shall cooperate with the States and local public and private persons and entities, State historic preservation offices, nonprofit Route 66 preservation entities, and Indian tribes in developing local preservation plans to guide efforts to protect the most important or representative resources of the Route 66 corridor.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. RESOURCE TREATMENT.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—

(1) **PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall develop a program of technical assistance in the preservation of the Route 66 corridor and interpretation of the Route 66 corridor.

(2) **PROGRAM GUIDELINES.**—As part of the technical assistance program under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall establish guidelines for setting priorities for preservation needs for the Route 66 corridor. The Secretary shall base the guidelines on the Secretary's standards for historic preservation.

(b) **PROGRAM FOR COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall coordinate a program of historic research, curation, preservation strategies, and the collection of oral and video histories of events that occurred along the Route 66 corridor.

(2) **DESIGN.**—The program under paragraph (1) shall be designed for continuing use and implementation by other organizations after the Cultural Resource Programs are terminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 66) to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance, pursuant to House Resolution 230, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL STUDY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 791.

□ 1442

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the national trails system, with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 791, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST). H.R. 791 authorizes a study be completed for a potential addition to the National Trails System. Specifically, this bill would study the designation of the route the British took in their invasion of Maryland and Washington, the District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense during the War of 1812.

The proposed trail would stretch through six Maryland counties, Washington, D.C., and the City of Baltimore, where the trail would ultimately lead to Fort McHenry. Fort McHenry, of course, is where, on September 14, 1814, American forces bravely turned back the British invasion of Baltimore and was the event which sparked Francis Scott Key to pen our national anthem.

The designation of this route as a National Historic Trail would serve as a reminder of the importance of the concept of liberty and give long overdue recognition to the patriots who preserved this liberty for future generations of America.

Mr. Chairman, we have all worked hard on this bill and addressed the concerns of both the minority and the administration. This is a good bill, and we have bipartisan support on this bill.

It is supported by the National Park Service. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 791.

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

□ 1445

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, under the National Trails System Act, any route proposed for designation as a national historic trail must be studied to determine the suitability and feasibility of such a designation. H.R. 791 would authorize such a study of the route taken by British troops during the invasion of the United States during the War of 1812. The route crosses nine counties in Maryland and passes through the cities of both Washington and Baltimore.

There is no doubt many of the sites along this proposed site are significant in American history. Not only did British forces lay siege to the U.S. Capitol and eventually burn it down, but it was during the ultimate American victory of Fort McHenry that a local attorney named Francis Scott Key penned what is now our national anthem. A study of these sites for a national historic trail can only serve to deepen our knowledge of the importance of these events in our history.

During our committee's consideration of this measure, an amendment was adopted ensuring that this new study will be carefully coordinated with several ongoing studies with which there could be some overlap. Such coordination will improve the final result of each of these products.

This is a bipartisan bill where both sides have worked closely to have this bill passed, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 791, as amended.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources, for yielding me this time; and I thank all the members of the Committee on Resources for their help on this piece of legislation. But in particular I want to thank the residents of the State of Maryland in my district for bringing this idea, this concept, to our attention.

The War of 1812 is not one of those wars that elicits a great deal of dramatic thought. We do not see it on the silver screen very often. I like to compare it to the Korean War. We hear a great deal about World War II, and there has been many films about the Vietnam conflict, but we did not hear a lot about the Korean War veterans until in recent years, and there is a stunning monument on the mall to the

Korean War veterans for their efforts and struggles to preserve liberty in that part of Asia.

During the American revolution, patriots fought so valiantly to bring liberty and justice to light in the Americas, to bring a new idea that people can institutionalize freedom, that people can institutionalize the idea that an individual is independent, and we talk a great deal about the American revolution.

The War of 1812 was a conflict that was our second war of independence. Now, there was a great deal of misunderstanding between the British and the French and the Americans, and certainly back in 1812 there were no telephones, no fax machines, no E-mail, for example. There was no way to communicate with another person until one was talking face-to-face with that person. I bring that up because some of the issues that caused the conflict between the United States and Great Britain were resolved 2 days before the war started, but there was no way to get that message across. So we had this conflict.

And the conflict basically was continental. The conflict was in the Great Lakes, Lake Champlain, Canada, the mid-Atlantic States, the great Chesapeake Bay, and certainly all the way down to the Gulf of Mexico at the battle of New Orleans. This could all have been averted, but we needed this struggle, I guess, to show Europe the United States was firm in its belief that it was independent; that it preserved the right of freedom and justice and liberty for all Americans, and eventually for all the rest of the world.

Now, if we could go forward quickly to the end of the conflict, the agreement to end the war was signed 2 weeks before the last battle was fought. And anybody on the House floor right now who is, I guess, middle-aged, they will remember that song; "In 1814, I took a little trip, along with Colonel Jackson down the mighty Mississippi. We took a little bacon and we took a little beans, and we took a little ride to New Orleans." I remember I used to love that song. But that battle that we smile when we hear the song was a tragedy. Hundreds and hundreds, if not well over a thousand men on both sides were killed because of that conflict. And that conflict was fought to show that the United States was determined to be independent and free.

This trail, which we will come up with after about 3 years of study, will show people all across this country and all across this world America's second battle of independence. There will be a brochure that people can follow from the lower Chesapeake Bay through the Potomac River, up several counties in Maryland, to show how the British tried to take the troops that protected Washington, south of Washington into Georgetown, and draw them away as far as Baltimore so that they could go into the District of Columbia, our Nation's capital, and burn every single

Federal building except for the post office and the patent office, including this building that we now speak from. Fortunately, however one wants to look at it, coincidentally a huge tornado with driving rains came in and flushed out the fire.

Now, we know the rest of the story which is fundamental to this legislation. The Star-Spangled Banner. Francis Scott Key went on board a British ship to try to release Dr. Beanes from his captivity. Francis Scott Key was accompanied by John Skinner. They were going to release Dr. Beanes, but they also wanted to attack Fort McHenry, as the chairman mentioned a little earlier.

As the ship traveled up the Chesapeake Bay, the beautiful Chesapeake Bay, which probably had a few more fish in it at the time, maybe some more clams and oysters, but we are trying to restore the Chesapeake Bay, and maybe a piece of this legislation will bring some attention to that as well, as they came up to Fort McHenry they wanted to bomb Fort McHenry and continue their onslaught to recapture America. And what Francis Scott Key saw we still remember today. As the night glistened in stars, it also glistened with the bombardment from the British ships, but the Americans held. And the next morning the flag still flew over Fort McHenry. And that flag, Mr. Chairman, is now in the Smithsonian institute.

But Francis Scott Key penned the poem which later became our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner. The flag still waves over Fort McHenry, regardless of the bombs bursting in air. And that spirit, that feeling, that sense of community that we are one among many still holds today in the United States. So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Star-Spangled Banner Trail Bill.

The last comment I want to make is a gracious "thank you" to those constituents that brought this idea to our attention, and also to my staff, Erika Feller, for doing a great deal of work on this particular issue.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) for yielding me this time, and I thank my friend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for listening to those constituents and responding to those constituents and allowing the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), who represents the City of Baltimore in which Fort McHenry is located, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) from Montgomery County, in which, of course, there are many historic sites of the War of 1812, and, of course, I have represented the City of Bladensburg for many, many years, another historic site in the British effort

to turn aside the revolution and the Peace Treaty of 1783, signed, as my friend knows, in the old Statehouse in Maryland, which is pictured, the Senate Chamber in which that Treaty of Paris which ended the war was signed on the 14th of January 1784 in Annapolis, and the picture of the Senate Chamber is on the wall in the rotunda.

Mr. Chairman, all of us are reciting some degree of history. It is important that we learn from history. It is important we not forget history so that we are not condemned to live the worst parts of history. The historic trails are important assets for our country and for our generations yet to come.

The eloquence of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) in reciting that song that, yes, brought a smile to my face as well, because I remember it well. I loved that song. It is a catchy tune. But as he points out, it relates a tragic event.

The history of Maryland is replete with events that surround the founding of this Nation and the establishment of the greatest democracy the world has ever known, and certainly its most long-standing democracy in the world. So I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do so. In order to designate a historic trail, we need to research that issue. This bill will provide for that effort to be undertaken. I think it is very appropriate.

The proposed trail would provide an opportunity for citizens to learn about the British Washington-Baltimore campaign during the War of 1812 and to experience the story of how our national anthem came to be written by Francis Scott Key.

The Star Spangled Banner Trail would be the first national historic trail in the mid-Atlantic region. As currently envisioned, it could take visitors through six counties in Maryland as well as Washington, D.C. and Baltimore.

The route, which would follow the path taken by the British in the War of 1812, would begin in my district where the British landed in Calvert County Maryland and launched their campaign to destroy the Barney Flotilla and, after the Battle of Bladensburg, burn Washington, D.C.

The trail would then follow the path of the retreating American army up through Georgetown, through Montgomery County, and onto Baltimore where they ultimately defeated the British forces at Ft. McHenry.

Mr. Speaker, the War of 1812 and this campaign is a fascinating, but untold, chapter in our Nation's history. Creating this trail will provide a critical link in this turning point in our Nation's history.

I want to thank my good friend Mr. GILCREST for sponsoring this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Puerto Rico, who I might say does such an outstanding job and who, I hope at some point in time, will represent the 51st State. That is an aside, that is not the issue today, I understand that, but this bill is about freedom, this bill is about stars in the Star-Spangled Banner, and perhaps we will add one for the representative from Puerto Rico in the near future.

I thank also my friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for his leadership in getting this bill to the floor. The gentleman is a very fine Member of this House and his attention to details large and small has been appreciated by this body, and I appreciate his leadership in bringing this to the floor.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and I wish to tell the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that I appreciate his comments very much.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for yielding me this time and for all the leadership he has shown not only in this legislation but in other legislation that has enhanced the American people.

I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), for his work in bringing this bill to the floor, and others also.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to lend my support to H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999, and I certainly want to commend my very good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), who introduced this and who just gave a very moving explanation of the bill and all of its implications.

I am honored, along with my colleagues, to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It will ultimately lead to the creation of a trail to help preserve and honor significant historic sites associated with the War of 1812, America's second war of independence.

Trails provide our Nation with many benefits. They offer opportunities to experience solitude or to socialize with families and friends. Natural trail corridors preserve vegetation and wildlife. Bicycles and pedestrians commute on trails, and that decreases road congestion and air pollution.

Americans are seeking trail opportunities as never before to participate in a wide range of recreational activities, from hiking and bicycling, to horseback riding and backpacking, trails across our country are used by all types of people in settings ranging from urban, suburban, rural and wilderness.

In the early days of our Nation before railroads and highways and rail were constructed, people traveled on foot, on horseback, or by wagon. Some of these trails remain in existence today as reminders of our rich history. For example, the Oregon Trail, the Santa Fe Trail, the Trail of Tears. They all exist as chapters in our Nation's heritage.

In the early 20th Century, trails became a way to gain access to spectacular natural beauty. The first interstate recreational trail was conceived in 1921 as a national preserve parallel to the East Coast, and we now know that trail as the Appalachian Trail.

H.R. 791 simply authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a

study of the British invasion route and the line of American defenses occurring in Maryland and Washington during the War of 1812 for potential addition to the national trail system.

□ 1500

While the War of 1812 and the British invasion during the conflict is a defining period in the history of our Nation, it is an often neglected period of our national heritage. It is my hope that this legislation will help to reorganize and honor the important battles during the summer of 1814 which helped to shape our Nation.

The War of 1812 remains the only time in which the United States of America has been invaded by a foreign power. In August of 1814, a British expedition in the Chesapeake Bay won a victory at Bladensburg, Maryland, and subsequently took Washington, burning the Capitol and the White House. The British, however, were halted at Ft. McHenry in Baltimore on September 14th under the "Rockets' Red Glare."

Currently, just down the National Mall from the Capitol at the National Museum of American History, technicians, historians and textile experts are working to preserve the actual Star-Spangled Banner which flew over Ft. McHenry. There are about 30 sites along the proposed Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail, both famous and forgotten, which marks some of the most historically significant events of the War of 1812.

I am proud to represent a place called Brookeville, Maryland, a tiny town which played a huge role during the War of 1812. Under H.R. 791, this town is to be included on the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail study.

Brookeville, only 18 miles from Washington, served as our Nation's capital for a brief period in August of 1814, when President James Madison fled the White House to escape the British invasion.

The home of Postmaster Caleb Bentley and his wife, Henrietta, served as a refuge for President Madison and several members of his Cabinet. Mrs. Bentley, a Quaker, said, "It is against our principles to have anything to do with war, but we receive all and we relieve all who come to us."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 791, to honor our Nation's history and recognize the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail and the critical events of the War of 1812.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), for yielding me this time and for his help in marshalling this bill through the committee.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), for

his work on this issue. This is an important bill. I want to compliment the speed in which this matter was handled in the committee.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) and I filed this legislation on February 23, and we were later joined by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in moving this bill to, we hope, the establishment of this trail.

I also want to acknowledge the hard work of the Senate sponsor, Senator SARBANES, who is marshalling this bill in the other body. We are working together. I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) bringing this up to our constituents.

I represent a district that is rich in history in Baltimore, and I want to thank the historians in my community who have been working with us on this trail. I have the honor of representing the district that includes Ft. McHenry and, of course, the great history that was accomplished in that particular spot. I want to thank the people from Ft. McHenry for their help in bringing us to this motion that we can now act on, H.R. 791, the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999.

I think it is highly appropriate that on the eve of the last July 4 celebration before we start the new century this body is considering a bill that would recognize the sacrifices and contributions of American patriots from the previous one. This legislation would authorize a study to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, D.C., as well as the route of the American defense, a National Historic Trail.

Mr. Chairman, we have done this on many occasions, established historic trails in our country. We have done it for the Appalachian Trail, the Continental Divide, the National Scenic Trail, the Florida National Scenic Trail, and many, many others. I think it is altogether fitting and appropriate, in the interest of our Nation, that we do likewise for the War of 1812.

This War of 1812 was important for many reasons in the history of this Nation, and my colleagues have already commented on many of the important aspects of this particular battle. One that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), mentioned is it the only time in the history of our Nation that we were invaded by a foreign power.

Of course, we successfully were able to defend ourselves. But for a good part of this particular war, it was uncertain as to whether we were going to be able to defend our Nation. It was clearly our second war of independence, and it bode well for the future of this Nation in developing a defense that has been able to protect our citizens against all foreign tyrants.

The story of the War of 1812 goes beyond just stopping the British from invading our young Nation. But the

heroics of many of our citizens at many different battles along the way will go down as part of the heritage of our Nation.

We hope that this trail will be able to allow people in our country to better appreciate what our patriots have done during the history of our Nation. Whether it was at Bladensburg, where we were not successful, or North Point, where we were successful, or Ft. McHenry, where we were successful, heroism was the order of the day.

Of course, we are all very proud of Francis Scott Key, a young attorney who took upon a mission of mercy to have released a young doctor that was being held by the British. The doctor had helped young British soldiers, and Francis Scott Key was able to implore the British to release this particular soldier from captivity. But, as was Francis Scott Key's luck, he was on a British boat at the time that they were ready to invade Baltimore and Ft. McHenry, so he was required to stay on the ship during the battle of Ft. McHenry. He was so inspired by what he saw that he wrote the poem that has become our national anthem.

So there is a great deal to be learned from the War of 1812. There is a lot that we all can learn from it. I applaud the committee for setting in motion the way that we will be able to establish an historic trail that will allow our citizens a better understanding of the history of this Nation and what makes this Nation so great, the people who are willing to give of their lives to protect the freedom that we all enjoy today. This is a fitting monument to their work, and I applaud this House for taking it up today.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time. I will not take the entire minute, but I do want to say just two quick things.

My compliments and gratitude to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for their effort in moving this legislation through and for taking the time to come down to the House floor this afternoon and saying the words that they have spoken. It is greatly appreciated.

I also want to make a comment about our counterparts on the Senate side, and I know we are not supposed to mention the senators, but the effort they are making on that side to move this legislation through there, as well.

The last comment I would like to make is that I would invite my colleagues, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), that when the trail is finally done that the four of us stand at Ft. McHenry

and sing for our constituents the Star-Spangled Banner.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would welcome my colleague into the Third Congressional District of Maryland to participate. We do have, of course, Flag Day. We invite all Americans to join us in a pause for the pledge to the flag and our national anthem.

Let me assure my colleague that I checked with the Parliamentarian and we can mention the names of senators if they are sponsors of a comparable bill in the other body. So it was within the rules of the House to mention our senators.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind invitation. I think, rather than singing it, he would probably prefer to have me say it if he heard me sing before. He might play the piano, too.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the gentleman has a wonderful voice. I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) has a wonderful voice, and I know the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has a wonderful voice. So we will work it out.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank all those who have participated in the very inspiration and interesting speeches we heard.

I look forward to the four of my colleagues singing the Star-Spangled Banner. And in the previous bill we just passed, I would assume the gentleman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) will then join and sing the theme song from Route 66, as long as we are going that way.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 791

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail Study Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, during the

War of 1812 marks a defining period in the history of our Nation, the only occasion on which the United States of America has been invaded by a foreign power;

(2) the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail traces the arrival of the British fleet in the Patuxent River in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, Maryland, the landing of British forces at Benedict, the sinking of the Chesapeake Flotilla at Pig Point in Prince George's County and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, the American defeat at the Battle of Bladensburg, the siege of the Nation's Capital, Washington, District of Columbia (including the burning of the United States Capitol and the White House), the British naval diversions in the upper Chesapeake Bay leading to the Battle of Caulk's Field in Kent County, Maryland, the route of the American troops from Washington through Georgetown, the Maryland Counties of Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore, and the city of Baltimore, Maryland, to the Battle of North Point, and the ultimate victory of the Americans at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1814, where a distinguished Maryland lawyer and poet, Francis Scott Key, wrote the words that captured the essence of our national struggle for independence, words that now serve as our national anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner; and

(3) the designation of this route as a national historic trail—

(A) would serve as a reminder of the importance of the concept of liberty to all who experience the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail; and

(B) would give long overdue recognition to the patriots whose determination to stand firm against enemy invasion and bombardment preserved this liberty for future generations of Americans.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF TRAIL FOR STUDY.

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (36) (as added by section 3 of the El Camino Real Para Los Texas Study Act of 1993 (107 Stat. 1497)) as paragraph (37) and in subparagraph (C) by striking "determine" and inserting "determine";

(2) by designating the paragraphs relating to the Old Spanish Trail and the Great Western Scenic Trail as paragraphs (38) and (39), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(40) STAR-SPANGLED BANNER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail, tracing the War of 1812 route from the arrival of the British fleet in the Patuxent River in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, Maryland, the landing of the British forces at Benedict, the sinking of the Chesapeake Flotilla at Pig Point, the American defeat at the Battle of Bladensburg, the siege of the Nation's Capital, Washington, District of Columbia (including the burning of the United States Capitol and the White House), the British naval diversions in the upper Chesapeake Bay leading to the Battle of Caulk's Field in Kent County, Maryland, the route of the American troops from Washington through Georgetown, the Maryland Counties of Montgomery, Howard, and Baltimore, and the city of Baltimore, Maryland, to the Battle of North Point, and the ultimate victory of the Americans at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1814.

"(B) AFFECTED AREAS.—The trail crosses 8 counties within the boundaries of the State of Maryland, the city of Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, District of Columbia.

"(C) COORDINATION WITH OTHER CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED ACTIVITIES.—The study under this paragraph shall be undertaken in coordination with the study authorized under section 603 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5 note; 110 Stat. 4172) and the Chesapeake Bay Gateways

and Watertrails Network authorized under the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 112 Stat. 2961). Such coordination shall extend to any research needed to complete the studies and any findings and implementation actions that result from the studies and shall use available resources to the greatest extent possible to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

"(D) DEADLINE FOR STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after funds are made available for the study under this paragraph, the study shall be completed and transmitted with final recommendations to the Committee on Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate."

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having resumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 791) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the War of 1812 British invasion of Maryland and Washington, District of Columbia, and the route of the American defense, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System, pursuant to House Resolution 232, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 66 and H.R. 791, the two bills just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE TO HAVE UNTIL FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1999 TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1995, TEACHER EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce may have until 3 p.m. on Friday, July 9, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 1995, the Teacher Empowerment Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 592.

□ 1514

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 592) to designate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as "World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills", with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

□ 1515

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 592 introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA). H.R. 592 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate a portion of Gateway National Recreation Area in New York as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. H.R. 592 would change the name of this park to recognize and honor the veterans of our world wars who fought to protect and defend democracy and freedom.

During markup of this bill, we accommodated concerns by the administration. This bill is now supported by

the National Park Service and the minority. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 592.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 592.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 592 as introduced would have amended the act designating the Gateway National Recreation Area in New York City to change the name of Great Kills Park to World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills.

The National Park Service testified at the hearing of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on May 11 that it opposed this name change because there is no known connection between Great Kills Park and World War II activities or historical figures, nor do veteran groups have any known connection with the area. It was also noted that NPS already administers several entire national park units that are historically tied to World War II veterans.

However, we learned at the hearing that there is general agreement to provide some sort of recognition to veterans at a more suitable location, known as Miller Field, within the Gateway National Recreation Area.

While the NPS appears to have administrative authority to make such a change, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment, drafted by the NPS, to designate the location as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. Based on the representations made to us by the NPS, this change appears to be in keeping with NPS policies and as such we support the bill as amended.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the sponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 592 is a simple bill. If passed, it would rename a portion of the Staten Island Unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area as World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. The purpose of this bill is simply to honor the brave men who served in World War I and World War II. Staten Island has a long and proud tradition of honoring our veterans, and this bill merely adds to that tradition.

First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) of the Committee on Resources and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for their assistance in moving this bill through the committee process, and, on my staff, Travers Garvin, for really carrying the load.

Originally, as the ranking member indicated, H.R. 592 was intended to rename the Great Kills portion of the Gateway National Recreation Area. H.R. 592 would have renamed that park World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills. The National Park Service was concerned that the park being renamed should have a historical connection to the new name. Nevertheless in response to those concerns, we agreed to a compromise. H.R. 592 will now rename another portion of the Gateway National Recreation Area, known as Miller Field.

Miller Field was originally named after a World War I aviator and was used as a military airstrip during World War II. In order to recognize veterans from both World War I and World War II, the bill seeks to rename the park World War Veterans Park at Miller Field. This change satisfies the National Park Service concerns and, more importantly, still recognizes veterans from Staten Island, Brooklyn and our Nation. I have spoken with veterans who had supported the original bill and they have agreed to the change.

I believe strongly that without our veterans' dedication and sacrifice, we would not have the freedoms that we enjoy to this day. My concern is that as time goes by, perhaps the memories, particularly those in the World War I and World War II generation, may fade. The renaming of this park will stand as a timeless reminder of the heroism of the brave men and women who served our Nation. It is my wish that for generations to come, the thousands of people who use this park will stop for a moment and remember the heroism of these men and women.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enactment of H.R. 592 will have no significant impact on the Federal budget. It is simple, again non-controversial and bipartisan. The bill has 13 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle and all parts of the country. H.R. 592 is legislation that takes pride in America. Because of this, I expect it will be an easy vote for. I think it would be especially appropriate to pass this bill for our veterans as we head into the Fourth of July weekend.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from New York's legislation to honor veterans of World War I and World War II by renaming Miller's Field in honor of our veterans. As the only New York member on the Committee on Resources, I was happy to support this legislation in committee. I believe that this park will not only honor veterans in the New York-New Jersey area but veterans throughout our country.

Recently, I had the honor to join the French Consul General in New York to present the French Medal of Honor to a World War I veteran who lives in Flushing, New York. Tragically this

gentleman is one of only a few veterans of the World War I era who are still with us today. Men and women who served in World War II are rapidly passing away as well. This park will help honor their deeds and their fight for freedom which brought an end to tyranny and injustice, not once but twice in this century.

I am proud to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) in support of this proposal to honor our veterans. As the largest metropolitan area in the United States with one of the largest concentrations of veterans, I can think of no better place to honor the memories of these men and women who fought for freedom and to remind future generations of the valor and heroism of our American soldiers.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY). I know he was a great help at the committee in steering it through. We have 56,000 veterans in the 13th Congressional District. Again I can only hope and pray that we can do all we can to recognize their efforts. This bill would go a long way. I encourage its strong support.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY).

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend both the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and all of those who are supporting this legislation. It is appropriate that we take this up at this particular time as we approach another celebration of our Independence Day and remember to keep our priorities straight. Had it not been for the men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States military through the years, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the earth. Freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it. Not a day goes by that I do not remember all of those who, like my brother Bill, made the supreme sacrifice and all of the many veterans who served our country and then came back home and rendered such outstanding service in our communities and raised wonderful families to carry on their great traditions.

I enthusiastically support this legislation. I thank the sponsors. I urge my colleagues to approve it unanimously.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 592

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PORTION OF GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AS WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD.

Section 3(b) of Public Law 92-592 (16 U.S.C. 460cc-2(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The portion of the Staten Island Unit of the recreation area known as Miller Field is hereby designated as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'. Any reference to such Miller Field in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'."

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 592) to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as "World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills", pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate a portion of Gateway National Recreation Area as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 592, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

RURAL NEVADA AGAIN UNDER SIEGE BY U.S. FOREST SERVICE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the absolute greed of the Federal bureaucracy is pushing aside the common sense of local people on an issue in my district.

I would like to share with my colleagues what can only be termed as an insensitive approach to a very personal and private situation of the Federal Agency Forest Service in my home State of Nevada.

In its seemingly endless battle over public lands in rural Nevada, once again we are under siege by the Forest Service. But it is not commercial real estate or high market value land interests that we are after, it is about a mere two-acre cemetery.

The Forest Service wants to sell the small town of Jarbidge, Nevada, two acres to buy its own cemetery where the parents and grandparents of this small rural town have been laid to rest since the beginning of this century.

The Federal Government already owns nearly 90,000 square miles of Nevada's lands. Nevadans are not asking for much, a mere two acres to be exact, a two-acre cemetery already occupied for nearly a century by parents and grandparents of many Nevadans.

On behalf of the families of Jarbidge, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1231 to convey these two acres out of the millions they own.

WHERE I STAND—MIKE O'CALLAGHAN: USFS PICKS NEW FIGHT

(Mike O'Callaghan is the Las Vegas Sun executive editor)

About the time it appears there is some justice and common sense ruling north-eastern Nevada, along comes another goofy act.

A couple of weeks ago this column praised the Nevada Supreme Court for settling a dispute started three years ago by a few Elko County residents who saw a conspiracy under every rock in that huge area. After using and abusing the power of a local grand jury the district judge was slapped and four state employees were given back their lives by the Supreme Court.

That whole mess was started by a businessman who believed the state and federal conservation agencies were conspiring to destroy the county when acting to protect the environment. He wrote a letter to the county commissioners calling for a grand jury because the conservation agencies, especially the Nevada Division of Wildlife and the U.S. Forest Service, and environmental groups were ruining almost everything held dear by the people of that area. Those suffering economically, according to the writer, were the ranching, mining, and business communities and all of the taxpayers.

The grand jury was called and it acted as wild as the charges made in the letter. While all of this was going on, the U.S. Forest Service sat on its hands and took no action to replace a road damaged by a flood in 1995. This resulted in the county going to fix the road running alongside the West Fork of the Jarbidge River. Immediately another federal agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, came unglued because it said the roadwork was hurting the bull trout habitat. Eventually this mess was calmed down and on the surface appears straightened out because the state also had a role to play.

So now everything is hunky-dory between the federal conservation agencies and Elko County? Not really. There's the small issue over cemetery land at Jarbidge. Yes, a very small two acres that Rep. Jim Gibbons wants turned over to the county. Here are Gibbon's words before a subcommittee in Washington last week:

"As you may know Jarbidge is a small, rural community in Elko County, Nevada. Known historically for its contribution to Nevada's mining industry, this community is surrounded by national forest lands and the Jarbidge Wilderness Area.

"Within this area is a small cemetery, under administration of the Forest Service, where generations of residents of this historic community have been laid to rest.

"The earliest tombstones are dated in the very early 1900s, and some members of the Jarbidge community claim that this land has been used as a cemetery long before its designation as Forest Service land.

"Since 1915 the Jarbidge Cemetery has been operated under a permit to Elko County by a Special Use authorization which runs periodically for 10 and occasionally 20 years.

"In an effort to remove the uncertainty about the continued existence of this cemetery and to resolve the operational responsibility, the residents of Jarbidge have long expressed an interest in having two acres, containing the cemetery, conveyed to the county so they might have a permanent, private cemetery.

"Madame Chairman, that is why I have introduced HR 1231, a bill that would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey approximately two acres of National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, or continued use as a cemetery."

No problem for this small request coming from a state with thousands of square miles controlled by the federal government. Guess again. USFS Deputy Chief Ron Stewart testified against HR 1231 because his agency expects to be paid fair market price of those two acres. His testimony doesn't describe how you put a price on a cemetery that's just a bit less than 100 years old. What it does reveal is a petty attitude by a large federal agency that continues to result in even its rational decisions being questioned by the people in and around little Jarbidge.

Gibbons could hardly believe Forest Service officials were making the demand but it they were, he added, they "should hang their heads. These people are asking for a cemetery, not for land to build commercial or residential enterprises. . . ."

Because of the actions of Elko's runaway grand jury I began to wonder what was in the water the jurors were drinking. This most recent action by the Forest Service in Washington has convinced me that its decision makers are drinking straight from the polluted Potomac River.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BAIRD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO MODERNIZE AND STRENGTHEN MEDICAL CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start this afternoon by talking about the President's plan to modernize and strengthen Medicare for the next century which he announced at a press conference that was held at the White House yesterday; and let me say, Mr. Speaker, if I can, that I strongly welcome this proposal. I think it is a very good proposal and specifically with regard to the new prescription drug benefit, the effort to eliminate co-payments and deductibles for preventive care, the fact that it also includes the Medicare buy-in for the near elderly, those who just are below the age of 65, and the fact that by using 15 percent of the projected surplus that Medicare is fully funded for a much longer period of time than would be the case under current conditions. All these things I think are a strong indication that this is a very good proposal which certainly the Democrats support and which I am hopeful that the Republicans and the Republican leadership will support as well so that we can get a bill out of committee to the floor and passed in this Congress.

Let me just talk a little bit about some of the most important aspects of this Medicare proposal in my opinion. I think probably the most important aspect is the new voluntary Medicare Part B prescription drug benefit that is affordable and is available to all beneficiaries.

We all know that when you talk about Medicare the biggest gap, if you will, that exists in the Medicare program now is the lack of a prescription drug benefit. When Medicare was started under President Johnson as a Democratic initiative back in the 1960s, over 30 years ago now, prescription drugs were not that much a part of the average senior citizen's budget. Medicine then was not so much emphasizing preventive care, particularly prescription drugs; and, frankly, a lot of the prescriptions that we have now had not even been invented. So it was not an important issue. It was not included in the Medicare package at the time.

But as time went on over the last 30 years the lack of a prescription drug benefit has been a major gap causing senior citizens to expend a lot of money out of pocket, in some cases several thousand dollars a year. And so the President's response in trying to include a modest prescription drug benefit is commendable, it is fully paid for, and I think it will go far towards helping senior citizens and the disabled under Medicare to deal with this problem.

I just wanted, if I could, to outline some of the high points of this. There is no deductible. And, well, basically the way it applies is that you contribute initially \$24 a month as the premium that you pay for this new Part B; and Medicare, once you participate, pays half of your drug costs from the first prescription filled each year up to

\$2,000 a year when the program begins. And eventually that will be phased in to be up to \$5,000 a year in drug costs. And, of course, the premium will go up as well and could, when fully phased in by 2008, be as much as \$44 per month.

But what it would mean is that, when the program starts, is that if you pay \$24 a month and you have as much as \$2,000 in prescription drug costs for the year, half that will be paid by Medicare. And there is no deductible, there is no copay, so to speak, so that starts with the first prescription, that half of it is paid for by Medicare.

The other thing that is important is that this program, if you participate in this new Part B benefit, will insure the beneficiaries a discount similar to that offered by many employer-sponsored plans, which is estimated to be, on average, over 10 percent. So even if you go above the \$2,000 per year, you are still benefiting in the discount, and of course the discount is your floor. So you are going to get a discounted price before you are even starting to pay for the prescription drugs.

The cost I mentioned initially is \$24 per month beginning in 2002 when the program is set to begin. I would also point out that for those beneficiaries, for those Medicare recipients who are below a certain income level, there would be no premium. Beneficiaries with incomes below 135 percent of poverty, and that is \$11,000 for a single individual or \$17,000 for a couple, would not pay premiums or cost sharing. Those with incomes between 135 and 150 percent of poverty would receive premium assistance as well. So in many ways this is modeled after the so-called QMB program with Part B of Medicare where, if you are below a certain income, you do not pay the premium at all, and then there is assistance for those a little bit above that level to pay part of the premium.

Finally, I wanted to mention with regard to the prescription drug benefit that it would provide financial incentives for employers to retain their retiree health coverage if they provide a prescription drug benefit to retirees that was at least equivalent to the new Medicare outpatient drug benefit. This would save money for the program. So we would encourage those who already provide or have a prescription drug benefit as part of their pension or retirement health benefits, that would be incentives for employers to keep that benefit.

Now some may say, "Well, how many Medicare recipients would actually benefit from this prescription drug program and would see fit to opt for it because it is voluntary?" And we estimate, the President estimates, that most Medicare beneficiaries will choose the drug option because of its attractiveness and affordability. Older and disabled Americans rely so heavily on medications that about 31 million beneficiaries would benefit from this coverage every year. So there are about 31 million, which is the majority

of Medicare recipients, who would find that if they pay this premium per month, or if they were eligible to not have to pay the premium, that they would end up saving money and opt for the Part B prescription drug benefit.

Now let me talk a little more about some of the other major aspects of this, the President's Medicare proposal, that I think are worthy of note. One of the things that is changing, and I think for the good with regard to health care, and that is not only for seniors and the disabled, for everyone, is the renewed emphasis on prevention. A few years ago, preventive medicine was not really in vogue. Some people did it, some people did not, but it was not thought about a great deal. But increasingly we know that if people take preventive measures, and prescription drugs are really part of that, I mean then they avoid hospitalization, they avoid nursing home care, they avoid expensive treatment.

Well, the President, when he unveiled his Medicare expansion and modernization proposal yesterday at the White House, said that it would include the elimination of all cost sharing for preventive benefits in Medicare, and that means basically that there would be no copayments and deductibles for preventive services covered by Medicare. And just to give you examples, that would include cancer screening, bone mass measurements, pelvic exams, prostate cancer screening, diabetes self-management benefits, mammograms. Anything that is preventive we would eliminate the deductible and the copayment.

I think that is significant, not maybe as significant as the drug benefit, but kind of that goes along with it, because what it means is we do not want to discourage people because they have to shell out a certain amount of money into not taking preventive measures, and the reason makes sense, not only for them individually, but also because it saves the government money because, if they do these types of screenings, maybe they avoid hospitalization and expensive operations that Medicare would have to pay down the road.

So I think it makes a lot of sense, and let me just mention two other things. One is the Medicare buying proposal. This is something that is not new. The President proposed it in his State of the Union address, but he is reiterating it once again, and it will be part of this legislation that is sent up to Congress. And that says that Americans between the ages of 62 to 65 would be able to buy into the Medicare program for approximately \$300 per month if they agree to pay a small risk adjustment payment once they become eligible for the traditional Medicare at 65. So people in those years would be able to buy into Medicare. Displaced workers between 55 and 62 who had involuntarily lost their jobs and insurance would buy in at a slightly higher premium, about \$400 a month, and re-

tirees over age 55 who had been promised health care in the retirement years would be provided access to COBRA continuation coverage if their old firm reneged on their commitment. So, again, we are reiterating this buying proposal for the near elderly, very important because so many of those people do not have health insurance.

And last thing, and then I would like to yield to one of my colleagues, is that the President reiterated once again that he will dedicate 15 percent of this growing surplus over 15 years to Medicare, and that will ensure the life of the Medicare trust fund until at least 2027. So we are extending the life of the Medicare trust fund. It means that Medicare remains solvent for almost another 30 years, terribly significant.

So many senior citizens come up to me and say that they are worried about, as my colleagues know, whether Medicare is going to be there, and of course younger people as well. It is probably more of a problem for younger people than it is for senior citizens right now. But this proposal which the President put forward would keep Medicare intact and fully paid for until the year 2027.

So I think it is a great idea. I am sure going to see a lot more Democrats coming up and saying that they support it, and hopefully we will get support from the Republican leadership as well.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to go into some more details about the President's Medicare plan because I think that it is so important. Many people, many Members of Congress, I am sure, hear from their constituents about the problems that their constituents have because of gaps in Medicare, particularly with regard to the prescription drug benefit. But the bottom line is that the President's plan is seeking to modernize and strengthen Medicare in a lot of different ways, as my colleagues know. And if I could just highlight some of the other things that were mentioned yesterday by the President when he had the press conference at the White House?

□ 1545

A lot of the Medicare modernization program that he has put forward seeks to modernize and strengthen Medicare by making it more competitive and efficient.

I know that those are words that are often thrown out around here and people mention that all the time, but I think that it is important to kind of stress some of the efforts that the President is putting forth that would also make the Medicare program more competitive and efficient, if I could at this time.

One of the things that he stressed was giving traditional Medicare new private sector purchasing and quality improvement tools. The proposal would make the traditional fee-for-service program more competitive through the

use of market-oriented purchasing and quality improvement tools to improve care and constrain costs. It would provide new or broader authority for competitive pricing, incentives for beneficiaries to use physicians who provide high quality care at reasonable costs and coordinating care for beneficiaries with chronic illnesses and other best practice private sector purchasing mechanisms.

Essentially, what he is trying to do is to make Medicare more competitive, more efficient, by bringing in some private sector tools. That is estimated to save about \$25 billion over 10 years.

The second area where this competitiveness comes into play is by extending competition to Medicare managed care plans by establishing a competitive defined benefit while maintaining a viable traditional program. The competitive defined benefit proposal would, for the first time, inject true price competition amongst managed care plans in Medicare. Plans would be paid for covering Medicare's defined benefits, including a new subsidized drug benefit which we mentioned, and would compete by offering lower cost and higher quality.

Price competition would make it easier for beneficiaries to make informed choices about their plan options and would, over time, save money for both the beneficiaries and the program.

The competitive defined benefit would do so by providing beneficiaries with 75 cents of every dollar of savings that result from choosing lower cost plans. Beneficiaries opting to stay in the traditional fee-for-service program would be able to do so without an increase in premiums. There is a savings from that of \$8 billion over 10 years starting in the year 2003.

Then there are two more points, if I could, and then I would yield to some of my colleagues who I see are joining me on the floor to discuss this.

The third point is that the President's proposal constrains outyear program growth but more moderately than the balanced budget amendment which we adopted in 1997. To ensure that program growth does not significantly increase over most of the Medicare provisions of the Balanced Budget Act, which expire in 2003, the proposal includes outyear policies that protect against a return to unsustainable growth rates but are more modest than those included in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I do not want to keep going into all of the details of this, but I think that the President again should be commended for trying to bring a more competitive and efficient approach into the Medicare program. And that is one of the reasons that we are able to save some money.

So, in essence, what he is doing here is bringing a significant amount of the surplus, 15 percent, into the Medicare program to make sure that the program is solvent, to expand the benefits

to include the drug benefit, but at the same time trying to make the program more competitive and efficient and saving money.

That would be also brought back into the program for these extra benefits like prescription drugs, as well as to keep the program solvent until the year 2027.

Obviously this is the type of thing that is very important, and I think only helps in the overall effort to strengthen and modernize the Medicare program.

It is interesting because many of us on the Democratic side have been talking about the need to include a prescription drug benefit, and our effort, and I see my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is here, actually goes back to, I think it was sometime in May, around Mother's Day, when there was a report put out by the Older Women's League, OWL, and I had come to the floor at that time to specifically point out how the gaps in the Medicare program have a particularly negative impact on older women, which the OWL report highlighted.

Most of what was discussed was the problem in terms of out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs.

The other thing that the OWL report pointed out is that many of the lowest income senior citizens again are women and those are the very women who would benefit most from this prescription drug benefit and would not have to pay at all because they fall below the poverty level and would not even have to pay the \$24 monthly premium.

So all in all, this is a great program. Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine, who came down here to join me and discuss this.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day. The President's proposal to reform Medicare is a giant step forward to preserve, protect and strengthen a program that is one of the best things that we do, that the Federal Government does, for senior citizens.

Together, Medicare and Social Security keep 40 to 50 percent of our seniors out of poverty and yet these programs both face some challenges. In the case of Social Security, the challenge is largely demographic, simply more people are growing older. And as the baby boom generation retires, there will be extra pressure on the program.

Medicare has a demographic problem but also a cost problem and a quality problem.

I thought what I would do today is talk a little bit about the prescription drug benefit that is contained in the President's proposal and then talk a little bit about some other aspects of the proposal that I think are very important.

Last year, I asked for a study in my district on the cost of prescription

drugs to the elderly, and that study was done by the Democratic staff of the Committee on Government Reform, and they found that, on average, seniors are paying twice as much for their prescription medications as the drug companies' best customers, and the best customers are hospitals, HMOs, and the Federal Government through the purchases it makes for veterans or through medicaid.

As a consequence, I introduced last year and again this year what is now H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. Now, this legislation would allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal Government. We think it would reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by 40 percent, 40 percent, at virtually no cost to the Federal Government.

Now, when I introduced this legislation, I thought we would have some support on the Republican side of the aisle, because I thought, naively, that a bill which provided a substantial discount on prescription drugs to seniors, at virtually no cost to the Federal Government, with no new bureaucracy, would have broad bipartisan support, but that has not happened.

I am very pleased that in the President's proposal this concept, though not the bill, is included. The concept is included in the President's proposal by the suggestion that Medicare would contract with pharmacy benefit managers and that those pharmacy benefit managers would get at least a 10 percent discount from the manufacturers for prescription drugs.

I think we could do better. I think we could be more aggressive, but it is really a step in the right direction.

The President's prescription drug benefit is a modest step, but again the right sort of step. What he is proposing is this: For an initial premium of \$24, rising to \$44 by 2009, Medicare beneficiaries could sign up for a prescription drug benefit that would pay them initially \$1,000 maximum toward their prescription drug costs, one half of their total costs, covered costs, and that benefit would rise to \$2,500 by the year 2009.

So for those seniors who have \$2,000 in prescription drug costs right now or \$5,000 in prescription drug costs by the year 2009, the government would basically pay one half of all their costs in return for a modest premium. That is a good plan and a real step forward.

What is interesting is the reaction of the Republicans to these various proposals. On the one hand, the Republican reaction to the President's plan has been, well, two-thirds of seniors have coverage for their prescription drugs; we do not need this plan. But the two-thirds is not quite right.

Thirty-seven percent of all seniors have no coverage at all for their prescription medications. That percentage in rural areas is 50 percent. Fifty percent of seniors in rural areas have no coverage whatsoever.

Another significant percentage have inadequate coverage. So at the very least, we are talking about half the seniors on Medicare and we cannot just dismiss them out of hand and say because it is only half the seniors on Medicare we should therefore forget about them. These seniors have very serious problems paying for their food and for their medication.

A couple of stories. I have seniors in my district who have written me, women who have written me and said, I do not want my husband to know, but I am not taking my prescription medication because my husband is sicker than I am, and we cannot both afford our medications.

It should not be that way in this country, not when all of those people are already on a Federal health care plan called Medicare.

The Republican reaction to our bill, which has virtually no cost to the Federal Government, is, oh, dear, it may involve price controls, which it does not; pharmaceutical companies may not be as willing to do research and development. I do not believe that for a moment.

They have not signed on to a bill with virtually no cost to the Federal Government, and when it comes to the President's plan they say it costs too much.

What is uniform here is a refusal to recognize the seriousness of the problem that seniors are having paying for their prescription medications and their food and their rent or whatever, an unwillingness to come to grips with it. The President's plan comes to grips with this problem. He is basically saying, if we were inventing Medicare today, no one, no one, would leave out a prescription drug benefit.

So the question in this time of unprecedented economic growth, with budget projections that are better than any this country has seen in the last 30 or 40 or 50 years, the question is, cannot we take care of our seniors? I really believe that we can.

There is another piece of the proposal that I wanted to mention. I think this is an important piece of the proposal. What the President is saying is we need a competitive defined benefit plan. It builds on the security and the stability that we have in Medicare today.

Now, what do I mean by that? Well, today the benefits that people have under Medicare remain the same, from year to year to year, unless Congress acts to change them. There is stability. There is predictability. There is continuity in that benefit structure. But if private insurance companies come into Medicare, take over Medicare, what we will find is the benefits will start changing; prescription drugs that are covered today will not be covered next year; the benefits will change; the premiums will change, and we will wind up with confusion, with lack of clarity, with instability and with lack of predictability. That is not what seniors in this country need.

Now, what the President is saying to the extent that there are managed care companies, HMOs, operating under Medicare, and that is about 14 percent of the Medicare market right now, they ought to be providing a basic, defined benefit plan which cannot be changed. Stability, continuity, predictability, that is the kind of competition we need, over price, over quality, but not over variation in benefits.

□ 1600

Private health insurance companies will also act to exclude the sickest and the poorest and to cover the healthy and the wealthy. That, again, is not what our seniors need. We want the equity of this existing Medicare system to continue under any reform proposal.

What is exciting about the President's proposal is that he has made the commitment to preserve the equity in the system, he has made the commitment to expand and improve on the benefit structure by adding a Medicare benefit, and he has also insured the solvency of Medicare out to the year 2027.

This is a remarkable achievement. We should not let this opportunity pass by. We have a chance in this country now to take the two programs that mean the most to our seniors, social security and Medicare, and use the surplus that we have, set it aside, save it, and take care of these two major commitments of the Federal government.

The message is clear, first things first. We have a commitment to our seniors, social security, and Medicare. We have the resources to make sure that the government follows through on that commitment, and we ought not to let this opportunity pass by. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to thank the gentleman from Maine. He has been the leader on this whole issue of the high cost of prescription drugs. He introduced a bill, I think he gave us the number, but I call it the Allen bill, because he is the prime sponsor. I am a cosponsor of that bill. I think it is a very important piece of legislation in terms of the effort to try to control prices of drugs, which are out of hand, particularly for senior citizens.

I am really glad that the gentleman talked about how the President's bill, even though it is different, or the President's proposal, even though it is different, tries to get at the costs. One of the things we mentioned was this whole discount that would be available, as well as the competitiveness.

The gentleman's proposal as well as this one I think kind of follow on each other in an effort to try to achieve the same goal. I just wanted to say, I wanted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I know a lot of people, and I have already heard that from some of the Republicans, and I am not saying all of them, because I think we are going to actually get some Republican support on this, and hopefully a lot of it. But I have heard the same thing,

this does not help everyone, this only helps 50 percent of the people.

The President said yesterday, this was a modest proposal. This was not a proposal to try to cover everyone, but it is modest and it is paid for. That is the main thing.

He went out of his way in the document that was presented to us yesterday and in the discussions we have had since then to show in detail how every penny of this thing is paid for. I think that is important, because we know that everything is not endless around here and we have to pay for things.

The fact of the matter is something like 31 million seniors would benefit from this program, a majority. To me that is a strong beginning, and something that we should support. I appreciate what the gentleman said.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if I might address some queries to both gentlemen, first, if I understand the legislation of the gentleman from Maine, it does not involve any cost to the taxpayer at all. Is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN. I would agree with that, except there might be some small administrative cost, but virtually no cost.

Mr. DOGGETT. There are various ways to deal with this problem, but what the gentleman is spotlighting, those least able to pay get charged the most. I know one very commonly prescribed medication for those over 65 having to do with cholesterol, that it is 300 percent more if one is a senior paying individually than if one is in some kind of group health insurance plan, like many of my folks are there in central Texas.

So, for example, I have here in Washington today a number of teachers from our public schools. They have a better arrangement probably now through their group and health insurance to get prescriptive drugs than they would have as an individual retiree once they are on Medicare, because there is no Medicare coverage, and they are going to be charged all the market will bear when they are having to bargain for themselves individually, is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman has it, that is right.

Mr. DOGGETT. But that is not true for veterans, is it? We also have some veterans here today from central Texas. A veteran going through the Veterans Administration can avoid that problem to some extent, can he not?

Mr. ALLEN. To some extent. Certainly some veterans get their prescription drugs free through the Veterans Administration. It does not apply to all veterans, but it does apply to some. There are some benefits for veterans, that is true.

Mr. DOGGETT. How is it that the Veterans Administration is able to get these prescription drugs at a more reasonable price than an individual veteran not covered, or someone who is on

Medicare and not covered can get them?

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will yield again, basically this is a question of market power. The best prices are given by the manufacturers, the pharmaceutical manufacturers, to hospitals, HMOs, or the Federal government, all of which have some negotiating power.

What my legislation does and what the President's proposal does, to an extent, is basically say, for those people who are already under a Federal health care plan, namely, Medicare, they ought to get a similar discount. That is all that we are saying with the legislation that I have introduced.

Mr. DOGGETT. So to all those major interest groups that are opposing the gentleman's legislation and saying we are going to have cost controls and we are going to threaten research and all these various straw men that they raise to oppose doing something for seniors who have to pay the most when they have the ability to pay the least, the gentleman is saying, really, he is going to let the market work, but he is going to bring a little equity in the bargaining power to the marketplace.

Then I would ask the gentleman, and I appreciate very much the gentleman's leadership on this measure, I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey about why it is, at a time when Congress has recessed early, before people have left work in Austin, Texas, and in much of the country, I think Congress recessed today again just after doing very, very little and nothing very meaningful for the American people. We were not here on Monday. There is some debate whether we will be here on Friday.

Why is it that there can be an issue as important as providing prescription drugs for those who are over 65 and addressing the concerns through a Patients' Bill of Rights of those of all ages who rely on managed care, why is it that the Congress is not out here having a full debate, where Republicans and Democrats are debating about what the best way is to solve this problem?

Mr. PALLONE. I think the answer is very simple. That is that the Republican leadership in the case of the Patients' Bill of Rights, the HMO reform, simply does not want to bring up the bill because they do not want it to pass. They know if the Patients' Bill of Rights, the HMO reform, comes up and it is considered, it will pass, so they exercise their leadership by not bringing it up.

I think the reason they do it is very simple: They are beholden to the insurance companies. They are beholden to the HMOs. They spend, the HMOs spend millions of dollars on advertising and influencing congressional races. They do not want this legislation brought to the floor because they know it will pass.

Mr. DOGGETT. At least in terms of the time available here, there is no rea-

son why we could not have already considered the Patients' Bill of Rights. And as far as prescription drugs, whether it is the approach the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has taken, the approach that the President has recently indicated he supported, or any number of other avenues, there are other pieces of legislation introduced, the reason that those are not getting considered here on the floor has nothing to do with the Congress not having time to consider them, does it?

Mr. PALLONE. I do not think anybody can make the argument that we do not have the time. As the gentleman very well pointed out, we did not meet Monday, we met yesterday very briefly, today we adjourned at 2:30.

Mr. DOGGETT. We will have a recess next week. I doubt most people will know we are in recess. The Congress has done so little so far this year, they probably won't miss anything other than the rhetoric next week, certainly no meaningful action.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentleman did not mention, but I could add, it took almost 2 weeks in the other body, the Senate, for the Democrats to insist that the Patients' Bill of Rights be brought up. They almost had to filibuster in order to make sure that the bill was brought up.

I understand that when we come back after the recess that there is an agreement to bring up the Patients' Bill of Rights in the Senate, but there were two weeks wasted because the Republican leadership would not bring it up. It remains to be seen whether they actually do when we come back.

Mr. DOGGETT. I know next week during the recess here in Washington I am going to be meeting with seniors in Austin at a pharmacy to do very much the kind of presentation I know the gentleman has already done in New Jersey, to point out for a neighborhood pharmacy in Austin, Texas, the difference in the charges that seniors without prescription drug coverage get charged and that everybody else gets charged. It is a cruel disparity.

I have one letter after another here that I expect I will have an opportunity to explore with the gentleman at another time as we try to draw attention to the failure of the Republican leadership to deal with this issue; of people saying that they have to make some really critical lifetime choices, and sometimes it is a matter of choosing food, of choosing groceries, or choosing prescriptive drugs.

I think the American people should be appalled at the failure of this Congress to come to grips with these issues. It is not a lack of time, it is a lack of leadership and a lack of interest in these kinds of pressing problems that the American people face. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this up.

When the President unveiled his plan yesterday, and we were there, that was

the reason he cited why he was dealing with this prescription drug benefit, because he said that when he was first elected he was hearing a chorus from different senior groups about how they had to decide between whether they were going to eat and have proper nourishment as opposed to paying for their prescription drugs.

He vowed that he was going to make sure that something was done about it so people did not have to make that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

Coming from Florida, where we have over 3 million senior citizens, this is a real crucial issue for us. I can tell the gentleman that no matter where I go in Florida, the major issue is Medicare and what is going to happen to the program. Really, it is not social security, it is not education, this is what on their minds, because of the cuts that exist in the program from the balanced budget amendment.

Can the gentleman tell me a little bit about the President's proposal in restoring some of those cuts in home health care?

Mr. PALLONE. I know that concerns have come up with home health care, with some of the outpatient services, and also with teaching hospitals that have been concerned about the limitations on the amount of money that they have available with research.

What the President said, and I do not have the details in front of me, was that because of the infusion of funds from the 15 percent of the surplus, which is a growing amount now that would be dedicated to the Medicare program, and because of the cost savings that he was putting in place with the new efficiency and competitive proposals that I mentioned previously, and others, that more money would be available to address some of these problems.

Yesterday he did not specifically mention which ones would receive a certain amount of money, but a lot of things the gentleman mentioned, including the home health care.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Nursing homes.

Mr. PALLONE. They were mentioned. My understanding is that because of the savings, as well as the money that is going to be made available in the surplus, because of the surplus, some of those concerns can be addressed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. A couple of those things that he did mention, which is very exciting for people in Florida, and one that the gentleman has been talking about, the prescription drugs, which is so crucial for the people of Florida, I cannot tell the the gentleman how many times that I go home and this subject comes up about the cost of medicine.

People join the HMOs for various reasons. Basically, their prescriptions eat

it up in a couple of months, and then they are left having to pay this astronomical cost of medicine. So I am very excited about this portion of the President's proposal.

Another proposal that is very exciting is that when this program started in 1965, a lot of the things that we have done in medicine were not available, so the prescreening portion, that people can go in and be screened for cancer, diabetes, and other things without any cost, that preventative part, and not be penalized, that preventative part I think is so crucial.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. I have to be honest, for the 12 years that I have been in Congress, I guess it is 11 years, the thing that always bothered me the most was how we did not provide any incentives for preventative care.

Forgetting the health aspects, which of course we do not want to forget, that is the most important thing, but just looking at it from a financial perspective, every one of the things that the gentlewoman mentioned, if that manages to catch something before it gets worse it is going to save us so much money, because down the road we would have to pay for the operation, the hospital care, the nursing home care, astronomical costs that can be saved because somebody does some kind of preventative screening or testing.

So what the President proposed makes sense. Why penalize people or discourage them from having those kinds of preventative measures? I totally agree. I think that was one of the best aspects.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. One of the things that I have decided to do, Mr. Speaker, to highlight the program, is in my town meetings I am going to bring in seniors in Jacksonville, I am going to have a coffee with them, to discuss the proposal; in Orlando I am going to bring them in during a luncheon. Because I think it is important that they not only talk with me and get the details of the proposal, but they call the other representatives in the area.

I think it is very important, particularly for Florida, with the number of elderly population that we have, and growing, that we get some relief. I think this is a way that we can go in Florida. I am hoping that all Members of the Florida delegation will support this proposal. Of course, the people can decide whether or not they think this is important.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. One of the things, one of the reasons I think it is so important that we have these kinds of outreach programs, is my own experience in my district.

My district runs from very wealthy to very poor. A lot of the seniors who are below a certain income and eligible for what we call the QMBY program, where their Part B benefit was paid and they did not even have to put out a premium, were not even aware that that was true. They did not know that

they were eligible to not have to pay the premium for the Part B doctor's bills. The same is going to be true with this program.

□ 1615

Once we put this into place, this new part D, if they are below a certain level, I think I mentioned \$11,000 for a single or \$17,000 for a couple, they would not even have to pay the premium. So for the group of people that are in that category, this is a Godsend in my opinion. So it is important to get out there and, as the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) says, and talk to people about it. Because a lot of people are not even aware of the benefits that are there for them now, let alone once we pass this new benefit.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I think, in the richest country in the world, it is ludicrous that seniors have to decide whether or not they are going to pay their rent, buy their medicine or buy food. I think we need to commend the President for coming forward with this recommendation.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. So I will do all I can to inform the public so that they will call Members of Congress. A lot of people think that we are working because we are meeting 5 days a week. But it is not the quantity, it is the quality of what we are doing. If we are not dealing with the issues that is important to them, then we might as well be home doing constituent case work.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. Madam Speaker, if the gentlewoman would bear with me, I mentioned earlier OWL, which I think stands for Older Women's League. They put out this report around Mother's Day this year that we were talking about on the floor at the time to try to get some of the changes that the President has now proposed. There were just three examples. They gave some real life examples that were mentioned at that time. If I could just briefly mention them, because I think they really illustrate why this is so important.

This is a woman from Montgomery, Alabama, Clusta, I do not know if I am pronouncing it right, C-L-U-S-T-A, I guess is her first name. She is 77, widow of 15 years, lives alone. Social Security is her sole source of income. Her Medicare Part A hospital coverage is supplemented by Blue Cross/Blue Shield. She pays her Medicare Part B premium as part of the specified low income Medicare beneficiaries. So that means that she does not get it all free, but she gets some assistance. So she does not pay the whole thing.

But she goes on to talk about how valuable Medicare is, but she says it is not enough. She spends as much as \$3,000 a year on her health, most of which goes for medicine. She takes 15 different medications, some twice a day. Of course, she lives in subsidized housing.

In order to be in that slim B category, she is probably making maybe, I

do not know, \$12,000, \$13,000 a year. She is spending \$3,000 of that on prescription drugs. I mean, it is ridiculous. My colleagues can see how this would benefit her.

There is this other woman, Joan, from southern Connecticut. She is 67, retired social worker, and I am going to skip a lot of this stuff. But she has an illness which she explains as too many infection fighting T cells that attack her internal organs and her nerve cells. She goes on to describe her illness, but she has a supplemental insurance policy which covers 80 percent of her medication. Otherwise, prescription drugs would cost her \$3,500 annually. But this policy, which is a Medigap policy, is said to expire, and she is now looking to replace it.

Now, again, I think the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) was pointing out that there has been some suggestion, well, a lot of seniors get prescription drugs because they have Medigap, supplemental insurance that they pay, so what is the big deal? Well, the big deal is that, in many cases, they cannot afford to buy Medigap because it is getting more and more expensive. A lot of people cannot get the coverage.

In this woman's case, she knows it is going to expire. She obviously cannot continue it. I mean, she would benefit in a major way, \$3,500 a year in prescription drug benefits. It is unbelievable.

Then I just want to mention one more, and this is a woman, Rhoda, from suburban Minnesota. She is 70. Her late husband and her both suffered from chronic disease. She is a breast cancer survivor. She talks about the value of Medicare.

She said that her and her husband spend closes to \$300 a month on prescription drugs. They take three prescription medications apiece everyday, and her husband took two insulin shots each day as well. The couple pay out of pocket for various things.

I mean, again, I do not want to get into all the details, but there are just so many people out there that are in this category. That is why we need this program.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to add one thing. With all of the advances in medicine, some of the most beneficiary advancements include our ability to detect diseases before they become life threatening. Under the President's plan, these types of screening would also be covered.

We all know that one ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. This is a perfect example of how we can use medicine advanced to make smart and cost effective changes in the way we deliver health care.

I really want to commend the President for coming forth with this recommendation, and I am hoping that we in the Congress will look very seriously

at his proposal, and that the community will get involved, and that different groups that support elderly get involved so that we can pass a bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have to say I know that we have been very disappointed with the Republican leadership on a number of health care initiatives, most importantly the Patients' Bill of Rights that they refuse to bring up, so that now we have got to actually sign this discharge petition and try to get it to the floor.

So far, there has not been a lot of criticism of the President's proposal on Medicare. I am hopeful, I am sort of crossing my fingers here and hoping that, at some point, we will see an expression of support for this.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am certainly hoping that everybody from Florida will take a real close look at this proposal because I do not think it should be a Democratic or a Republican proposal. I think this proposal should be one that benefits the people, particularly the people of Florida. I am just hoping that my colleagues will come to the table and let us work together for the good of the people of Florida and also the good of the people throughout the country. I think we can do this in a very bipartisan way.

Mr. PALLONE. I hope so. Madam Speaker, again, I just keep pointing out that the only reason that we start to agitate as Democrats is because we cannot get some of these good proposals brought forward. That is certainly true with the Patients' Bill of Rights. But, hopefully, it does not have to be the case with this Medicare proposal.

I know that, initially, there was Republican resistance to the idea of taking 15 percent of the surplus and using it for Medicare. I hope that they will go along with that. I hope that they will go along with the prescription drug proposal and some of these other very significant changes in Medicare that the President has proposed.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I once again want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his leadership on this matter. The people in Florida owe him a great deal of gratitude for bringing this issue before the public.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) again for leading us always on these very important issues.

I was listening to the comments in my office. It dawned on me that I represent one of the youngest, if not the youngest, district in the Nation. Traditionally, a lot of the discussions in my district are about young people, and, therefore, day care and education and schools; and a lot of times, unfortunately, not enough is discussed about the issue of senior citizens.

Yet, it dawned on me also, as I was listening, like the rest of America, my district is aging. We are not becoming the younger district that we were. All of a sudden, this becomes a very serious issue.

I just wanted to come down and take just a few minutes to say that I think the President has put before us an excellent plan, and there is no reason why we should not respond to it.

But my biggest concern continues to be the same concern I had when I came down last week and joined the gentleman for the discussion on HMOs, managed care. The whole issue of how can we as the greatest Nation on earth continue to dodge, to duck the issue of providing the best, which we are capable of, medical care, the most affordable, which we are not doing but we are capable of, and the most universal medical care.

If we had bad medical services in general, if we had bad medicine and we had bad doctors, then maybe the plan would be to keep a lot of people away from it and not make it available to everybody. But that is not our case.

So what the gentleman from New Jersey is doing here today, and what I want to join him, is to plea with the American people to join us in alerting Members of Congress to the fact that this time here we are dealing with yet another issue in the whole area of providing medical services.

At times, we deal with the millions of young people and Americans who are not covered by medical insurance. At other times, we deal with the whole issue of the people who are not getting the proper services. Here we are talking about people that are covered but who run the risk of having this kind of coverage either end someday or not be handled properly or not be of the quality that it should be.

We have before us a proposal that I think makes a major step to address that issue. We have an opportunity to deal with it in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to take these few minutes to join the gentleman from New Jersey, to thank him again for bringing us together and to tell him to count on me and his colleagues to continue to put this message forward, that this is about saying what a society stands for.

If a society cannot take care of its children, and we have spoken about that, cannot take care of its elderly, then it really did not accomplish what it set out to do. This is an opportunity, and we can do it.

Mr. PALLONE. We will continue and bring this up on a regular basis.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

PROVISIONS FOR LANDSLIDE AND MUD SLIDE
VICTIMS

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about a rather unique, but important natural disaster that has occurred in my district. Since actually well before I was sworn in, a very slow moving but pow-

erful landslide has destroyed more than 130 homes in the city of Kelso, Washington.

The nature of landslides is such that they are not well covered by coverage normally available through FEMA and HUD and other disaster relief mechanisms available through the government. The result is that these people have lost virtually everything they own. Fortunately, we have lost no lives. But 130 people have seen their dreams destroyed by this landslide.

I have exhausted and worked very hard with my staff and the agencies to provide whatever help we can provide. Yet, still uncompensated and uninsured damages remain, and we have looked for ways that we might be able to help them.

Therefore, we have devised some targeted tax measures that would assist folks in this particular type of situation. It would provide targeted tax relief to homeowners located in State or federally declared disaster areas who have lost their homes due to disasters for which insurance is not readily available.

Let me underscore that. One can buy insurance for a great many natural disasters, but landslide and mud slides, it is very difficult to find insurance, and it is very expensive if one can find it.

Let me underscore also that normal FEMA coverage does not help in situations like this. The homeowners in this particular district have done everything they can. They have done it right. They have played by the rules. They are two income families. Yet, they have lost everything.

So this is what our bill would do. It would clarify the law to ensure that any mortgage forgiveness provided to homeowners would not be taxable as income. What would happen there is, should a lender decide to forgive interest or forgive a mortgage, under current law, that forgiveness could be considered a gift, and the poor taxpayers who now have their home buried under mud would have to pay taxes on a home which has been completely obliterated. It will not be a common thing, but if people are kind enough to step forward and forgive mortgage in those cases, it would be important.

Additionally, this legislation would establish a tax credit to help those taxpayers who required to continue paying mortgage payments on the destroyed home as they also pay rent or additional mortgage payments for a new residence.

Put ourselves in the position of these homeowners. Again, they have played by the rules. Through no fault of their own, their primary home has been destroyed. They are still having to pay mortgage on that home while they rent another residence for their family. This proposal would provide some tax relief in that circumstance.

There is a third thing this would do. If one should try to claim a casualty loss for one's destroyed home, under current law, the calculation on that

loss is on the basis of the home. As we know, the basis is its initial value when one purchased it, not the current value. So what we would do is adjust the way that calculation is developed so that one could deduct, take a casualty loss based on the current value of the home, the most recently assessed value.

These are common sense measures. They are fair measures. They would help good hard working constituents who played by the rules and, through no fault of their own, have lost virtually everything they own. It would have minimal impact on the Treasury because it deals with the very small and specific instance in which our existing laws have not been able and our existing agencies have not been able to help these folks.

Finally, Madam Speaker, and there are some cases where homeowners are fortunate enough to sell their home in these disasters, and this legislation would allow the homeowners to deduct the full value of the loss.

□ 1630

There are some complexities to it which we could share in accompanying written testimony, but my main point is to share the following points:

We have homeowners who have, again, lost everything they owned, who were not able to buy insurance and for whom FEMA and the other disaster mechanisms have not been able to help. This is a targeted, specific and quite inexpensive proposal to just help those folks in federally- or State-declared disaster areas who have lost virtually everything try to get a little bit back through the structure of the tax codes.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and I hope the Congress will consider this favorably.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about a natural disaster situation in my district that warrants significant relief, and to introduce legislation that will provide some badly needed assistance to the victims of these disasters.

Since even before I was sworn in as a member of this body, I have been working with a group of constituents from the City of Kelso, in my Southwest Washington district, to provide assistance to their disaster-torn community. This city has literally been torn apart by slow-moving landslides that resulted from heavy rainfalls. In fact, during the last 14 months, more than one hundred homes have been destroyed by those landslides, and the remainder of the homes may suffer the same fate in the next 5 to 10 years.

These constituents and their families have struggled to rebuild their lives after their homes or their businesses tumbled down the hill under tons of mud and debris, and I have done everything in my power to ensure that the federal government does everything that we possibly can to help them to that.

Our Nation has experienced several very powerful natural disasters in the past few years. What differentiates these disasters in my district from many others is the fact that insurance was not readily available for this type of disaster—in fact, most homeowners policies

specifically exclude mudslides as a covered peril—and now many of these folks have lost nearly everything they own.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I have devised some targeted tax measures that would assist folks in this type of situation.

My legislation would provide targeted tax relief to homeowners located in state or federally-declared disaster areas, which have lost their homes due to disasters for which insurance is not readily available. I can't emphasize enough—many of these folks have lost everything. In most cases, any assistance received from FEMA or state agencies might compensate for 15 to 20 cents on the dollar for their losses, but will only be a small step in helping these homeowners get back on their feet.

These homeowners need a fair chance to get back on their feet, without continuing to shoulder the burden of heavy debt for a destroyed residence. So this bill combines a number of changes to the tax code to help give them such an opportunity.

First, the bill clarifies the law to ensure that any mortgage forgiveness provided to these homeowners would not be taxable as income. Madam Speaker, I have heard from some financial planners in my district that in some cases, they have advised their clients not to seek forgiveness of their mortgage debt from their lenders for this very purpose; and I know for a fact that there are some local lenders who would generously provide such relief for some borrowers if, in fact, such forgiveness was sought by the homeowner. The Federal Government simply should not be taxing the generosity of these lenders who may provide relief of a disaster-victim's heartache. To me, this is common sense and should be expressly defined by the tax code.

Additionally, the legislation would establish a tax credit to help those taxpayers who are required to continue paying mortgage payments on that destroyed home as they pay rent or additional mortgage payments on a new residence. These are some of the most devastated homeowners that I have encountered. Not only have they lost nearly everything they own, but now they face years of carrying this heavy burden of debt in addition to the regular expenses of purchasing a new home and rebuilding their lives.

So I have developed a tax credit that would permit these taxpayers to reduce their taxes by the amount of the mortgage payments on that destroyed home in the years following a disaster. As I stated before, this provision would apply to those disasters for which insurance is not readily available, and only to those mortgage payments made after the qualifying disaster. I simply believe that this is the most direct method of helping our constituents who carry this enormous burden.

Third, the bill would adjust the computation of the casualty loss deduction by allowing taxpayers to deduct the fair market value of a home, instead of only the basis in the home as permitted under current law. Again, this applies only to taxpayers facing this extreme set of circumstances and would not apply to taxpayers who elect to take the credit which I discussed previously. But more importantly, this is a fair measure. Taxpayers who may have lived in a particular home for 20 or 30 years, who may have nearly all of their savings tied up in that home, deserve to get an adjusted deduction that accounts for the modern-day value of that home.

Finally, Madam Speaker, in those cases where the homeowner is fortunate enough to sell a home located in such a devastated area, which may or may not have been irreparably damaged but may be severely devalued, this legislation allows taxpayers to deduct the full value of that loss. Current law limits taxpayers to a capital loss deduction of \$3,000, with the ability to carry over any balance to future years. Section 5 of this measure would eliminate the \$3,000 limit under these narrow circumstances, so that taxpayers would be able to immediately deduct the full value of a loss taken on the sale of their property which, in many areas heavily impacted by natural disasters, may have depreciated extensively. As under current law, any balance of the capital loss beyond taxable income would be carried over to future years. In my opinion, there's no reason for applying this limitation to capital losses to natural disaster situations and, for that reason, I am proposing that we lift the cap in only these cases.

Madam Speaker, I realize that the situation in Kelso may be unusual, but as such, the impact of this measure on the federal government should be limited. It's impact, however, in helping to rebuild the lives of our disaster victims would be enormous.

This is clearly the right thing to do to help our neighbors get back on their feet. As we wrestle with the option for spending projected budget surpluses in the foreseeable future, I ask my colleagues to consider the plight of our nation's disaster victims and to support these efforts to expeditiously enact the measures that I am proposing today.

FIBROMYALGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GRANGER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the approximately 3.7 million Americans who are plagued by a little-known chronic disorder called fibromyalgia.

Fibromyalgia is a severe form of arthritis characterized by widespread pain and tenderness in the areas of the neck, spine, shoulders, and hips, as well as by fatigue, weakness and sleep.

Unfortunately for these individuals affected by fibromyalgia, the exact cause of the disorder is unknown, and worse yet, there is no known cure; however, this much is known about fibromyalgia, it may be triggered by stress, trauma or possibly an infectious agent in susceptible people.

Thanks to the efforts of organizations such as the National Arthritis Foundation, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, and the National Institute of Arthritis and Muscular Skeletal and Skin Diseases, NIAMS, breakthroughs in treatments for relieving the pain of those affected by fibromyalgia are now more commonplace, thank goodness. Medical experts, for example, have determined that a combination of exercise, medication, physical therapy, and relaxation

can help relieve the symptoms of fibromyalgia. This is very good news, but there is a lot of work still left to be done.

I respectfully call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the severity of the issue of fibromyalgia, to support individuals affected by fibromyalgia through public awareness and education, to recognize the leadership of the Arthritis Foundation, CDC, and the States in developing the National Arthritis Action Plan, which includes strategies to address all forms of arthritis, including fibromyalgia, and to recognize the importance of committing resources to the Arthritis Foundation, the CDC, NIAMS, and the relevant Federal research institutions helping to pinpoint the cause of fibromyalgia, and eventually find a cure for fibromyalgia.

Before I finish, I would like to share with my colleagues a story of a constituent of mine, Lin Kisslinger, from Oklahoma City, who was diagnosed with fibromyalgia 9 years ago. Lin is an extremely courageous woman who has gone to great lengths to promote an awareness of fibromyalgia in my home State of Oklahoma and throughout the country. Lin successfully helped establish a statewide fibromyalgia awareness day in Oklahoma, and she played an integral role in finding the Fibromyalgia Support Group of South Oklahoma City.

With Lin Kisslinger's continued dedication to promote the awareness of fibromyalgia, combined with the efforts of the Oklahoma City and Tulsa chapters of the National Arthritis Foundation, the National Arthritis Foundation itself, the CDC, and NIAMS, I am confident that a cure for fibromyalgia will be discovered sooner, rather than later.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to support my House Resolution on fibromyalgia.

SUSPEND CLINTON-CASTRO MAY 1995 MIGRATION ACCORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise to call for the immediate suspension by the Clinton administration of the May 1995 Migration Accord with the Cuban dictatorship and to urge the adoption of a serious U.S. policy of assistance to the Cuban internal opposition, and other steps to accelerate the liberation of Cuba and an end to the refugee tragedy, as well as to the threats to U.S. national security posed by the Castro dictatorship, all of which are being covered up and ignored by the Clinton administration.

This administration's policy towards Cuba can no longer hold. The administration cannot continue to sweep the Cuban crisis under the carpet. The Cuban crisis and the tragedy of the oppression of the Cuban people must no

longer be treated as an immigration issue. We must address the issue comprehensively as one of vital U.S. national security, including the need to stop Cuban narcotrafficking, a congressional hearing on which will take place very soon.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and their staffs for their critical work on this very serious matter.

We also have to realize that this problem, the problem of the Cuban dictatorship, is one of biological weapons development, of promotion of international terrorism, of destabilization of the Western Hemisphere, of alliances with rogue states in furtherance of anti-American interests, and of the promotion of international criminal activity.

The way to solve the immigration problem is to solve the national security problem and the tragedy of the oppression of the Cuban people. Before Castro's takeover of Cuba in 1959, never, even during the worst poverty of the economic depression of the 1930s, not only were there no rafters, there was not even 1 year when the U.S. quota allotment of immigrant visas for Cuba was filled. The Cuban people are not an emigrant people. They are desperately seeking freedom today due to the totalitarian oppression and economic destruction caused by the Castro dictatorship.

Yesterday, off the coast of Miami Beach, we saw an unfortunate demonstration of the profoundly unacceptable nature of the Clinton policy of focusing on the Cuban tragedy as an immigration issue. The policy is deeply flawed.

The United States should immediately, one, first suspend the immoral and illegal Clinton-Castro Migration Accord of May 1995, which violates the generous tradition of the American people with regard to refugees from Soviet Bloc countries and also violates the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966.

Secondly, inform Castro with all clarity that any attempt to fabricate a new crisis for the United States, such as by attempting to send massive amounts of refugees, shall be responded to with immediate U.S. action which would include a naval blockade of Cuba, not only of refugees which would be returned to the Cuban shore, but also of all oil shipments to the island.

And, thirdly, initiate a serious and vigorous program of assistance to the Cuban internal opposition and other steps to hasten the demise of the Cuban dictatorship and the reestablishment of democracy and the rule of law in Cuba.

The time has come, Madam Speaker, to end the suffering and oppression of Cuba, not to fire water cannons and pepper spray on defenseless Cuban refugees trying to swim to freedom.

HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, we ought to begin this presentation with proposing a toast, and perhaps we can raise our glasses to propose a toast to the health of the American people, because that is what this special order is all about, the health of the American people.

For a long time now, many of us in the House have been about the business of trying to double, over a period of 5 years, the funding for the National Institutes of Health. In doing so, we are focusing directly on the reason for the toast that we made to start the proceedings, namely preventive medicine for the health of the American people, remedies for some of the maladies that afflict the American people, and long-term strategies to bring about a world safer for our people, and to rid the world eventually of all of our diseases that so ravage the lives of so many people.

So doubling the funding for the NIH, for the National Institutes of Health, is a worthy goal and it accomplishes so many facets of goals for the American people, and for the citizens of the world, for that matter, that sometimes we wonder why there is not more support than there sometimes is shown. But last year, last session, we were successful, those of us who participate in this endeavor, in making the first downpayment on the doubling effort over a period of 5 years by succeeding in having our appropriators list \$2 billion into the then budget, the downpayment on the doubling.

We are now in the posture where we must do the same thing in order to maintain the momentum by bringing about increased funding for the NIH for the current session. In doing so we have introduced H. Res. 89, I believe it is, which asks our Congress, our House of Representatives, to consider doubling the funding for NIH.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the copy of H. Res. 89, which takes care of what we are after in the funding for the National Institutes of Health.

H. RES. 89

Whereas past investments in biomedical research have resulted in better health, an improved quality of life for all Americans, and a reduction in national health care expenditures;

Whereas the Nation's commitment to biomedical research has expanded the base of scientific knowledge about health and disease and revolutionized the practice of medicine;

Whereas the Federal Government represents the single largest contributor to biomedical research conducted in the United States;

Whereas biomedical research continues to play a vital role in the growth of this Nation's biotechnology, medical device, and pharmaceutical industries;

Whereas the origin of many of the new drugs and medical devices currently in use is based on biomedical research supported by the National Institutes of Health;

Whereas women have traditionally been underrepresented in medical research protocols, yet are severely affected by diseases including breast cancer, which will kill over 43,900 women this year; ovarian cancer which will claim another 14,500 lives; and osteoporosis and cardiovascular disorders;

Whereas research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health is responsible for the identification of genetic mutations relating to nearly 100 diseases, including Alzheimer's disease, cystic fibrosis, Huntington's disease, osteoporosis, many forms of cancer, and immune deficiency disorders;

Whereas many Americans still face serious and life-threatening health problems, both acute and chronic;

Whereas neurodegenerative diseases of the elderly, such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, threaten to destroy the lives of millions of Americans, overwhelm the Nation's health care system, and bankrupt the medicare and medicaid programs;

Whereas 4,000,000 Americans are currently infected with the hepatitis C virus, an insidious liver condition that can lead to inflammation, cirrhosis, and cancer, as well as liver failure;

Whereas 250,000 Americans are now suffering from AIDS and hundreds of thousands more with HIV infection;

Whereas cancer remains a comprehensive threat to any tissue or organ of the body at any age, and remains a top cause of morbidity and mortality;

Whereas the extent of psychiatric and neurological diseases poses considerable challenges in understanding the workings of the brain and nervous system;

Whereas recent advances in the treatment of HIV illustrate the promise research holds for even more effective, accessible, and affordable treatments for persons with HIV;

Whereas infants and children are the hope of our future, yet they continue to be the most vulnerable and underserved members of our society;

Whereas approximately one out of every six American men will develop prostate cancer and over 49,200 men will die from prostate cancer each year;

Whereas diabetes, both insulin and non-insulin forms, afflicts 15,700,000 Americans and places them at risk for acute and chronic complications, including blindness, kidney failure, atherosclerosis, and nerve degeneration;

Whereas the emerging understanding of the principles of biometrics has been applied to the development of hard tissue such as bone and teeth as well as soft tissue, and this field of study holds great promise for the design of new classes of biomaterials, pharmaceuticals, and diagnostic and analytical reagents;

Whereas research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health will map and sequence the entire human genome by 2005, leading to a new era of molecular medicine that will provide unprecedented opportunities for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and cure of diseases that currently plague society;

Whereas the fundamental way science is conducted is changing at a revolutionary pace, demanding a far greater investment in emerging new technologies and research training programs, and in developing new skills among scientific investigators; and

Whereas most Americans show overwhelming support for an increased Federal investment in biomedical research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Biomedical Revitalization Resolution of 1999".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that funding for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 and that the budget resolution appropriately reflect sufficient funds to achieve this objective.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I also want to enter into the RECORD the list of our cosponsors for the resolution, which reads like a who's who of our current membership in the House of Representatives.

H. RES. 89

Sponsor: Rep Gekas, George W. (introduced 03/02/99).

Cosponsors (58):

Rep. Bentsen, Ken—03/02/99.

Rep. Callahan, Sonny—03/02/99.

Rep. Nethercutt, George R., Jr.—03/02/99.

Rep. Stearns, Cliff—03/04/99.

Rep. Green, Gene—03/04/99.

Rep. Frost, Martin—03/04/99.

Rep. Moakley, John Joseph—03/10/99.

Rep. Horn, Stephen—03/10/99.

Rep. Gonzalez, Charles A.—03/10/99.

Rep. Cooksey, John—03/10/99.

Rep. Ose, Doug—03/10/99.

Rep. Lofgren, Zoe—03/11/99.

Rep. Baldacci, John Elias—03/11/99.

Rep. Slaughter, Louise McIntosh—03/17/99.

Rep. Gordon, Bart—03/17/99.

Rep. Carson, Julia—03/23/99.

Rep. Goss, Porter J.—03/25/99.

Rep. Lewis, John—04/13/99.

Rep. Cummings, Elijah E.—04/13/99.

Rep. Bilirakis, Michael—04/13/99.

Rep. Hooley, Darlene—04/13/99.

Rep. Phelps, David D.—04/13/99.

Rep. Brady, Robert—04/15/99.

Rep. Gejdenson, Sam—04/27/99.

Rep. Wynn, Albert Russell—04/27/99.

Rep. Watt, Melvin L.—05/04/99.

Rep. Sanchez, Loretta—05/26/99.

Rep. Lantos, Tom—06/08/99.

Rep. Forbes, Michael P.—06/22/99.

Rep. Pelosi, Nancy—03/02/99.

Rep. Porter, John Edward—03/02/99.

Rep. Morella, Constance A.—03/04/99.

Rep. Shows, Ronnie—03/04/99.

Rep. McCarthy, Carolyn—03/04/99.

Rep. Pryce, Deborah—03/10/99.

Rep. Cunningham, Randy (Duke)—03/10/99.

Rep. Blagojevich, Rod R.—03/10/99.

Rep. Etheridge, Bob—03/10/99.

Rep. Bachus, Spencer—03/10/99.

Rep. Frank, Barney—03/10/99.

Rep. Nadler, Jerrold—03/11/99.

Rep. King, Peter T.—03/11/99.

Rep. Clement, Bob—03/17/99.

Rep. McIntyre, Mike—03/23/99.

Rep. Price, David E.—03/23/99.

Rep. Hoeffel, Joseph M.—03/25/99.

Rep. Mink, Patsy T.—04/13/99.

Rep. Bilbray, Brian P.—04/13/99.

Rep. Capps, Lois—04/13/99.

Rep. Coyne, William J.—04/13/99.

Rep. Wamp, Zach—04/13/99.

Rep. Eshoo, Anna G.—04/15/99.

Rep. LaFalce, John J.—04/27/99.

Rep. English, Phil—04/27/99.

Rep. Miller, Gary—05/04/99.

Rep. Capuano, Michael E.—06/08/99.

Rep. Borski, Robert A., Jr.—06/10/99.

Rep. McGovern, James P.—06/23/99.

Mr. GEKAS. And, Madam Speaker, I also wish to add to the RECORD a state-

ment that I have prepared for this special order in which the title, quite appropriately, is "Doubling NIH Budget in Five Years—Taking the Second Step Toward Doubling." That is exactly what we are talking about.

"DOUBLING NIH BUDGET IN FIVE YEARS—TAKING THE SECOND STEP TOWARD DOUBLING"

1. Doubling funding for the National Institutes of Health over the next five years. Is this a reasonable goal? Can we and should we obtain this goal?

What is the current budget situation for the NIH? The Congress has a history of doubling the NIH budget over ten years, so we are suggesting that we accelerate the pace of discovery by increasing health research from the usual 7% or 8% increase to a 15% increase per year for five years. This is a reasonable and obtainable goal given our past funding experience and the future potential for health discoveries. We are suggesting that the NIH FY'2000 budget contain a \$2 billion increase rather than the \$1 billion increase the Congress would usually provide.

The result is that NIH will go from a funding level of \$15.6 billion in FY'99 to \$17.6 billion in FY'2000. This would be the second step toward doubling because we added \$2 billion increase to the NIH budget last year. The second step should be easier than the first. We would take the NIH from a \$14 billion budget to a \$28 billion budget.

When I say we would make these increases I am referring to my colleagues, 56 other Members of the House who are committed to this same doubling goal and taking the second step by cosponsoring H. Res. 89. I am introducing for the RECORD the list of the 56 cosponsors, the "Dear Colleague" letter circulated by the Co-Chairs of the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus: Reps. Callahan, Pelosi and Bentsen, joined by Reps. Porter and Nethercutt, along with a copy of the bill.

Can we make this goal this year? Certainly those in the Congress who know the operations of the NIH the best support us in the effort, including the Chairman of the authorizing Committee, Rep. Bilirakis and the Chairman of the appropriations Committee, Rep. Porter. I am pleased that both have committed to the goal and joined H. Res. 89. We also have Senate support for the NIH doubling goal in five years from by fellow Pennsylvanian, Senator Specter, who has introduced a similar bill, S. Res. 19, to accomplish the same goal. He was joined in a bipartisan manner by his ranking Member on the Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Harkin. We certainly have the political will to go forward with the second downpayment, if we call upon it. I am asking all of my colleagues to join us on this mission and cosponsor H. Res. 89, so we can call upon our leaders and show that we support this important funding priority.

2. I may have convinced you that we have the ability to meet this goal, but you may ask why we should? Here we stand in June 22nd, 1999, on the brink of the next millennium, very different, healthier people because of health research, than the cruel and short lived lives of individuals that witnessed the dawn of this past 1000 years. Despite the progress that we have made in health research, we still face major global health challenges. Because the U.S. is the world leader in biomedical research, we have a special duty to transfer the benefits of our discoveries to the people of the world. Although this is an altruistic statement, we also know that our own quality of life and security will be enhanced if infectious diseases are controlled. The spread of infectious disease is the number one global health issue

that we all face, according to a recent report of the World Health Organization, infectious diseases killed 11 million people globally in 1998 and killed 180,000 people in the U.S., the third leading killer in the U.S. The NIH is taking the lead in confronting this global health problem by establishing a new center for vaccine development. Vaccines that immunize people against the HIV virus, new highly infectious strains of TB and against malaria the killer of children in sub-Saharan Africa are all possible, if we have the resources.

I feel very strongly about the global effort to transfer the benefits of NIH research through communication efforts such as the Internet and through commerce such as vaccine type drug therapies and prevention strategies. We will ultimately strengthen the economies of the developing world by attempting to eradicate disease. Last Congress I introduced a bill to establish a National Goals Commission with this purpose as its mission and I invite all of my colleagues to join me as original cosponsors of a new bill that also focuses on encouraging increased Internet conferencing on biomedical research and the control of infectious diseases through increases in vaccine development.

We are truly at a new frontier with the end of World War II, the end of the Cold War, where now former enemies in Europe work together to eliminate despotic state action that had once been tolerated, earlier in this Century. The U.S. has mobilized its resources to accomplish these goals and we can now harness and mobilize our scientists in all disciplines to assist the world effort to eliminate disease. This should be our highest priority for a national goal.

3. The increased funding we were able to provide the NIH last year has had a real impact on new priorities for the NIH with expanded activities in the following areas:

Expanding clinical research funding through better translation of research from the bench to the patient.

Accompanying expanded clinical research is promoting more PH.D/M.D. Researchers, which are on the decline, as the number of PH.Ds grows.

Expanding opportunities for collaboration with other science disciplines such as computer science and physics to work better at the molecular level.

Interpreting the human genome, which will be completed within the next two years.

4. Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus Briefings for the Congress have educated the attendees on the latest, cutting edge research. There have been over 90 briefings for the Congress since 1990. The 1999 Caucus Series was particularly instructive of the advances we are making in health care because of increased funding for research. For example, last week Dr. Solomon Snyder from Johns Hopkins University, told us that the role of Nitric Oxide in many human body functions such as heart pressure and as a neurotransmitter was only discovered in 1990. Since that time, medications such as Viagra, for male impotence have been developed in less than a decade. The pace of discovery has truly accelerated.

5. Emergency Spending-outside the 1997 budget caps: There is a global killer on the prowl killing 11 million people around the world and killing 180,000 people in the U.S. The World Health Organization just sounded an alert that we must control this killer before it is completely out of control. Emergency spending has been found to assist in the Kosovo Campaign and I submit that this is no less important.

Madam Speaker, the 56 cosponsors are intent on having people like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER)

and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) use their influence as chairmen of respective committees vital to this effort, who are also cosponsors, and I offer at this time the written remarks of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), of whom I just spoke, on this subject.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of increasing the federal government's commitment to biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health. As Chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, I am a strong advocate of this agency's vital mission. I have joined many of my colleagues in supporting efforts to double federal funding for the NIH.

The NIH is the primary federal agency charged with the conduct and support of biomedical and behavioral research. Each of its institutes has a specialized focus on particular diseases, areas of human health and development, or aspects of research support. When we consider its role as one of the world's foremost research centers, it is amazing to remember that the NIH actually began its existence as a one-room Laboratory of Hygiene in 1887.

Medical research represents the single most effective weapon against the diseases that affect many Americans. The advances made over the course of the last century could not have been predicated by even the most farsighted observers. It is equally difficult to anticipate the significant gains we may achieve in years to come through increased funding for further medical research.

Last year, Congress gave a substantial increase in funding to the NIH. The fiscal year 1999 omnibus appropriations law provided \$15.6 billion for the NIH—an increase of almost \$2 billion or 15 percent over the previous fiscal year. This increase represents a sizable down payment toward the goal of doubling its funding over five years. This year, I am hopeful that we can make similar progress in that regard.

As we work to increase federal funding, I am also sponsoring legislation to encourage private support for NIH research efforts. My bill, H.R. 785, the Biomedical Research Assistance Voluntary Option or "BRAVO" Act, would allow taxpayers to designate a portion of their federal income tax refunds to support NIH research efforts. I introduced the bill on a bipartisan basis with the Ranking Member of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Madam Speaker, every dollar invested in research today will yield untold benefits for all Americans in years to come. Indeed, our own lives might some day depend on the efforts of scientists and doctors currently at work in our nation's laboratories. I urge all Members to join me in supporting a strong federal commitment to biomedical research.

Mr. GEKAS. And so, Madam Speaker, we see we have an appropriator and a chairman of relevant committees, as well as many other Members who are interested in seeing this effort succeed.

And the question arises, well, who is interested in this besides the people at NIH? Every American citizen ought to be interested in it. It has to do with the health of the household. Mr. and Mrs. America and the children and the other

residents of the household can hope for nothing better than for clean, healthy lives so that they can fulfill their destiny with as little as possible disruption by ravaging disease and ill health.

So this is our effort, all of us. And it is that simple. Do we want reduction in health costs? Of course we do. Do we want less hospitalization for our people? Of course we do. Do we require fewer and fewer spaces in the future for nursing homes and more people to be able to remain at home? Of course we do.

All of this is within the scope of what we are trying to do. Because every effort that the National Institutes of Health makes on research, biomedical research and other kinds of findings that they can make, all of that goes to the prevention of disease and the curing of disease. And not only do we save lives but we save money. That is why we have to consider the doubling of the effort as being one of an investment in eventually reducing costs, because we will reduce costs along the way.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) has been one of the chief supporters of this effort, Madam Speaker, and I would like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to stand in support of the gentleman's resolution.

Some of our colleagues stood up here today and praised the President for coming across with the support for helping to finance the cost of pharmaceuticals for our seniors, and the issue of Social Security being taken off budget.

And I would like to say that I think those of us on the Republican side praise the President for coming over and supporting some of the concepts that Congress took action on not too long ago, this month, in saying that Social Security is a trust fund, not a slush fund. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has been trying to reach consensus on what we should be able to work out some time within the near future, and that is the ability of seniors to be able to have their pharmaceutical drugs paid for.

□ 1645

So I, for one, am going to stand up here today not only with the chairman but also to praise the President for coming across and supporting a lot of congressional priorities. But I think the issue of pharmaceutical drugs with Medicare is still treating symptoms of the problem, and that is we have these diseases which continue to be a problem in our society.

The resolution of the chairman really, as we would say, is an investment in the future. Because if we can avoid or reduce diseases such as heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, if we can reduce stroke, then we can reduce the cost of having to treat problems related to those diseases.

This resolution really says that it is time that America makes a commitment to investing in our public health

just as we invest in our infrastructure, roads, bridges, and canals.

I would strongly support the contention of the chairman that we need to double our investment. In fact, I would say clearly by comparison that Americans one day are going to wake up to the fact that in 1960 President Kennedy stood up and challenged this country to put a man of the Moon within 10 years, and at that time we increased the funding to a level that would be about 10 times what we spend on public health research, in the process of putting somebody on the Moon.

That kind of national commitment was made possible by strong leadership but really the big point was that level of commitment resulted within 10 years in the fulfillment of the promise and fulfillment of the commitment, and the fulfillment of the goal of placing a man on the Moon.

I think we can all agree, when it comes down to affecting our families, our children, our grandchildren, our great grandchildren's lives, that the one thing that really could totally dwarf placing somebody on the Moon is the ability to end cancer as we know it, to end heart disease as we know it, to make Alzheimer's a thing of the past, such as polio has become practically in our society, to take things like stroke and put it in the category of smallpox.

This is really a chance for us to make that commitment, with all the resources we have available, not by buying from this group or that special group or promising this group that we are going to give them more money. This is a promise to all Americans, the globe, all humans, that America at this time and this place is making the type of commitment to public health that was made back in the 1960s for space exploration.

The fact is this is our chance to be able to make a commitment. Let us just say this resolution is just a first step at saying we are going to put forth more effort and, hopefully, achieve more of the successes we are going to see in districts like mine.

Madam Speaker, San Diego County has one of the most aggressive health research facilities in the world. We are doing the human mapping program that not only allows us to understand what causes heart disease or causes Alzheimer's, but is allowing us to know why the body does what it does so that we can someday avoid these diseases rather than just treat them as we are talking today on the Medicare issue.

I want to stand again as not only a San Diegan who has many of these research facilities in his district but also as somebody who has the privilege of serving on the Committee on Health and the Environment and has oversight for many of these operations. I want to thank the chairman, and I want to stand here today and say, all America should be looking at this type of commitment. I want to thank the author of the resolution. Let us move forward and let us rise to the challenge.

Just as America rose to the challenge of John Kennedy, I think the resolution of the chairman deserves our commitment to rise and fulfill the promise that our public health strategies can actually provide for America.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the commentary of the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) who has been stalwart in most of the efforts surrounding the problems of continued funding for medical research.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) very much not only for his leadership on this issue of increasing medical research funding in the Government but for his leadership on so many issues.

I am grateful to have a chance to talk for a few minutes to acknowledge not only his work but to acknowledge the need for additional medical research through the National Institutes of Health and other agencies of Government which conduct medical research.

It is not a small matter that is defined and distributed to the National Institutes of Health for research only. It is a very big issue for not only the human condition in our country but also for other agencies that coordinate with the National Institutes of Health and in doing some very, very important research to try to cure diseases in this country.

I happen to have a very serious interest in diabetes and recognize fully the cost of diabetes to society. Twenty-five to twenty-six cents out of every Medicare dollar goes for paying for the consequences of diabetes in our society.

So, to the extent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and others in this body, both Democrats and Republicans, engaged in adding preventive care to the Medicare legislation that we set back in 1997 to allow for diabetes education and diabetes test strips, to allow for mammographies and colorectal exams and prostate exams for people in the Medicare population, that is a money saver.

So with the preventive care effort that is undertaken by Congress, combined with the research that is being done at the National Institutes of Health, not only on diabetes but on many other diseases, we can reduce this cost to the Medicare system.

So it is in our national best interest, in my judgment, that we devote more resources to the National Institutes of Health research and medical research through the National Science Foundation, through the VA Hospital system, through the Department of Defense, and other agencies of Government, the Centers for Disease Control, for example, and others, if we are going to help the human condition.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his work, and I am very serious about the hard work he has done to make increasing

medical research funding a reality in our country. It is a wise expenditure of money, of the taxpayers' dollars, because it helps all of us.

Diabetes, for example, is indiscriminate in touching not only minority races but the Caucasian population. It hits all ages and stages. It hits native American populations disproportionately to the rest of the populations in our country, and it is a cruel disease that affects so many people. Sixteen million Americans in our country have diabetes, and some 7 or 8 million of them do not know they have it. So not only diabetes but cancer and Alzheimer's and all those diseases that touch people's lives need to be cured.

I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) I was out at the National Institutes of Health just last week and met with the Director Dr. Varmus and the other directors of the Institutes talking not only about diabetes but increasing funding. I mentioned to them at the time that I felt the President's budget, which I think is around 2.3 percent, is just inadequate. I know we did an extraordinary increase last year in the appropriations process, and I am proud to be on the Committee on Appropriations and supported it. But we want to do better than 2.3 percent so that we take advantage of these great opportunities for research and cure some of these serious diseases that affect all of us.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has touched on an important aspect of what we are trying to do. The more we are able to prevent disease or cure the existing diseases, the more beneficial will be our Treasury as well as the lives of our citizens.

This chart that we have here shows heart disease, cancer, Alzheimer's, mental disorder, arthritis, depression, stroke, osteoporosis, etc. Altogether, these cost us \$500 billion a year as a society. That is what it costs us.

Now, insofar as research can settle in and provide a cure for one or all of these, billions of dollars every year can be saved, not to mention the lives that will be happier and safer and more fully destined for fulfillment than under the present conditions.

So we are not only spending money when we invest in the National Institutes of Health, we are saving money.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for one moment more, the gentleman is absolutely right.

If we add diabetes into that, that is some \$80 billion or \$90 billion more in cost to our country, not to say anything of the issue of lost productivity.

A person who has Alzheimer's today is most likely an unproductive part of our society. If we can prevent that Alzheimer's or cure it, that person, that sufferer and that family that suffers with that person will be more productive and it will save money long-term.

Just in the diabetes research, I should say the diabetes test strips and diabetes education money or provisions

that were set forth for the Medicare program, my memory is that it was about a \$31 million savings the first year of having that preventive component to health care.

So I thank the gentleman for his good work. I am proud to be his partner in all of this. We will have to just work hard and persevere and help humanity by curing some of these diseases through research.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) recognizing that she is the heart and soul of the National Institutes of Health, because she has never breathed a day's worth of breath without considering the NIH.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend my very good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for scheduling this special order and for charts and for the work that he does prior to and even after this special order. He has such a tremendous commitment to biomedical research and to the National Institutes of Health.

I am also pleased to identify myself with the comments made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) too. We do have a good, solid group of Members of Congress who do believe very strongly in biomedical research.

I am proud to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) in renewing our bipartisan commitment to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health over a 5-year period.

Madam Speaker, the NIH has been called "the only crown jewel of the Federal Government." Well, it is indeed a world-renowned institution. It is located in Montgomery County, Maryland, which happens to be the district I represent. It is considered the leading force in mankind's continuing war against disease.

In fact, it is located in Bethesda, Maryland; and I think that Bethesda was appropriately named for the Biblical Pool of Bethesda, which had healing qualities. And so does NIH.

The Federal commitment to biomedical, behavioral, and population-based research is responsible for the continued development of an ever-expanding base that has contributed to medical advances that have profoundly improved the length and quality of life for millions of Americans.

Information gained from NIH research is revolutionizing the practice of medicine and the future direction of scientific inquiry. With this research, we have learned that disease is a complex and evolving enemy.

Despite the extraordinary progress that has been made in the fight against many diseases, there are still serious challenges that remain. Infectious diseases continue to pose a significant threat as new human pathogens are discovered and previously known and

controlled microorganisms acquire antibiotic resistance. The risk of bioterrorism also necessitates new research on diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutic agents.

The number of Americans over age 65 will double in the next 30 years to more than 69 million. So research is needed to help reduce the enormous economic and social burdens posed by chronic diseases, as were mentioned, osteoporosis, arthritis, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, heart disease, and stroke.

As a matter of fact, one of the figures I saw recently is that, if we can just hold back the advent of Alzheimer's disease for 5 years, we can save \$40 billion. This is an example of how we save money as well as enhance the quality of life.

□ 1700

NIH funded research into many of these diseases is the foundation underlying the search for answers. Without the essential role that the NIH is playing in our health care equation, we as a Nation will fail to achieve the goal of a healthy, more productive Nation. The American people want increased funding for medical research. There was a Wall Street Journal/CNN poll that indicated that more than two-thirds of those who were surveyed support doubling the NIH budget within 5 years.

The clock on this commitment began ticking in 1998 when we successfully enacted a 15 percent increase in the NIH appropriation to \$15.6 billion in fiscal year 1999. Again this year we are requesting another 15 percent increase for fiscal year 2000 as the second step in achieving our goal of doubling the NIH budget by 2003.

Madam Speaker, the 15 percent increase in the current fiscal year has enabled funding of close to 10,000 new grants. That is an increase of 2,400 over the fiscal year 1998. It is not by chance that the United States is the undisputed world leader in high tech medical science and drug development. It is in large part because the Federal Government has made a commitment to fund basic biomedical research for over 50 years and create a strong partnership with the private sector to bring new life-saving techniques and treatments to patients throughout the world.

I want to mention some examples of new preventive strategies against disease which is changing the lives of millions of Americans:

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in American women, claiming the lives of more than 43,000 women each year. The NIH-sponsored breast cancer prevention trial tested the use of tamoxifen, a drug that was used for 20 years to treat breast cancer, as a breast cancer prevention agent. Tamoxifen reduced the incidence of breast cancer for more than 5 years by 49 percent in women at high risk for the disease.

Another example is tuberculosis. TB is the most common infectious disease

worldwide. One-third of the world's population is infected with the bacterium that causes this serious disease. TB causes devastating lung disease and weight loss in patients and often attacks the nervous system and the kidneys as well. Moreover, the greatest known risk for development of TB infection is HIV infection. NIH and CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, supported scientists collaborated with researchers in Uganda where a study was conducted to test different drug regimens for their ability to prevent TB in HIV-infected adults. The researchers found that a 6-month course of an anti-TB drug reduced the risk of TB by 67 percent in HIV-infected adults. The findings from this research led the World Health Organization's global tuberculosis program to further evaluate whether TB prevention programs for high-risk groups in developing nations are an effective and economical way to reduce the risk of TB infection to the individual and the community.

Another example, Madam Speaker, is the recent evidence that kidney damage from diabetes is reversible. We have just had a discussion with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) about diabetes. One of the many serious complications that patients with diabetes encounter is damage to their kidneys. Despite improved patient survival and regulation of blood sugar, this disease continues to be the major factor of kidney failure. Researchers have known that after many years with the disease, diabetic patients gradually develop scarring in the kidney that filters the body's waste produced from the blood. As the scarring progresses, the kidneys fail, leaving the patient dependent on dialysis. Now researchers are making progress. By studying patients who had received a pancreas transplant, researchers found that kidney disease was actually reversed in some diabetic patients who had maintained normalized blood sugar levels over a 10-year period. This research will help not only diabetic patients receiving pancreas transplants but also will guide treatment strategies for other diabetic patients who are now at risk for kidney disease. Now, not only can we prevent kidney damage in patients with diabetes, but in some cases the damage can be reversed.

Madam Speaker, scientific advances resulting from NIH-supported research mean improved health and reduced suffering, job creation in biomedical research and biotechnology, and far-reaching economic benefits touching every State through major universities, government laboratories and research institutes. In global competition, biomedical research and biotechnology are areas of strong American leadership and commitment. Continued strong support for NIH will ensure that American scientific excellence continues as we enter the next century. We can afford to do no less for

this generation and for generations to come.

Before I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has been so kind about giving me this time, I want to extol the benefits, also, of the creation of the Office of Research on Women's Health. I and other Members of Congress were involved in that a number of years ago. We now have it codified, and so women are included in all clinical trials and protocols. Thanks to the Members of this Congress with the gentleman from Pennsylvania at the helm and others, we have now been able to put far more money into all elements of research, and in the Office on Research on Women's Health for breast cancer, ovarian cancer, cervical cancer, osteoporosis, AIDS in women, lupus and all of the other diseases. We also have made some advances in research for prostate cancer, kind of the equivalent of breast cancer in terms of the number of people who are diagnosed with it each year and the number who die of that disease. This is so important that we do this special order and that we carry through with our goal of doubling the budget by 2003 of the National Institutes of Health. It has been an honor to be here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas whom I see has arrived for participation in this event, Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD several letters from important entities in our country supporting our effort for doubling the funding for the NIH. I will quickly read off the titles:

The American Heart Association.

The BIO organization, which is the Biotechnology Industry Organization.

The Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding. Just to give my colleagues an idea, to give our audience, the American public, a feel for how many people, how many organizations are deeply involved in the health of our country, the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, which is made up of dozens of organizations like the American Geriatrics Society, the American Society for Investigative Pathology, American Society of Transplantation, just to get an idea of all the various things that affect our households; Corporation for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Friends of the National Library of Medicine, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. My gosh, they cover every facet of our lives. National Caucus of Basic Biomedical Science Chairs, Oakwood Healthcare System, Primary Health Systems, and on and on and on. This is our fellow Americans joining in certain entities to advance our health care.

Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy.

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 22, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GEKAS: The American Heart Association applauds your con-

tinuing initiative and leadership in the bicameral, bipartisan effort to double funding for the National Institutes of Health by the year 2003. The historically large funding increase received by the NIH for FY 1999 represented a significant step toward that goal.

Your ongoing efforts and those of the 56 co-sponsors of H. Res. 89, expressing the sense of the House that the federal investment in medical research should be increased by \$2 billion in FY 2000, are vital in securing the next installment to double funding for the NIH. The American Heart Association strongly supports your hard work in making funding for the NIH a top priority in the FY 2000 appropriations process.

Recent state-based polls show that an overwhelming majority of Americans favor doubling federal spending on medical research by the year 2003. NIH research reduces health care costs, provides cutting-edge treatment and prevention efforts, creates jobs and maintains America's status as the world leader in the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries.

In addition, an overwhelming majority of Americans want Congress to increase funding for heart and stroke research. According to an April 1999 national public opinion poll, 81 percent of Americans want Congress to increase funding for heart research and 78 percent support increases for stroke research. The fight against heart disease—America's No. 1 killer—and stroke—America's No. 3 killer—requires innovative research and prevention programs. However, these programs to help advance the battle against heart disease and stroke are contingent on a significant increase in funding for the NIH. Now is the time for NIH to capitalize on progress and pursue promising opportunities that could lead to novel approaches to diagnose, treat, prevent or cure heart disease and stroke.

The American Heart Association commends you for your outstanding leadership and steadfast commitment to double funding for the NIH by the year 2003. Thank you.

Sincerely,

VALENTIN FUSTER, M.D., PH.D.
President.

BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY
ORGANIZATION,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE W. GEKAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GEKAS: I am writing to indicate BIO's strong support for your efforts to double the budget of the national Institutes of Health (NIH) by 2003, as called for in H. Res. 89. We commend you for organizing speeches on this subject and ask that you read from our statement and/or include it in the printed record.

We support these increases in NIH appropriations because of their importance to the development of tomorrow's cures for the most deadly and disabling diseases, including AIDS, Parkinson's, cancer, Alzheimer's, and diabetes. Apart from helping patients, NIH funding also plays a crucial role in generating hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs in our industry and billions of dollars in economic activity.

Many of BIO's 840 members have collaborative agreements and licenses with NIH and its grantees. The dynamic division of labor between NIH, focusing on basic research, and our industry, focusing on applied research, has been a powerful catalyst for change and progress. These partnerships are the cornerstone of America's preeminence in biomedical research.

We are witnessing an explosion of new products to treat patients. In 1998, 22 new products and vaccines were approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) push-

ing the biotech industry's total approved drugs and biologic projects to over 80. Furthermore, biotechnology companies currently have over 300 biotech drugs and biologics in the pipeline in second and third stage human clinical trials at the FDA.

In terms of economic benefits, 2,214 new companies have been formed since 1980 that were based in part on licenses from NIH and its grantees. And in FY 1997, \$28.7 billion of U.S. economic activity can be attributed to the results of academic licensing the (majority of which resulted from NIH-sponsored research), supporting at 245,930 jobs.

Past investments in NIH has helped make America the undisputed world leader in the medical sciences and drug development. The fact that America produced half of the world's new medicines over the last ten years clearly demonstrates America's world leadership. Doubling the NIH's budget by 2003 will further strengthen America's leadership in these fields and create new medicines for patients while generating new high-wage jobs.

Finally, we wish to praise you for your superb leadership of the Biomedical Research Caucus. We have attended many of the educational events you have sponsored and believe they have contributed to the developing consensus in favor of doubling NIH's research budget.

If I or my staff at BIO can help you in your efforts to double the NIH budget, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,
CHUCK LUDLAM,
Vice President for Government Relations.

THE AD HOC GROUP FOR
MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE W. GEKAS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GEKAS: On behalf of the over 300 member organizations of the Ad Hoc Group for Medical Research Funding, I write to commend you for your leadership in the effort to double the NIH budget in five years. The Ad Hoc Group firmly believes that if our nation is to continue to translate the promise of scientific discovery into a reality of better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans, Congress must maintain the commitment begun last year to double the NIH budget.

Our investment in medical research over the past decades has produced a revolution in science that has transformed the practice of medicine and significantly improved the health of our citizens. The explosion of new scientific knowledge has led to major strides in our understanding of disease at the cellular and molecular levels. This in turn has catalyzed the development of new strategies for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease. The following are some recent examples.

NIH-sponsored research has led to the approval of tamoxifen—a drug used for twenty years to treat breast cancer—as an agent to prevent breast cancer in women at high risk for the disease. Tamoxifen reduced the incidence of breast cancer for five years by 49 percent in women at high risk for the disease. A new prevention study, scheduled to begin this year, will examine whether raloxifene also is effective in preventing invasive breast cancer in women who have not had the disease.

Autoimmune diseases, such as diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, and lupus, are conditions where the immune system attacks the body's own cells and tissues. Basic scientists have discovered the mechanisms by which common infections can trigger some autoimmune diseases by producing proteins that are normally found in the body. Understanding how this "molecular mimicry"

works may allow us to prevent the devastating effects of autoimmune diseases.

One-third of world's population is infected with the bacterium that causes tuberculosis (TB). Scientists supported by the NIH and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention collaborated in a study that revealed a new preventive strategy to reduce the incidence of TB in HIV-infected patients. They found that a six-month course of the anti-TB drug isoniazid reduced the risk of TB by 67 percent in HIV-infected adults.

In addition, new avenues in the development of therapeutics have opened, including new hope for the treatment and cure of Hepatitis C and the first evidence that the kidney damage from diabetes is reversible.

Advances such as these in the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease depend on the development and testing of new ideas, which requires resources. Our nation still faces many health challenges. The more new ideas our scientists can generate and explore, the quicker we can conquer these challenges.

Despite the progress that had been made, infectious diseases still pose a significant threat as new human pathogens are discovered and previously known and controlled microorganisms acquire antibiotic resistance.

The baby boom generation is aging with the number of Americans over 65 years of age expected to double in the next 30 years. Research on chronic diseases as osteoporosis, arthritis, Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases, and heart disease will help reduce the enormous economic and social burdens on our nation.

Today, there are still too many infants and children who suffer needlessly from diseases, such as asthma and cystic fibrosis, injury, abuse or a host of societal problems. More research is needed to identify and promote the prerequisites of optimal physical, mental, and behavioral growth and development through infancy, childhood and adolescence.

The U.S. population is growing increasingly diverse. Eliminating or reducing the disproportionate share of disease and disability among minorities and the socioeconomically disadvantaged will improve the quality of life for many and also benefit the U.S. economically.

The Ad Hoc Group firmly supports the effort to double the NIH budget by FY 2003. As a second step toward the bipartisan goal of doubling the NIH budget, the Ad Hoc Group endorses an FY 2000 appropriation of \$18 billion, a \$2.3 billion (15%) increase, for the NIH.

Attached is a list of the more than 300 organizations that have endorsed the Ad Hoc Group proposal for FY 2000. The patients, families, scientists, health care professionals, and companies represented by these organizations and institutions stand ready to work with you and all of the supporters of medical research on Capitol Hill to realize the goal of doubling the NIH budget by FY 2003.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. KNAPP, PH.D.,
Chairman.

Attachment.

ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE FY 2000
PROPOSAL AS OF JUNE 21, 1999

Academy of Clinical Laboratory Physicians and Scientists.

Academy of Osseointegration.

Academy of Radiology Research.

Administrators of Internal Medicine.

Advocate Health Care.

Albany Medical College.

Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Alliance for Aging Research.

Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation.

Alzheimer's Association.

Ambulatory Pediatric Association.

American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.

American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

American Academy of Dermatology.

American Academy of Neurology.

American Academy of Ophthalmology.

American Academy of Optometry.

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons.

American Academy of Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery.

American Academy of Pediatrics.

American Academy of Physical Medicine—Rehabilitation.

American Association for Cancer Research.

American Association for Dental Research.

American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases.

American Association for the Surgery of Trauma.

American Association of Anatomists.

American Association of Chairs of Departments of Psychiatry.

American Association of Colleges of Nursing.

American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine.

American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy.

American Association of Dental Schools.

American Association of Immunologists.

American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists.

American Association of Neurological Surgeons.

American Board of Pediatrics.

American Cancer Society.

American Chemical Society.

American College of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.

American College of Clinical Pharmacology.

American College of Neuropsychopharmacology.

American College of Physicians—American Society of Internal Medicine.

American College of Preventive Medicine.

American College of Rheumatology.

American Federation for Medical Research.

American Foundation for AIDS Research.

American Gastroenterological Association.

American Geriatrics Society.

American Heart Association.

American Lung Association.

American Medical Association.

American Neurological Association.

American Optometric Association.

American Pediatric Society.

American Physiological Society.

American Podiatric Medical Association.

American Psychiatric Association.

American Psychological Society.

American Psychiatric Nurses Association.

American Red Cross.

American Social Health Association.

American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.

American Society for Bone and Mineral Research.

American Society for Cell Biology.

American Society for Clinical Nutrition.

American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics.

American Society for Investigative Pathology.

American Society for Microbiology.

American Society for Nutritional Sciences.

American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.

American Society for Reproductive Medicine.

American Society of Addiction Medicine.

American Society of Clinical Oncology.

American Society of Hematology.

American Society of Human Genetics.

American Society of Nephrology.

American Society of Pediatric Nephrology.

American Society of Transplantation.

American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.

American Thoracic Society.

American Urogynecologic Society.

American Urological Association.

American Veterinary Medical Association.

Americans for Medical Progress.

America's Blood Centers.

Association for Academic Surgery.

Association for Medical School Pharmacology.

Association for Research in Vision and Ophthalmology.

Association of Academic Departments of Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery.

Association of Academic Health Centers.

Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries.

Association of Academic Physiatrists.

Association of American Cancer Institutes.

Association of American Medical Colleges.

Association of American Universities.

Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges.

Association of Chairs of Physiology Departments.

Association of Independent Research Institutes.

Association of Medical and Graduate Departments of Biochemistry.

Association of Medical School Immunology and Microbiology Chairs.

Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs.

Association of Medical School Psychologists.

Association of Minority Health Professions Schools.

Association of Ohio Children's Hospitals.

Association of Pathology Chairs.

Association of Population Centers.

Association of Professors of Dermatology.

Association of Professors of Medicine.

Association of Program Directors in Internal Medicine.

Association of Schools of Public Health.

Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry.

Association of Subspecialty Professors.

Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine.

Association of University Anesthesiologists.

Association of University Professors of Neurology.

Association of University Professors of Ophthalmology.

Association of University Radiologists.

Barnes Jewish Hospital.

Baylor College of Medicine.

Berkshire Medical Center.

Biotechnology Industry Organization.

Campaign for Medical Research.

Cancer Research Foundation of America.

Carolinas Medical Center.

Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine.

Children's Hospital Medical Center of Cincinnati.

Children's Hospital of Michigan.

Children's Hospital of Wisconsin.

Children's Mercy Hospital.

Children's National Medical Center.

Citizens for Public Action.

CJ Foundation for SIDS.

Clerkship Directors in Internal Medicine.

Coalition for American Trauma Care.

Coalition for Heritable Disorders of Connective Tissue.

Coalition of Patient Advocates for Skin Disease Research.

College on Problems of Drug Dependence.

Columbia University.

Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Conference of Boston Teaching Hospitals.
Congress of Neurological Surgeons.
Consortium of Social Science Associations.
Cooley's Anemia Foundation.
Corporation for the Advancement of Psychiatry.
Council of Emergency Medicine Residency Directors.
Council of Graduate Schools.
Council of University Chairs in Obstetrics and Gynecology.
Creighton University School of Medicine.
Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America.
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.
Dartmouth Medical School.
Digestive Disease National Coalition.
Duke University Medical Center.
Dystonia Medical Research Foundation.
Eastern Virginia Medical School.
Emory University School of Medicine.
Emory University, Woodruff Health Sciences Center.
ESA, Inc.
Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.
Federation of Animal Science Societies.
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.
Friends of the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research.
Friends of the National Library of Medicine.
Genetics Society of America.
Glaucoma Research Foundation.
H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute.
Hackensack University Medical Center—Institute for Biomedical Research.
Huntington Memorial Hospital.
Illinois Neurofibromatosis, Inc.
Immune Deficiency Foundation.
Indiana University School of Medicine.
Inova Institute of Research and Education.
International Psycho-Oncology Society.
Johns Hopkins University.
Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
Joint Council of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology.
Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International.
Krasnow Institute for Advanced Studies.
Lehigh Valley Hospital and Health Network.
Louisiana State University Medical Center—Shreveport.
Loyola University—Chicago, Stritch School of Medicine.
Lymphoma Research Foundation of America.
Magee Womens Hospital and Research Institute.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Medical College of Georgia.
Medical College of Ohio.
Medical Library Association.
Medical University of South Carolina.
Michigan State University College of Human Medicine.
Morehouse School of Medicine.
Mount Sini School of Medicine.
National Alliance for Eye and Vision Research.
National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.
National Alopecia Areata Foundation.
National Association for Biomedical Research.
National Association of Children's Hospitals.
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
National Caucus of Basic Biomedical Sciences Chairs.
National Coalition for Cancer Research.
National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.
National Foundation for Ectodermal Dysplasias.
National Health Council.
National Jewish Medical and Research Center.
National Marfan Foundation.
National Medical Association.
National Multiple Sclerosis Society.
National Organization for Rare Disorders.
National Osteoporosis Foundation.
National Perinatal Association.
National Sleep Foundation.
National Vitiligo Foundation.
Neurofibromatosis Inc., Mass Bay Area.
New York University.
New York University Medical Center.
Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine.
Oakwood Healthcare System.
Oncology Nursing Society.
Orthopaedic Research Society.
Palmetto Health Alliance.
Paralyzed Veterans of America.
Parkinson's Action Network.
Parkland Health and Hospital System.
Pharmaceutical Research Manufacturers of America.
Plastic Surgery Research Council.
Population Association of America.
Primary Health Systems, Inc.
Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago.
ResearchAmerica.
Research Society on Alcoholism.
RESOLVE, the National Infertility Association.
Rush Medical College.
Rush Presbyterian—St. Luke's Medical Center.
Rush University.
Saint Francis Hospital and Medical Center.
Scleroderma Foundation Central New Jersey Chapter.
Scleroderma Research Foundation.
Scott and White Memorial Hospital.
Society for Academic Continuing Medical Education.
Society for Academic Emergency Medicine.
Society for Gynecologic Investigation.
Society for Investigative Dermatology.
Society for Neuroscience.
Society for Pediatric Research.
Society for the Advancement of Women's Health Research.
Society of Academic Anesthesiology Chairs.
Society of Gynecologic Oncologists.
Society of Surgical Chairs.
Society of Toxicology.
Society of University Surgeons.
Society of University Urologists.
Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.
Stanford University of Medicine.
State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences.
State University of New York at Stony Brook Health Center School of Medicine.
State University of New York Health Science Center of Brooklyn.
State University of New York Health Science Center at Syracuse.
Stratton VA Medical Center.
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Alliance.
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center.
The American Dermatological Association.
The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.
The Endocrine Society.
The Genome Action Coalition.
The George Washington University Medical Center.
The Jeffrey Modell Foundation.
The Protein Society.
Thomas Jefferson University.
Tourette Syndrome Association, Inc.
Tufts University School of Medicine.
Tulane University School of Medicine.
United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology.
University of Alabama at Birmingham.
University of Alabama School of Medicine.
University of California, Davis, School of Medicine.
University of California, San Diego, School of Medicine.
University of California, San Francisco, School of Medicine.
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine.
University of Colorado School of Medicine.
University of Florida Health Science Center and College of Medicine.
University of Iowa.
University of Kentucky Center—College of Medicine.
University of Louisville.
University of Maryland School of Medicine.
University of Massachusetts Medical School.
University of Massachusetts Memorial Medical Center.
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey.
University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey—New Jersey Medical School.
University of Miami School of Medicine.
University of Michigan Medical School.
University of Missouri Hospitals and Clinics.
University of Missouri—Kansas City School of Medicine.
University of Nevada School of Medicine.
University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences.
University of Puerto Rico.
University of Rochester Medical Center.
University of Alabama College of Medicine.
University of South Carolina School of Medicine.
University of South Dakota School of Medicine.
University of Tennessee, Memphis.
University of Texas-Houston Medical School.
University of Utah School of Medicine.
University of Washington Academic Medical Center.
UPMC Health System.
Vanderbilt University Medical Center.
Virginia Commonwealth University.
Wake Forest University School of Medicine.
Wayne State University School of Medicine.
Weill-Cornell Medical College.
Wright State University School of Medicine.
Yale University School of Medicine.

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE
FOR PUBLIC POLICY,
Bethesda, MD, June 22, 1999.

Hon. GEORGE GEKAS,
United House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GEKAS. On behalf of the Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy, representing 25,000 basic biomedical researchers, thank you for your leadership in organizing a Special Order on June 22 to discuss doubling the NIH budget in five years. We also thank you for introducing H. Res. 89, which calls for the same.

We wish to recognize your outstanding efforts through the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus to educate the Congress about the National Institutes of Health and its ability to effectively utilize a 15%, \$2 billion increase in this year's appropriation. We recognize that under current budget caps it will be difficult to achieve this goal, but we are confident that through your leadership and that of Congressman Porter, health research will be accelerated by this visionary investment.

As you well know, our country leads the world in biological science, enabled by a far-sighted national policy of federal funding for

research at our Nation's colleges and universities through the NIH and other agencies. The NIH is the major source of funds for critical research in laboratories throughout the U.S., on Alzheimer's disease, cancer, diabetes, AIDS and many other devastating diseases. This investment will provide a significant boost to those important efforts by translating the promise of scientific discovery into better health.

Through this second down payment towards doubling the NIH budget, we look forward to enhanced research in some of the research areas that have been presented at the Congressional Biomedical Research Caucus briefings this year. For instance, Dr. Robert Langer discussed "designer tissues". It was clear from his presentation that we are on the threshold of major discoveries that will enable the development of human tissue that will benefit those who have been injured or born with certain disabilities. Similarly, the discussion of hearing and deafness by Dr. A. James Hudspeth demonstrates how quickly treatments are moving forward from research to application in this area. It is our hope that through the 1999 Caucus briefing series, Members will see the great need for funding this important work.

Thank you for your support of biomedical research and basic science.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC S. LANDER, PH.D.,

Chair, Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy, Member, The Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research, Professor of Biology, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Director, The Whitehead/MIT Center for Genome Research.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) who is one of the cochairs of our Biomedical Research Caucus.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding and also want to commend him for convening this special order.

I want to, Madam Speaker, rise today in strong support of H. Res. 89 which was a sense of the House Resolution that the House of Representatives should provide an additional \$2 billion for the National Institutes of Health budget for the fiscal year 2000. This \$2 billion additional investment would be the second down payment on a 5-year effort to double the NIH's budget.

As one of the four cochairs of the Congressional Biomedical Caucus, I have strongly supported providing maximum resources for biomedical research conducted at the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense research budget. This \$2 billion investment in NIH's budget will help save lives and improve our international competitiveness. Our Nation's biomedical research is the envy of the world, but we must continue this investment to ensure that we maintain this preeminence.

This resolution would help to ensure more scientists have the resources they need to conduct cutting-edge research. Today, only one-third of NIH peer-reviewed, merit-based grants are funded. This additional investment would help us increase the number of grants awarded each year and ensure that young scientists continue to have the funds they need to discover new treatments for such life-threatening dis-

eases as heart disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's, cancer and AIDS.

For many Americans, these life-threatening diseases are a very real challenge they face each day. Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with a remarkable young woman from Houston, Texas who lives in my district, Miss Caroline Rowley, who is fighting to control her juvenile diabetes. Caroline is 9 years old and must monitor and maintain her blood sugar every day to prevent life-threatening complications. In our meeting, Caroline told me how often she must prick her fingers every day in order to monitor the insulin level in her body. If she does not maintain her insulin, she can go into hypoglycemic shock and must be rushed to the emergency room to prevent complications. Clearly, Caroline believes that doubling the NIH's budget would help find a cure for her juvenile diabetes and result in a better life for her and millions of other children. I can just say as a father of two young daughters, the very sight of having to see a young girl, or any young child, have to go through this on a daily basis is not one that I cherish, and I think it is every reason why we should work hard to try and defeat that crippling disease.

I am also convinced that doubling the NIH's budget can be used wisely and will produce impressive results in biomedical research. The NIH budget currently supports the work of more than 50,000 scientists within the United States, yet many of these scientists are struggling to keep the research funding they currently receive. In this age of managed care, our Nation's teaching hospitals and academic health centers are facing challenges in meeting their mission of providing high quality care in a research-based setting. Conducting cutting-edge clinical research requires additional resources to help pay for the clinical trials and protocols conducted at academic health centers. Yet many managed care health plans are not willing to pay for these added costs. The NIH is critically important to helping our Nation's premier research centers to continue to fulfill their missions of high quality health care in an academic setting.

I also believe that investment in biomedical research is cost-effective for taxpayers. A recent National Science Foundation study found that government investments in research and development has produced big results, totaling about \$60 billion a year. This study found that more than 70 percent of scientific papers identify government funding, not private research funding, as critical to new patents and biomedical discoveries.

This legislation is also consistent with the recommendations of our Nation's scientists. The Federation of American Societies of Experimental Biology recommend an NIH budget of \$18 billion, an increase of 15 percent above this year's budget of \$15.6 billion. This resolution would provide \$2 billion

more for the NIH, well on our way to meeting our goal of doubling the NIH budget over the 5-year period.

I also believe that investing in NIH helps our economy to grow. For every dollar spent on research and development, our national output is permanently increased by 50 cents or more each year. The government funds the basic research which biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies use to create therapies and treatments for cancer, diabetes and heart disease, to name just a few.

As the representative of the Texas Medical Center, one of our Nation's premier medical research centers, I have seen firsthand that this investment is yielding promising new therapies and treatments for all Americans. Earlier this year, it was announced that Baylor College of Medicine in my district will be one of three centers around the Nation that will map the human genome and accelerate the time line for completion of this project. With this new genetic map, researchers hope to understand the genetic basis for disease and provide new therapies by fixing genetic abnormalities.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I coauthored an amendment to add \$2 billion to the NIH budget for fiscal year 2000. Although this amendment was not successful, I believe it is critically important to continue to remind our colleagues of the potential for successes with more investment in biomedical research. For many families, maximizing the NIH budget is an important part of their effort to fight and beat chronic diseases such as heart disease and diabetes. Recent NIH-sponsored research has shown that we have identified some of the genes responsible for diseases such as Huntington's disease and cystic fibrosis. As we learn more about the molecular basis for disease, we can bring new tools to defeat diseases and save lives.

As part of the Congressional Biomedical Caucus, we have also sponsored numerous meetings to discuss biomedical topics in Congress.

□ 1715

These highly successful luncheons have helped to educate Congress and staff about cutting edge research and being conducted through NIH-sponsored grants. With this new understanding, Congress can learn exactly how their investment is being used and where to focus new resources. I strongly urge the House of Representatives to support and become a cosponsor of H. Res. 89, legislation that would provide \$2 billion more for the NIH budget as part of the Fiscal Year 2000 process. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

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

Before I recognize the next one of our colleagues, I want to do some house-keeping here.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEKAS. We have been joined by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) who is in his own way a leader in various fields in health care and who joins us for this effort for which we are grateful. I yield to him.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. I am also pleased to participate in this special order and support of doubling the NIH budget. Last year my colleagues will remember we were successful in our efforts to increase funding for the NIH. We all know how valuable the research being conducted by this institution is to our Nation's future, including its economic well-being. Advances in medical research to prevent, cure, or at least minimize the degree of financial devastation caused by such diseases is reason enough for us to fund this vital research project.

As my colleagues know, I would like to speak from a little parochial point of view, from Florida's point of view. I know how many of my constituents know how important NIH is, and in fact in 1998 the Sixth Congressional District in Florida received \$53 million in funding from NIH. I want to share with my colleagues the results of an unreleased poll that came through the Research America and Alliance for Discoveries in Health. This results, I think, which I am going to speak on are pretty much conclusive and support my colleague from Pennsylvania and what he is trying to do, and I commend him for his long term effort on this project to make the public aware how important NIH is and how important this research is.

When I asked the people in the poll: Do we receive value for Federal dollars spent on medical research, 65 percent said we do get value for dollars spent. Fifteen percent responded they do not know, while 20 percent said we do not receive a value for dollars spent. When I asked: Do you support, and this is a basic thrust here, oppose a proposal to double total national spending on government sponsored medical research over 5 years, the results were very positive. In fact, I have a little graph here. From the spring of 1998 through the spring of 1999 the people who supported this doubling rose from 60 percent in the spring of 1998. In the summer of 1998 it went to 63 percent. In the spring of 1999 it went to 68 percent. So it is pretty conclusive when you talk to people in Florida how they feel about supporting or opposing a proposal to double national spending on government sponsored medical research. They overwhelmingly support it with 68 percent. When asked if Florida is a leader in medical research, the results are not quite so stellar. Thirty-six percent

think Florida is a leader while 36 percent in Florida leads moderately. Seventeen percent said they do not even know, and 11 percent responded that they did not believe Florida was a leader. When I asked how important is it for Florida to be a leader in medical research, 93 percent responded that it is very, very important, and that is remarkable.

I agree with my fellow Floridians, and that is why I am here tonight, and that is why I am a cosponsor and supporter of the resolution to double NIH funding.

I also want to place in the RECORD an article by Wayne McCall who is a neighbor of mine. He is President of the National Alumni Association in which he talks all about this funding. So I would like to put this article into the RECORD:

[From the Alumni Scope]

WE CAN'T AFFORD TO LIMIT UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

Some in Florida feel that state university faculty should focus primarily on their role as teachers. They feel research is secondary—if not a complete waste of time. They argue that research, by its very nature, is successful only through inefficient and exorbitant expenditures of time, energy and money.

Such a view is short sighted. Research is critical to the future of our country and the world. The majority of the world's technological and medical breakthroughs are founded on university-based research. New ideas link university scientists and scholars to businesses. Today's scientific breakthrough achieved through university research becomes tomorrow's miracle drug.

Creative activities are an essential link in the university's mission of teaching, research and service.

And, the University of Florida excels in research. In 1992, its faculty attracted more than \$235 million in research contracts and grants. The College of Engineering, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences and College of Liberal Arts and Sciences won major portions, as did medical researchers in UF's Health Science Center.

The health center's \$57-million-per-year research program is a vital seedbed of discoveries that yields leads for improved diagnostic tests and treatments for disease. Research findings during 1992 and 1993, reported in many of the world's leading scientific journals, include potential advances for better health care for us all.

For example, UF researchers have successfully restored limited limb movement in cats with spinal cord damage. A UF neuroscientist has found evidence that structural abnormalities in the brain region covering language comprehension may be linked to dyslexia. Florida scientists recently discovered a method to deliver hormones that govern communication between the brain and body cells through the blood-brain barrier to aid treatment of certain brain diseases, including Alzheimer's.

Perhaps the most exciting development in the university's medical research mission is the new UF Brain Institute. An \$18-million federal grant has been awarded and will be matched with other funds to construct a \$58-million facility in which scientists will work to probe the mysteries of the brain.

There are countless other examples of economic and consumer research, agricultural advances, discoveries in chemistry, psychology and engineering that help keep us more productive, healthier and safer.

Historically, Florida has gotten more quality from its universities for less money than any other state in the country. But this accomplishment is in danger if Florida's legislative leaders continue their recent trend of failing to fund higher education adequately. Since 1989, UF alone has lost more than \$50 million in state funding. By the time you read this, the 1993 legislative session may have ended, and that toll could be even higher.

In a state with the fourth-largest population and the fifth-largest economy in the country, Florida's legislative leaders must protect what previous generations have built. University research is an important and worthwhile part of that investment.

WAYNE MCCALL,

President, National Alumni Association.

This article points out that the many success stories in the State of Florida in university based research, none is more important nor more exciting than development in the university's medical research mission than the Brain Institute that is at the University of Florida in which scientists will work to search out the entire mysteries of the brain.

So, my colleague from Pennsylvania is doing yeoman service here in his effort to double the NIH budget, and, as he knows, I and others have been a long advocate, that the dollars we provide for research today will reap vast savings in the future, and I think that is a key to this whole solution. That is why I am also original cosponsor of the gentleman's biomedical research revitalization resolution of 1999, and I commend him for his efforts here, and I hope more of my colleagues will support him this year, in the 106th Congress. We can make an effort to accomplish this task.

Mr. GEKAS. We thank the gentleman for his contribution to this special order.

We now recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) who has been vocally in support of our efforts ever since he has been in the Congress, so we yield to him.

Mr. LAZIO. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership, for allowing us to display our commitment to the doubling of the National Institute of Health budget, including the budget for the National Cancer Institute. I want to say this is one of the most exciting times to live in America. We have an explosion of research that brings great promise. We are seeing that through the efforts of the National Cancer Institute new efforts in terms of mapping the human genome being through the human genome project. Angiogenesis analysis and inhibitors, the increase of clinical trials and molecular therapy are all exciting and promising areas of discovery. If we can just reach out and redouble our efforts, we can bring the promise of a cure and of our understanding that much closer than would otherwise be the case.

I also want to send acknowledgements to somebody very close to me, my wife, Patricia, who happens to be a

breast cancer advocacy unit leader who it is our anniversary today as well, and she is back in New York, but I want to commend her for her great work on behalf of cancer victims throughout our region.

Let us focus, if we can right now, on the invaluable benefits that biomedical research makes to the quality of life and to the promise of preserving human life. It makes necessary the sustained significant commitment to research efforts at NIH, our Nation's premier research institution, and reaffirms the commitment and the professionalism of the great NCI team headed by Dr. Richard Clauzner. Increasing the budget of the NCI will enable extraordinary opportunities for research success and real progress in cancer prevention, detection, treatment and survivorship. Current Federal funding for cancer research, however, is inadequate to make the kind of difference in the lives and the one in two American men and one in three American women who will develop cancer over his or her lifetime. We must dramatically increase our Federal investment in cancer research a relatively paltry 2.3 percent of the total cost of cancer in these United States at a mere \$10.75 per person.

Cancer is quickly becoming the number one killer in America. Five 747 jumbo jets crashing every day for a year equals the 563,000 Americans who will die this year from cancer. Conservative estimates project that by 2010 and 11 short years cancer will become the leading cause of death as incidents increases 29 percent and mortality 25 percent and an annual cost of over \$200 billion. These statistics indicate that much more aggressive effort is required to combat cancer and to reduce human suffering and lives lost to cancer, and yet while cancer is a greater threat than ever, only 31 percent of approved cancer research projects receive funding today. We must seize this opportunity to quicken the pace of research by funding the most research initiatives possible, and we know what that brings:

For example, I have had the pleasure of holding forums as the founder and chairman of the House Cancer Awareness Working Group, and I want to thank so many Members for playing a role in this. We know that through a commitment through NCI for childhood cancer we have increased mortality rates for one of the most devious and troubling forms of cancer, and that is cancer for effecting children. But we also know by getting children into NIH protocol hospitals and by ensuring that they are in clinical trials we are saving more children. We need to bring that same promise to adults.

We must do it for Enri Nuss of New York and all those like her who are fighting lymphoma today. We must do it for the Judy Lewises of the world who are fighting breast cancer today. We must do it for Jeffrey Theobald, a young man I am proud to have called a

friend who died just recently from cancer at the young age of 8. We do it for all the family members who suffer with cancer and are victims on a daily basis.

The costs, both human and economic of cancer in this country are catastrophic. Our national investment in cancer research is the key to reduce spiraling health care costs. Research has shown that for every dollar invested in research, \$13 in health care costs is saved; for every dollar invested in research, \$13 saved. But it is more important to give cancer victims and their families the peace of mind that everything possible is being done to cure this devastating disease.

I want to thank my colleagues here in Congress who have been advocating for increased funding, and particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) who has been just a stalwart and a leader on this issue, and I am so pleased and proud to serve with him over the last few years. I am glad that we are going to resist the President's recommended budget on NIH who advocates a mere 2.4 percent increase this year for the National Cancer Institute and a 2.1 percent for NIH as a whole. This is no time to withhold resources for medical research, Mr. President.

I want to concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and encourage all of our colleagues to support doubling of the budgets of NIH and NCI because it is the right thing to do for America, and it is the right thing to do for the economy, it is the right thing to do to restrain health care costs, and certainly the right thing to do for America's families and the victims of cancer throughout our country.

I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to join you today and to be your partner and to discuss this vitally important topic.

Mr. GEKAS. We welcome your continued contribution, and we thank you for your participation today.

We now yield just for a moment before we get to the gentleman from Florida to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) who wants to make an introduction.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just want to say that I have the Russell Thomas children with me, Becca, Anna, Rachel and their niece, and they are learning about democracy firsthand, and thank you for your courtesy to let me introduce them.

Mr. GEKAS. By all means, and welcome the young people because part of what we are discussing here today right now has to do with maintaining healthy lives for the children of our country.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. And you are doing an outstanding job in that.

Mr. GEKAS. We thank you for that.

And now I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) who has been waiting patiently in the wings and has heard our colleagues who have participated in this project proceed. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you for recognizing me for just a few minutes to talk about

the subject that you are involved in here tonight, and that is adequate funding for research. I think it is very fitting that I be here tonight representing the State of Florida, and the State of Florida today is in mourning. We are in mourning for the wife of our Lieutenant Governor who passed away at 2:20 on Sunday afternoon, Mary Brogan. Anyone who knew Mary Brogan knew she was a fighter, knew she was always at her husband's side even when he was the Commissioner of Education in the State of Florida and through his election as Lieutenant Governor with our current Governor Jeb Bush. Today they held a memorial service in our State capital for Mary Brogan. Mary Brogan fought breast cancer. How important it is that we continue our fight for research, for adequate funding, for the National Institute of Health, for cancer research, so that we do not have to have another memorial service for another beautiful lady like Mary Brogan. She was only 44 years old, but she left behind many great memories. She even, when she was diagnosed with breast cancer and even before, became a strong advocate for research, for work such as you are dedicated here tonight.

□ 1730

We miss Mary Brogan. We salute her fine work, her courage right to the end, and I think it is a fitting memorial to Mary Brogan and others who have been victims of cancer that we pick up the responsibility of seeing that there is adequate funding, that there is adequate research, and that these agencies go forward to find a cure for a horrible disease.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for his work, for his efforts tonight, and for allowing me to spend just a moment memorializing a wonderful lady with a wonderful smile who I will always remember.

I am grateful for the work of the gentleman.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for his comments.

The chart that we have here, before I introduce the next speaker on our list here, is entitled, The Promise of NIH Research for Health. Every one of our colleagues spoke about a particular subject in which they were interested or in which they saw progress, and that is what the NIH does. Every single investigation that the NIH conducts into a known disease, or an unknown disease for that matter, results in improvement in our body politic as far as the health of our citizens is concerned and helps preserve and protect our treasury as well.

Just to give an idea of some of the subject matters that were touched upon by our colleagues, earlier detection of cancer with new molecular technologies, that falls right into place with some of the subject matter; medications for the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction; new ways to relieve

pain; earlier detection of cancer, which we heard so much about incidents of cancer from our colleagues, with new molecular technologies, et cetera. Everything that NIH does touches upon every family.

The next chart, please. In the meantime, I will offer into evidence the written documentation that backs the charts that we are presenting here.

History has demonstrated that government initiatives and support for research and development can reduce the time required to bring benefits to the American public. The benefits of this national investment in biomedical and behavioral research are realized on several levels: reducing pain and suffering; improving the quality of life; advancing the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease and disability; and contributing to a stronger economy through health care cost savings and increased productivity of our citizens.

1998 health care costs for the major diseases are estimated as follows: Heart Disease: \$128 billion; Cancer: \$104 billion; Alzheimer's Disease: \$138 billion; Mental Disorders: \$148 billion; Arthritis: \$65 billion; Depression: \$44 billion; Stroke: \$30 billion; and Osteoporosis: \$10 billion.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) plays a critical role in facilitating innovations that lead to significant reductions in health care costs. In a series of case studies published in 1993, the NIH identified 34 examples of clinical trials and applied research studies that have resulted in savings in treatment costs and reductions in lost productivity due to disease, disability, and premature death. Together, the examples yield an estimated annual potential savings ranging from \$8.3 billion to \$12 billion.

THE PROMISE OF NIH RESEARCH FOR HEALTH

Identify genetic predispositions and risk factors for heart attack and stroke.

New approaches to treating and preventing diabetes and its complications.

Genomic sequencing of disease-causing organisms to identify new targets for drug development.

Earlier detection of cancer with new molecular technologies.

New ways to relieve pain.

Diagnostic imaging for brain tumors, cancers, chronic illnesses.

Assess drugs for their safety and efficacy in children.

Medications for the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction.

Rigorous evaluation of CAM practices (complementary and alternative medicine).

Clinical trials database—help public gain access to information about clinical trials.

Understand the role of infections in chronic diseases.

Vaccines for preventing HIV infection, middle ear infection, typhoid, dysentery, TB, E. coli food contamination

Human genome sequence to assess predisposition to disease, predict responses to drugs and environmental agents, and design new drugs

New means of detecting and combating agents of bioterrorism

New ways to repair/replace organs, tissues, and cells damaged by disease and trauma

Understand and ameliorate health disparities

Improved interventions for lead poisoning in children

New interventions for neonatal hearing loss

Safer, more effective medications for depression and other mental illnesses

New approaches to preventing rejection of transplanted organs, tissues, cells

New treatments and preventive strategies for STDs (sexually transmitted diseases)

New approaches to restoring function after spinal cord injury

EMERGENCY FUNDS NEEDED FOR THE

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

THERE ARE SERIAL KILLERS LOOSE!

Killers also known as tuberculosis (TB), malaria and aids.

"These killers took six times as many lives in the past 50 years, as wars over the same period." (World Health Organization June, 1999 Report).

Victims of all infectious diseases: Number 1 killer in the world; number 3 killer in the U.S.; 11 million killed globally in 1998; and 180,000 killed in the U.S. in 1998.

"I am confident that a major pandemic will be repeated, even through the world is better equipped to deal with it." (Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg—Future Speaker at Biomedical Research Caucus Briefing on 10/20/99, "Biological Warfare.")

THE CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

We organized a biomedical research caucus ten years ago for the purpose of informing members and staff about the latest development in biomedical research and the treatment of diseases.

We now have nearly 100 members and have had 80 briefings.

First, Dr. Harold Varmus and now Dr. Michael Bishop, chancellor, University of California at San Francisco have been our advisors and recommended speakers and subjects to us.

We have covered a great number of topics, including cancer, alzheimer's, diabetes, learning disorders, and I want to include in the RECORD at this point the eight caucus topics we have scheduled for this year. And I will note that we will be hearing about stem cell research, heart failure and biology warfare.

These caucuses are sponsored by the Joint Steering Committee for Public Policy which is chaired by Dr. Eric Lander of the Whitehead Institute at MIT. Four scientific societies, the American Society for Cell Biology, the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, the Biophysical Society and the Genetics Society of America make up the steering committee.

Also, we have been offered the opportunity to bring these caucus briefings to interested people throughout the country through knowledge television broadcasts. This will provide cutting edge research information to our constituents so that they can understand the hard decisions we must make on NIH funding.

CONGRESSIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CAUCUS

1999 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

March 3, 1999—Designer Tissues, Robert Langer, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

March 24, 1999—Hearing & Deafness, A. James Hudspeth, The Rockefeller University.

April 21, 1999—Learning Disorders, Paula Tallal, Rutgers University.

May 19, 1999—The Sequence of the Worm Genome: What it Means for Human Biology, Martin Chalfie, Columbia University.

June 16, 1999—Nitric Oxide: The Serious Side of Laughing Gas, Solomon Snyder, The Johns Hopkins University.

September 15, 1999—The Potential of Stem Cell Research, John Gearhart, The Johns Hopkins University.

October 6, 1999—New Approaches to the Study of Heart Failure, Eric Olson, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center.

October 20, 1999—Biological Warfare, Joshua Lederberg, The Rockefeller University.

Before we go to the next one, we recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who himself has been a stalwart defender of the faith, as it were, in our efforts on behalf of doubling the funding for NIH.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding and congratulate him for organizing this particular discussion.

Everyone knows what a tremendous asset the National Institutes of Health has been to our Nation. It is truly one of the jewels of the research effort within this nation. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time for this particular discussion and for the comments that I have to make, because I wish to broaden the discussion, not just from the National Institutes of Health and their dependence upon biological knowledge but some of the background for that knowledge and where it comes from and how that relates to our research efforts today.

As we have heard, biological knowledge is in the midst of an explosion that is generating tremendous advances in our knowledge and technological capabilities, and particularly in developments for health care. Specifically, we are making very rapid progress in the tools that we have at our disposal for the treatment of disease and other medical afflictions.

The National Institutes of Health has, to a large extent, been our steward through this astounding growth phase of the life sciences. The leadership at NIH has been deliberate and patient in its investment in fundamental research projects which have matured to produce knowledge we can use to improve diagnostic tests, choose more effective treatments or even design new drugs to target specific diseases.

With the completion of the Human Genome Project, we may soon move toward a medical environment where particular forms of disease are treated with therapies customized to an individual's genetic makeup and clinical manifestations. However, the NIH has not been the only supporter of such novel and groundbreaking research. Nor has biomedical science been the sole source of our medical advances.

In fact, the recent surge in biological research has evolved through a synergistic relationship between all scientists, and that is the point I wish to make this evening. As a physicist, for example, I can point to a number of contributions from my field that have enhanced our biomedical capabilities in the laboratory and the doctor's office.

Significantly, the medical applications of these projects were not foreseen at the time they were funded and that illustrates the importance of supporting and sponsoring basic research, which eventually does result in such beneficial effects to the human race.

As an example, the discovery of x-rays, which is a curiosity over 100 years ago when discovered by Röntgen, as we know x-rays have tremendous medical applications today. It is hard to find any one of us who has not had numerous x-rays.

At the same time, what many of us do not know is that x-ray crystallography, which allows us to examine the details of protein structure as well as electromicroscopy, which allows us to look inside the cell and its working components, the organelles, both have been extremely important in also helping improve health care and diagnosis and treatment.

I have also described on the floor before another important tool, that is, Magnetic Resonance Imaging, MRI, which is a fascinating development because it shows the importance of basic research in very esoteric fields of physics.

In this particular case, nuclear magnetic resonance developed in the early 1950s, resulting in Nobel prizes for Ed Purcell and Felix Bloch, was a completely esoteric field, of interest only to those studying nuclear structure. It allows us to measure nuclear magnetic moments, electric quadrupole moments, as well as nuclear spins.

Another esoteric development at that time was developing data gathering and analysis techniques for discovering elementary particles in physics, totally unrelated esoteric fields within physics and yet they combine to result in MRI, which is the most advanced and superb diagnostic tool we have available today and certainly essential to the work done at NIH in other areas.

Beyond physics and chemistry, biology is dependent upon seemingly unrelated fields to support its growth. A prime example today is computer science. Digital analysis of tissue samples, rapid dissemination of information, both in the form of raw data between scientists and education information for public health uses, data bank compilation and analysis, and biological modeling programs, are all examples of how progress in biomedical research is sustained by growth in other scientific disciplines.

As was recommended in the Science Policy Report prepared by the Committee on Science last fall, adopted by them, and then adopted by this House as H. Res. 578, the Federal Government has an irreplaceable role to play in the Nation's basic research endeavors through stable and substantial funding reports.

I just want to make certain that everyone understands we have a responsibility to ensure that our cumulative research portfolio is balanced among the various disciplines, and I support Dr. Harold Varmus for his fine work in this and his recognition of our dependence upon many other sciences.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me to participate in this important discussion of the research priorities facing our nation as we enter the 21st century.

As we have heard, biological knowledge is in the midst of an explosion that is generating tremendous advances in our knowledge and technological capabilities. Specifically, we are making rapid progress in the tools that we have at our disposal for the treatment of disease and other medical afflictions.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) has, to a large extent, been our steward through this astounding growth phase in the life sciences. The leadership at NIH has been deliberate and patient in its investment in fundamental research projects which have matured to produce knowledge we can use to improve diagnostic tests, choose more effective treatments, or even design new drugs to target specific diseases. With the completion of the Human Genome Project, we may soon move toward a medical environment where particular forms of disease are treated with therapies customized to an individual's genetic make-up and clinical manifestations.

However, the NIH has not been the only supporter of such novel and groundbreaking research. Nor has biomedical science been the sole source of our medical advances. In fact, the recent surge in biological research has evolved through a synergistic relationship of all the sciences.

As a physicist, I can point to several contributions from my field that have enhanced our biomedical capabilities in the laboratory and the doctor's office. Significantly, the medical applications of these projects were not foreseen at the time they were funded. I have described one of these tools to you on this floor before, that of Magnetic Resonance Imaging—a result of studies in nuclear and particle physics—crystallography, which allows us to examine the details of protein structure, and electron microscopy, which allows us to look inside the cell at its working components, the organelles.

Beyond physics and chemistry, biology is dependent upon other seemingly unrelated fields to support its growth. A prime example today is computer science. Digital analysis of tissue samples, rapid dissemination of information (both in the form of raw data between scientists and education information for public health nurses), data bank compilation and analysis, and biological modeling programs are all examples of how progress in biomedical research is sustained by growth in other scientific disciplines.

As recommended in the Science Policy Report released by the Committee on Science last fall, and adopted by this body as H. Res. 578, the Federal Government has an irreplaceable role to play in the Nation's basic research endeavors through stable and substantial funding support. However, we also have a responsibility to ensure that our cumulative research portfolio is balanced among the disciplines to sustain the overall health of our research investment.

I would like to close with a quote from Dr. Harold Varmus, the Director of NIH. Speaking at the Centennial Meeting of the American Physical Society this past March, Dr. Varmus stated that "one of [his] convictions about medical research [was] that the NIH can wage an effective war on disease only if we—as a nation and a scientific community, not just a single agency—harness the energies of many disciplines, not just biology and medicine."

I agree with Dr. Varmus, and I also agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

GEKAS) and my other colleagues. We should capitalize on the advances which our past research investments are yielding in the health-related fields by increasing funding, but we must do so responsibly. We must not sacrifice today's fundamental research projects for quick advances in one field. Rather, we should concurrently nurture today's biomedical success while investing in tomorrow's unknown promises.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for yielding, I want to commend him for having this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the Members: America has always been up to the challenge, whether it was building the transcontinental railroad to unite our West Coast with the rest of the Nation after the civil war; putting a man on the moon; or soldiers coming back from a war; devising a GI bill; the interstate system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with the biggest challenge of all and that is the challenge that confronts each of us daily, and that is the challenge of disease. So I am proud to be a part of this effort in combatting it.

I did want to mention two people, Dr. Beatrice Hahn of UAB, who has actually, as a result of an NIH grant, traced over a 20-year period the origins of AIDS; and also Dr. Robert Castleberry and Dr. Peter Emmanuel, who have found the origin of a very rare form of childhood leukemia which only affects children under the age of 5. That is all as a result of NIH funding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention two teams of University of Alabama in Birmingham (UAB) researchers both of which have made progress in conquering or controlling two of our most prolific diseases, AIDS and Leukemia. The first team, led by Dr. Beatrice Hahn and her husband Dr. George Shaw, have waged a 20 year quest which resulted in the discovery of the origin of HIV-1.

THE ORIGIN OF HIV-1: UAB RESEARCHERS LEAD DISCOVERY EFFORT

(Synopsis Research News, Feb. 2, 1999)

UAB scientists have discovered the origin of Human-Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 (HIV-1), the virus that causes AIDS in humans. This finding by an international team of scientists led by Beatrice H. Hahn, MD, of UAB, solves a 20-year-old puzzle regarding the beginnings of the AIDS epidemic, which now afflicts some 30 million people worldwide. Dr. Hahn presented her study on January 31 at the 6th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections in Chicago. A paper detailing the discovery appears in the February 4 issue of the journal *Nature*.

Dr. Hahn, a professor of medicine and microbiology at UAB, is senior author of the paper. Feng Gao, MD, research assistant professor of medicine at UAB, is the paper's lead author.

The researchers identified a subspecies of chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes troglodytes*) native to West-Central Africa as the natural reservoir for HIV-1. "We have long suspected a virus from African primates to be the cause of human AIDS. However, exactly

which animal species was responsible was unknown," says Dr. Gao. Viruses related to HIV-1 had previously been found in chimpanzees and were given the designation SIVcpz (for Simian Immunodeficiency Virus). However, only three such infected animals were identified, and one of these harbored a virus so different from HIV-1 that most scientists questioned a direct relationship to the human virus.

SOPHISTICATED MOLECULAR TECHNIQUES

The recent breakthrough came when Dr. Hahn and her colleagues identified a fourth SIVcpz infected chimpanzee and used sophisticated molecular techniques to analyze all four viruses and the animals from which they were derived. The researchers found that three of the four SIVcpz strains came from chimpanzees that belonged to the *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* subspecies. The fourth virus strain, which was genetically divergent from the other three, came from an animal that belonged to a different chimpanzee subspecies, termed *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthi*, native to East Africa. The scientists then discovered that all known strains of HIV-1, including the major group M (responsible for the global AIDS epidemic), as well as groups N and O (found only in West-Central Africa), were closely related only to SIVcpz strains infecting *Pan troglodytes troglodytes*.

The puzzle's final piece was put in place when the researchers realized that the natural habitat for *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* overlaps precisely with the region in West-Central Africa where all three groups of HIV-1 (M, N, and O) were first recognized. Based on these findings, Dr. Hahn and her colleagues concluded that *Pan troglodytes troglodytes* is the origin of HIV-1 and has been the source of at least three independent cross-species transmission events of SIVcpz.

While the origin of the AIDS epidemic has been clarified, an explanation for why the epidemic arose in the mid-20th century, and not before, remains a matter of speculation. "Chimpanzees are frequently hunted for food, especially in West-Central Africa, and we believe that HIV-1 was introduced into the human population through exposure to blood during hunting and field dressing of these animals," says Dr. Hahn. And she believes that, while incidental transmissions of chimpanzee viruses to humans may have occurred throughout history, it was the socio-economic changes in post-World War II Africa that provided the particular circumstances leading to the spread of HIV-1 and the development of the AIDS epidemic. "Increasing urbanization, breakdown of traditional lifestyles, population movements, civil unrest, and sexual promiscuity are all known to increase the rates of sexually transmitted diseases and thus likely triggered the AIDS pandemic," adds Dr. Hahn.

"The importance of the current findings could be far reaching," says George Shaw, MD, PhD, a Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigator at UAB and a principal author of the paper. "Chimpanzees are identical to humans in over 98% of their genome, yet they appear to be resistant to the damaging effects of the AIDS virus on the immune system. By studying the biological reasons for this difference, we may be able to obtain important clues concerning the pathogenic basis of HIV-1 in humans and possibly new strategies for treating the disease more effectively." He further adds that a better understanding of exactly how the chimpanzee's immune system responds to SIVcpz infection compared to that of humans is likely to lead to the development of more effective strategies for an HIV-1 vaccine.

BUSH-MEAT TRADE

Finally, the authors of the paper note that transmission of SIVcpz could still be ongoing.

"The bushmeat trade—the hunting and killing of chimpanzees and other endangered animals for human consumption—is a common practice in West-Central Africa and represents an ongoing risk for humans," says Dr. Hahn. "Subsistence hunting has always been a part of West-Central African culture, but increasing logging activities in the past decade have provided unprecedented access to remote forest regions and have led to the commercialized killing of thousands of chimpanzees, gorillas, and monkeys. It took us 20 years to find where HIV-1 came from, only to realize that the very animal species that harbors it is at the brink of extinction."

"We cannot afford to lose these animals, either from an animal conservation or a medical investigative standpoint," she says. "It is quite possible that the chimpanzee, which has served as the source of HIV-1, also holds the clues to its successful control." Dr. Hahn and her colleagues hope that, as a consequence of their research, there will be additional measures taken to discourage chimpanzee poaching and to preserve this and other endangered primate species.

The team of scientists responsible for the AIDS discovery include UAB's Ya-Lu Chen, Cynthia Rodenburg, and Scott Michael, as well as Paul Sharp and Elizabeth Bailes from the University of Nottingham in England; David Robertson from the Laboratory of Structural and Genetic Information in Marseilles, France; Larry Cummins from the Southwest Foundation for Biomedical Research in Texas; Larry Arthur from the Frederick Cancer Research and Development Center in Frederick, Maryland; and Martine Peeters from the Laboratory of Retroviruses at ORSTOM in Montpellier, France.

The research was funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

The second team led by Dr. Peter Emanuel and Dr. Robert Castleberry, were involved in a 13 year effort to save our youngest citizens. Dr. Peter Emanuel at UAB is one of the first recipients of the K24 awards. The K24 award is an individual grant to aid in patient-oriented research and to allow the individual to mentor younger trainees. Dr. Emanuel and his colleague, Dr. Robert Castleberry, also at UAB, have been investigating for over a decade a rare but very deadly form of childhood leukemia which affects children under the age of five. Over their thirteen years of research in this disorder they have emerged as the world's leaders for this childhood leukemia, have led the investigations revealing the cellular and genetic mechanisms which cause this leukemia, and have discovered new therapies for this dreaded leukemia. As a result of this K24 award and other grants from the NIH and the Leukemia Society of America, Drs. Emanuel and Castleberry are about to start a new treatment protocol for this childhood leukemia which will cover all of North America. This treatment protocol will include chemotherapy, bone marrow transplantation, an experimental drug, and a vitamin A derivative, the latter two being developed as a result of discoveries made in the laboratory and taken to the patient bedside, so-called "Translational Research." This protocol, being conducted in close conjunction with the National Cancer Institute (NCI), will begin in the coming months. In addition, a North American registry and a web site for families and physicians alike are all in the works.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we want to acknowledge the presence of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), but we have no time to yield to him but we thank him for his participation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for another 3 hours so we can complete our message but I do not think I will get it. I see some heads shaking over there, but we thank everyone for the time that has been accorded us.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H. Res. 89, calling for a \$2,000,000,000 increase in the Federal investment in biomedical research in fiscal year 2000. Such an increase is vital to ensure that Congress fulfills the commitment it made last year to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health over five years.

I support H. Res. 89 with the hope that this increase will enable the National Institutes of Health to accelerate its research efforts in two particular areas that I feel have been neglected in the past. The first area is Ovarian Cancer. Each year more than 14,000 women die of Ovarian Cancer in the United States. There are no reliable methods for early detection so most women are diagnosed in the late stages when the five-year survival rate is only 15–20 percent. Even more tragic is the fact that a large portion of these women are only in their 20's and 30's when struck with this disease.

While the general population has grown more and more familiar with some cancers in recent years, ovarian cancer continues to fall below the radar of the general public. Until recently, little research was done exclusively on ovarian cancer, and to date, no early detection method for ovarian cancer has been developed. As a direct result, mortality rates for Ovarian Cancer have remained the same for the past 50 years. This is truly disheartening.

Such destruction compelled me to introduce legislation to address these research inadequacies. Every year since 1991, I have introduced legislation to promote and advance the ovarian cancer research and public education effort. In this Congress I have introduced H.R. 961, the Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999.

The Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999 has three components. First, it authorizes \$150 million of ovarian cancer research, one half to be spent on basic cancer research and one half on clinical trials and treatment. Of this research, the bill requires that priority be given to: developing a test for the early detection of ovarian cancer; research to identify precursor lesions and research to determine the manner in which benign conditions progress to malignant status; research to determine the relationship between ovarian cancer and endometriosis; and appropriate counseling, for women who participate as subjects in research, including counseling about the genetic basis of the disease.

Second, the bill provides for a comprehensive information program to provide the patients and the public information regarding screening procedures; information on the genetic basis to ovarian cancer; any known factors which increase risk of getting ovarian cancer; and any new treatments for ovarian cancer.

Finally, it requires that the National Cancer Advisory Board include one or more individuals who are at high risk for developing ovarian cancer.

It is time that we commit to ovarian cancer research the resources it deserves and give women a fighting chance in the war against ovarian cancer.

Doubling the budget for NIH will also strengthen our commitment to research in eye disease and vision disorders conducted at the National Eye Institute (NEI).

Given the demographics of the American population, blinding eye and vision disorders pose a tremendous challenge to our health care system and income support programs. By the year 2030, the elderly population in the United States is expected to double and more than 66 million Americans will be at risk for blinding eye disorders. Cataracts afflict 29 percent of Americans between ages 65 and 74; glaucoma afflicts over 2 million Americans and is the leading cause of blindness in African Americans; age-related macular degeneration afflicts 1.7 million Americans; and diabetic retinopathy is the most frequent cause of new blindness in our working population between the ages of 24 and 74. The incidence of these diseases promises to increase as the 'baby-boomers' age.

Today, eye and vision disorders cost society \$38 billion every year. This cost will grow exponentially unless existing research opportunities are vigorously pursued.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues to remain firmly committed to doubling the NIH budget, and furthermore, to ensure that the National Eye Institute receives a corresponding increase. Unfortunately, an analysis of funding trends over time indicates that the increases in the NEI budget have not kept pace with the increases received by the NIH. Since 1985, the NIH budget has grown by 60 percent while the NEI budget has grown by only 24 percent. When the appropriations over the past five years are averaged, the NEI has received the second smallest increase of the NIH programs. This is appalling given the serious diseases afflicting the aging eye. I am concerned about the commitment to eye and vision research reflected in this trend and have introduced legislation, H.R. 731, calling for a doubling of the NEI's budget over a five-year period. I invite all of my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this legislation.

When asked what sense do you fear losing the most, a majority of Americans respond that it is their vision. We, as representatives, have an obligation to make our commitment to eye and vision research at the NEI as strong as our commitment to the biomedical research enterprise at NIH. I urge my colleagues to support a 15 percent increase for NIH and NEI in Fiscal Year 2000, which will keep this Congress on track to doubling the budget of these institutions.

I urge my colleagues to make biomedical research a priority and support doubling the research efforts at the National Institutes of Health and to support increasing research efforts at the National Eye Institute and for Ovarian Cancer at the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, for arranging this Special Order, and I rise in strong support of Mr. GEKAS' House Resolution 89, calling for the doubling of the NIH budget by Fiscal Year 2003. As a member of the Biomedical Research Caucus and as someone who has personally benefited from the advances in biomedical research, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't an American today that has not benefited from the ground-break-

ing medical advances made by the National Institutes of Health. Future investments in NIH hold the key to long-awaited breakthroughs in life-threatening diseases and ailments that plague our society. Biomedical research is not only responsible for improving the lives of Americans and savings in health care, but it is also vital to our economic competitiveness. America is the leader in medical technology and that is why it is so important that we continue to invest in research so we do not lose our competitive advantage in this critical field.

In my district in Boston, several teaching hospitals and academic research facilities are leaders in producing biomedical research advances that have improved health care and the quality of life for patients, not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but throughout the world. This vital research produces new knowledge and technology, and it also provides the knowledge necessary for developing earlier, cost-effective diagnosis, less invasive surgical procedures, more effective rehabilitation and improved patient care. In 1998, Massachusetts teaching hospitals received \$421 million in funding from the NIH, which represents 47 percent of total NIH funding to independent teaching hospitals throughout the country. The NIH funding to teaching hospitals and universities in Massachusetts makes my home state the medical Mecca of the world.

Increasing the NIH budget will enable the medical community to continue its breakthroughs in finding cures for heart disease, AIDS, cancer, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, Alzheimer and many other life-threatening diseases. Increased funding is also critical to attracting our best and brightest students into the medical research field. It is vital that the government foster an environment in which medical research can flourish.

With increased investment in the NIH, more grants and research centers will be funded and NIH will be able to direct funds to previously underfunded areas of biomedical research. One area that I hope we will renew our nation's commitment to is eye and vision research. I am increasingly concerned about the impact of blinding disorders on our nation as America ages. One out of every four Americans 75 years of age and older suffers from serious vision loss which is not correctable with glasses. For example, macular degeneration is an irreversible loss of central vision and is the leading cause of visual impairment among the elderly. Also, diabetic retinopathy is an inevitable complication in patients with long term Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes and is the leading cause of blindness among Americans aged 25-74. Given the demographics in the American population, eye research is critical. Over the next thirty years, the number of Americans aged 75 and over will double. Unless we develop medical cures for these ailments, millions of Americans will lose their independence because of eye disorders.

In recent years, our nation's investments in eye and vision research conducted through the National Eye Institute (NEI) has just not measured up to the strength of our commitment in other areas of biomedical research at NIH. The NEI has received the second smallest increase of all NIH programs when you look at the average of appropriations from the last five years. Since 1985, NIH has grown more than 60 percent, while NEI has grown by only 24 percent. I fear if this trend continues,

it will result in a disastrous situation when the demographics of the next millennium are considered.

In order to reverse this trend I have joined my colleagues, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, as a cosponsor of her legislation, H.R. 731, which specifically calls for a doubling of the NEI budget over five years. I urge all of my colleagues to support in these efforts to increase funding in biomedical research and to continue to make solid investments in the health and well-being of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative GEORGE GEKAS for his leadership and commitment to biomedical research.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in American dramatist Tennessee Williams' play of the 1950's, "Cat On a Hot Tin Roof", "Big Daddy," fearing that a tumor found in his body is cancerous, speaks of "a man not having a pig's advantage." He refers to the human race's unique ability to conceive of its own mortality. Truly, the number of men and women throughout the world daily battling illness and disability is a constant reminder of the reality that humanity is at war with disease and death. What Big Daddy did not acknowledge, and also what most of us often fail to recognize, is that the human ability to conceive of our mortality does not confine us to the status of the disadvantaged. Instead, it affords us an advantage in terms of our capacity to treat and even cure disease should we focus our resources—combining our intellectual faculties with financial and technological resources in the biomedical field—toward the common goal of fighting disease.

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the organization in the U.S. where such resources are directed toward the discovery of treatments and cures for illnesses. Research at the NIH ranges from various forms of cancer to disorders which are cardiovascular, psychological, and neurological in nature. It extends also from immune deficiency disorders to diabetes and cystic fibrosis.

Because the NIH seeks to protect, treat, and preserve what is common to all humans—life—the benefits of NIH research are not confined to any specific race, sex, religion, or geographic region. Some of the major advances of the NIH in the past fifty years which serve the public include vaccines against polio, hepatitis B, and many other infectious agents; penicillin and other antibiotics; recommendations for health-promoting diet and lifestyle, including simple amens to lower the incidence of heart disease; replacements for many hormone and vitamin deficiencies; new methods for contraception; tests to protect the blood supply from hepatitis B and C viruses and HIV; new surgical methods, including organ transplantation and implantation of pacemakers and artificial joints; effective therapies for certain leukemias and cancers; drugs effective against mental illnesses; new therapeutics, such as blood cell growth factors, from recombinant DNA technologies; in vitro fertilization methods; and genetic testing for many inherited diseases. Needless to say, the list could go on forever. As our nation has historically been a leader in biomedical research, increasing Congressional funding to support the work of NIH would be a proactive step to continue our commitment to fight humanity's war against disease. Increasing the federal investment in biomedical research by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 would provide the scientific and medical communities

the resources necessary to continue to improve the quality of life for Americans and human beings worldwide.

As an original co-sponsor of House Resolution 89 and as co-chair of the Biomedical Research Caucus, I think the fact that the 106th Congress has witnessed for the first time in over 20 years an Administration's request for civilian R&D to exceed that for defense is just one reflection of the escalated need to prioritize biomedical research in the next century. We are presently at the close of a century which the average life expectancy in the United States has increased by nearly thirty years. As stated by Dr. Harold Varmus, director of NIH, such statistics make victory over disease and disability a goal that is realistic. For example, research sponsored by the NIH will map and sequence the entire human genome by 2005, leading to a new era of molecular medicine that will provide unprecedented opportunities for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and cure of diseases that currently plague society.

However, while we commend the medical field for the developments over the 20th century which have prolonged life for Americans, we must also recognize that the work is far from complete. With the aging of our nation's population, neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease, threaten to destroy the lives of millions of Americans, overwhelm the Nation's health care system, and bankrupt the medicare and medicaid programs. Incidentally, NIH researchers will inevitably face new puzzles about the human body, heredity, environmental insults, and infectious agents.

The bottom line is that the 25 institutes and centers of the NIH, each focusing on particular diseases or research areas inhuman health, receive their funding primarily from Congress. Ninety percent of NIH's budget is already committed to multi-year grant recipients for research, as well as the infrastructure of the Institutes and Centers. New scientific opportunities and earmarks compete for the remaining 10 percent, and these scientific inquiries would likely benefit public health. While overall funding for R&D has been reduced in recent years, biomedical funding at the NIH has nearly doubled over the last decade. Still however, about 75% of the research grant proposals submitted to NIH do not receive funding, leaving many scientists no choice but to find other careers. New discoveries in biomedical sciences require individual experimentation, and the prospect of winning the victory over disease becomes narrower and narrower as more scientists cease exploring for explanations, treatments, and cures.

In order to fully understand this issue, it is important to keep in mind the larger repercussions of the work of the National Institutes of Health. A present commitment to medical research in the U.S. means an eventual reduction in health care expenditures. Thus, allocating funds to the NIH is an investment that has the potential to yield favorable returns not only in terms of the quality of human life, but in economic terms as well. Furthermore, "since our country leads the world in pharmaceuticals and research, in [the] development of technologies and biomedical advancement" required to "hone in on the eradication of disease, not only will we be steadily moving towards the goal of preventing" and curing disease, but "at the same time we will fashion a

new leadership, economic worldwide leadership, for our country in producing the wherewithal by which to fight those diseases. What that means is more jobs, more enterprise, more prosperity, while helping save humanity from the ravages of the diseases in every corner of the world," even those too often unattended.

A discussion of a budget of billions of dollars for one organization can make the NIH funding issue seem impersonal, when it is exactly the personal level which makes the need for increased federal funding for NIH most clear. The debilitating and devastating effects of RETT syndrome, a neurological disorder which leaves little girls physically and mentally handicapped by three years of age, is just one example of a medical mystery in which the thousands of diagnosed individuals and their families must place all their hope in the NIH. Girls with the disorder show normal development until 6–18 months of life, then appear to arrest in development or regress in previously acquired skills. Traditional testing methods for the disease are inadequate because the afflicted child can not speak or gesture. In the early stages of the disorder, girls may exhibit the autistic features of withdrawal and isolation. Cognitive functioning appears to be severely impaired, but true understanding and intelligence are difficult to measure due to apraxia: the desire to move and respond, but incapability of directing movements.

The percentage of girls with RETT syndrome (about 50 percent who are able to walk are lucky. However, they do so in a broad based gait, which is often accompanied by shakiness of the limbs and torso. Other symptoms include: spasticity, curvature of the spine, and poor circulation of the legs causing loss of mobility. Many girls have abnormal breathing patterns such as hyperventilation and breath holding.

RETT syndrome has only recently been recognized in the United States. Several thousand people have been diagnosed with RETT syndrome this year, and it is estimated that many thousands more have gone undiagnosed. The prevalence of RETT syndrome is reported to be from one in ten thousand to one in fifteen thousand live female births.

There is currently no test for RETT syndrome. The girls must meet certain clinical criteria for diagnosis. Extensive laboratory investigations have not revealed a cause. But there is a suggestion that as the syndrome is confined to girls, a genetic basis may be indicated. More research is needed by many areas of the National Institutes of Health to give further insight into the disease in hopes of finding a cause, treatment, prevention, and cure. It is also well-documented that the research of RETT syndrome has an impact on similar neurodegenerative diseases and disorders such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, and the obvious autism and cerebral palsy. Clearly, increasing funding for NIH research and development would be instrumental in learning more about these diseases to help the victims, the families who care for and love them, and for all of us, who inevitably have a genetic predisposition for a disease or an environmental or lifestyle factor that places us at risk to develop an illness or disability for which we will one day place all hope in the NIH.

House Resolution 89 expresses Congressional approval of a federal expenditure of

which every American would be a beneficiary. Whether it be through the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, or cure of one's own disease, or that of a family member; whether it be through positive repercussions for the nation's health care system; whether it be through the creation of jobs and enterprise through the medical industry—in some way or another, each and every citizen benefits from an investment in biomedical research. Should the 106th Congress increase funding for the NIH, the U.S. will continue to lead the world in biomedical research.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's leader in medical research. We spend more each year on research to cure and prevent disease than any other nation, and we are at the forefront of developing new and innovative treatments for diseases ranging from heart disease to breast cancer to AIDS.

Funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is a vital part of the Federal government's effort to improve the health of all Americans. Recognizing this fact, both Congress and the Administration have pledged to work together in a bipartisan way to double NIH's funding over the next several years.

But, we need to match action with words. While I have strongly supported efforts in the past to increase NIH's funding, and I will continue to do so in the future. Yet, there is great uncertainty over whether Congress can fulfill this commitment and maintain the fiscal discipline demanded of us by the balanced budget agreement.

The fact is, we must fulfill this commitment. Medical research is not only economically expedient, it is necessary to bring an end to the suffering of millions of Americans who have debilitating and terminal conditions. It is only through continued and expanded biomedical research that this Nation can hope to understand, prevent and cure the diseases that threaten our lives and the lives of our children.

We have already accomplished great things, in the field of biomedical research as I previously mentioned. But what we have accomplished yesterday will pale in comparison to what we can accomplish tomorrow. There is no doubt about it, we are on the cusp of a revolution in biomedical research. We can either embrace the revolution or crush it before it begins.

The choice should be obvious. It is simply common sense that the most cost-effective way to treat diseases is to either cure them or prevent them. Prevention, while ideal, is not going to be completely effective. Experience has taught us that disease will occur no matter what steps are taken to prevent it.

So, we need to find a cure. Only by performing research into the nature of disease can we hope to unlock their secrets. Once a cure is discovered, it becomes a simple matter of administering the medication/vaccine. The difficult part is finding the cure. Research is the key and without dollars there can be no research.

I urge all my colleagues to renew and strengthen their commitment to making biomedical research a top priority as we enter the next millennium. Our children and their children will thank us as they live longer, and healthier lives.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for organizing this special order and for his

tireless efforts to educate our colleagues on the importance of biomedical research.

I stand today as one of what I am pleased to say is a growing number of members of this body who believe that biomedical research must be one of Congress' highest priorities in allocating scarce federal funding.

The role of such research in combating disease is well known. Federally-supported biomedical research creates high-skill jobs, helps retain U.S. leadership in biomedical research and development, and supports an industry which generates a positive balance of trade for our country. Research provides great hope for effectively treating, curing and eventually preventing disease and thereby saving our country billions of dollars in annual health care costs. For example, in terms of health care savings, the development of the polio vaccine alone—one of thousands of discoveries supported by NIH funding—has more than paid for our country's five decades of investment in federal biomedical research.

I serve as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which funds NIH—as well as the departments of Education, Health & Human Services and Labor—and I have made funding for biomedical research one of my highest priorities. For fiscal year 1999 (FY99), Congress was able to provide a 15 percent increase for the NIH. This increase raised the total appropriation for NIH to \$15.65 billion which is \$2 billion above the level provided for fiscal year 1998 and \$850 million above the amount that the President requested. I believe this to be the necessary appropriation for the NIH to adequately fund their vital and life-saving work.

Last year's appropriation was the first installment of what we hope will be a five year effort to double funding for the NIH through such annual increases of approximately 15 percent. In my judgment, it is clear that incredible opportunities presently exist for progress on a host of diseases and that such a commitment of resources is fully justified. Unfortunately, the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request for NIH includes an increase of less than two percent, an amount that would not even keep place with inflation. And the balanced budget agreement of 1997 also imposes very tight caps on discretionary spending that will make it hard for Congress to find the necessary resources.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, we must all actively work to build support in Congress for a second 15% increase and to find the resources necessary to make this funding level a reality in the coming year. Such priority treatment for the NIH is wise and appropriate. For quite literally, the health of our economy, of our people and our future prosperity all ride on the dividends that this research pays.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, for arranging tonight's Special Order. It is essential that Congress moves forward in its commitment to double the medical research budget at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Researchers at the NIH are developing cutting-edge treatments for hundreds of diseases from cancer to Alzheimer's to diabetes. Increased funding for NIH research and development will allow millions of Americans to lead healthier lives. I would like to submit for the record letters from researchers in my District that have benefited from NIH-sponsored initiatives.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Boston, MA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPUANO: I am writing to thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and your staff last week, as one of a group of young scientists I was pleased to be able to discuss with you issues concerning biomedical research and funding in this country. I greatly appreciate both your interest and concern in these matters and hope that you will be able to participate in the Special Order, scheduled for Tuesday, June 22nd, to discuss the need for doubling funding to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) over the next five years.

My training in the department of Molecular Medicine at Cornell University was supported by the Federal Government through an Institutional Training Grant in Pharmacology awarded by the NIH. As a Postdoctoral Fellow in the department of Medicine at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, I am currently the recipient of a National Research Service Award. My research regards the regulation of cell growth although very basic this type of work contributes to our understanding of cancer and will hopefully lead to more effective treatments for cancer in the future. It is an exciting time to be involved in biomedical research, the new cross discipline nature of the field allows for biologists, chemists and physicists to come together in multiple areas and has led to the development of Programs in Chemical Biology such as the new Institute of Chemistry and Cell Biology at Harvard Medical School. These types of collaborative efforts should lead to new drugs and treatments in the future.

The past commitment of our country has brought us to the forefront of biomedical research and medical care in the world. With our investment leading to new technologies and a highly trained work force we are now in a position to make this financial commitment payoff. The federal government's contribution to biomedical research has brought us to a new time of molecular approaches to medicine and with the human genome project well under way it seems feasible that we will soon be able to prevent, treat, and even cure many diseases from which our society suffers. As the single largest contributor to biomedical research the federal government's continued commitment is critical to realizing these goals and should allow for an improved quality of life for Americans and of course lead to a decrease in the expenditures for national health care in the country. Additionally expenditures for biomedical research on the governments part stimulate economic growth in the private sector creating jobs in the Biotechnology and Pharmaceutical Industries, this is of particular relevance in the 8th district.

It seems clear that staying to the goal of doubling the NIH funding in five years (H. Res. 89) we must find a way to increase the proposed \$320 million increase to \$2 billion in fiscal year 2000. Although current budget caps make this difficult I believe that the peoples interest would be served by a continued commitment to biomedical research by the federal government. The bipartisan support that this issue receives and the support of the public should justify the requested increased funding to keep us on track.

Please feel free to contact me if I can be of any assistance to you and your staff on issues requiring scientific expertise or if you would like to form a scientific advisory committee to deal with complex scientific issues I would be happy to participate. Again thank

you for your time and consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. GLAVEN, PH.D.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
June 18, 1999.

Hon. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPUANO: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me last Wednesday regarding our efforts towards doubling the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) budgets over 5 years. As a Department of Defense (DOD) Breast Cancer Research Predoctoral Fellow at Tufts University in Boston, my research and academic pursuits have benefited greatly from the appropriations made to funding agencies such as the NIH, NSF and DOD. While at Tufts, DOD and NIH funding enabled my doctoral research on the inhibition of breast cancer growth and metastasis to go forward. Consequently, my coworkers and I have been able to demonstrate that the introduction of a soluble form of an important receptor on the breast cancer cell surface can competitively inhibit the binding of this receptor to its target, which is located in the matrix surrounding the cancer cell. By cutting off this interaction, we have slowed the ability of cancer cells to grow and migrate through the surrounding milieu, thereby inhibiting tumor growth and metastasis of breast cancer cells in a mouse model system.

This work has exciting implications, but without the continued support of the NIH through grants to the laboratory of my doctoral mentor, Dr. Bryan Toole at Tufts University, and the DOD predoctoral grants to the students in his laboratory, the continued development of this research could be lost. Furthermore, there is so much remaining to be understood regarding the growth and movement of the many different kinds of cancer cells. Since the work of Dr. Toole and his coworkers has the potential to be generalized to many different types of cancer, as evidenced by the fact that several tumor types appear to contain this important receptor at the surface of their cells, this research could be important to inhibiting the growth and movement of many types of cancer cells. Still, a great deal of work remains so that we may truly understand the mechanism behind this inhibition in order to manufacture therapeutics that specifically target tumor cells without damaging surrounding normal tissues. Therefore, the support of NIH and DOD programs is integral to the progression of our own cancer research, as well as to the work in other laboratories across the country. It is through the continued support of many different federally-funded laboratories that we will come to a collective understanding of the communication systems within the tumor cells themselves, thereby enabling us to find more efficient ways of attacking and exploiting these pathways in order to eradicate this fatal disease.

Even though the majority of the funding from federal agencies goes directly to Tufts laboratories doing basic science and fundamental biomedical research, there are a number of notable research and education programs that benefit from grants to the university from the NIH and the NSF as well. One exciting educational program, funded by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (under NIH) and led by Dr. Claire Moore, is the Summer Research Program for Undergraduate Minority Students, where minority students from around the country are brought to Tufts University to do summer research and participate in enrichment activities, such as field trips and seminars on basic biomedical and

translational research. In addition to their one-on-one interaction with the research faculty at Tufts, minority students are also exposed to fundamental laboratory techniques and are given guidance on how to apply for graduate study in science, as well as to professional schools for medicine and dentistry. Training grants from the NIH are also very important to funding the work of graduate students in the majority of programs at the Sackler School of Graduate Biomedical Sciences, as well as the M.D/Ph.D. program (Medical Scientist Training Program) at Tufts University, since they promote cross-over research between several biomedical and clinical disciplines. Furthermore, Tufts University offers a unique Pathobiology Course, under the direction of Dr. Irwin Arias, for basic scientists that involves patients, pathology, and hospital-based learning. This course helps bridge the gap between basic research and clinical diseases and promotes a better understanding of pathobiology and disease-related processes for Ph.D. graduates.

As you can see, increased support of the NIH, NSF and other federally funded programs is essential to ensuring that these research efforts and educational programs continue to thrive. In the United States, and internationally, there exists a highly educated work force dedicated to their research and the training of others. Doubling the NIH budgets will safeguard their important investigations and bring us one step closer to understanding the basis of life and the diseases that threaten it. Steady and increased levels of support to these programs will keep research on track by promoting cross-disciplinary research that brings scientists together across different fields and towards finding the answers to the difficult questions we face. I urge you and all members of Congress to embrace this course of action and secure an additional 15% increase to the NIH this year. The students, post-doctoral researchers and principal investigators in Massachusetts and across the country remain committed to their scientific pursuits and to ensuring that others will be appropriately trained to continue the fight against disease. All that we ask is that you commit the funds necessary to help us do our jobs and do them well.

Sincerely,

REBECCA MOORE PETERSON, Ph.D.,
Cell, Molecular and Developmental
Biology,
Tufts University.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEORGE GEKAS, for organizing this important discussion about increasing funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH is the world's leading biomedical institution. As a strong supporter of NIH, and of biomedical research as a whole, I rise to support the effort to increase the NIH budget by \$2 billion for Fiscal Year 2000.

NIH research touches many aspects of our lives. There are twenty-five separate institutes which make up the NIH, each with a specific function and mission. Each institute conducts research about a myriad of diseases and ailments, including diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, muscular dystrophy, and kidney disease. This research is then used to develop treatments and cures. New treatments are currently under development for diseases like AIDS, forms of cancer and muscular skeletal diseases, to name a few. Without the initial research conducted and sponsored by NIH, the treatments we have today would not be available. Our lives are better off today than they would be without biomedical research and the efforts of NIH scientists.

There is a real need to develop treatments and cures for diseases. I don't know anyone who would not want to develop a cure for AIDS or cancer. This movement to increase spending for NIH research is not just a money dump into another federal agency. Rather, it is an investment for our future. Congress needs to ensure that we have the best preventative medicine and treatments available. The best way to move into the 21st Century is to increase NIH funding and to develop treatments and cures that will keep our citizens healthy.

The effort to increase the NIH budget by \$2 billion next year is just one piece of our goal to double the NIH budget by 2003. These funds would provide the means for NIH to take advantage of the boom in biomedical technology, to continue to recruit the best and brightest scientists, and to provide the information necessary for medical professionals to use the treatments developed by NIH scientists properly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 89, a bill to express the sense of Congress to increase NIH funding by \$2 billion for Fiscal Year 2000. As I, and the rest of my colleagues, have explained tonight, the future health of Americans depends on it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for arranging this special order tonight, to focus on the importance of doubling America's investment in health research over the next five years.

I am honored to be an original cosponsor of H. Res. 89, to double our national investment in health research. This research is the gift of America's hard-working taxpayers to this generation and the next—not just to Americans, but to the world.

Furthermore, for us to take fullest advantage of this investment, we must take care to invest it wisely. So in addition to increasing our work in basic health research at the National Institutes of Health, we should treat in a similar fashion our investment in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and in the programs of the Health Resources Service Administration, which are vital to putting in practice the things we learn through basic health research. As a strong fiscal conservative, and as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, I am committed to working with my colleagues to achieve these goals within a limited federal budget.

Rather than to address this issue myself, I have asked several of my constituents and leaders in the field of health research to address this issue themselves. With the consent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point several letters, emails and notes that describe in further detail the importance of doubling our investment in health research.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I am writing in support of your efforts to double the amount of funding to medical research in the next five years. As a person who has suffered through the pain of seeing a father slowly and but surely fade away from the ravages of Alzheimer's disease and as one who is now in a higher risk category as a result, I can only hope that there is a cure or effective treatment by the time I reach my seventies (which is not that far away). I know that the incidence of Alzheimer's disease in this country is supposed to double or triple in the next fifty years. Can we afford

to wait any longer to get a handle on this dread disease? I think not . . .

Additionally, my son Pete was struck with grand mal epilepsy four years ago at the age of 24. Needless to say it has drastically changed his life. His seizures, thus far, have not been controlled by any of the medications presently on the market. His wife recently said that when he leaves in the morning she worries whether this will be the last time she sees him alive. He has recently told me he doesn't think he can have children in his uncontrolled state. He said it wouldn't be fair to his wife or the children. He is losing hope . . .

Your proposal to double medical research funding is something that is very personal to me and my family, and I whole heartedly endorse your efforts. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help.

Thank you for caring.

RON HENDRIX.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: I was copied on your email and would like Congressman Cunningham to know how medical research, and in particular arthritis research has helped make my life better.

I acquired rheumatoid arthritis when I was 12 years old. By the time I was 18, the arthritis had damaged my knees so severely that all of the cartilage was worn, causing a tremendous amount of pain with every step so that I could barely walk.

Due to medical research, instead of being relegated to a wheel chair for the rest of my life, I became a candidate for total knee replacement surgery. After both knees were replaced, I could walk pain free for the first time in years. I was able to complete college, and eventually law school, and today I have a very satisfying career as an employment law attorney in a well respected firm.

In addition to being able to support myself, I sit on the board of the local chapter of the Arthritis Foundation and am chair of the Public Policy and Advocacy committee.

Since those first surgeries, I have had a number of other surgeries including total hip replacements and been on a number of arthritis drugs which have also made a tremendous difference in my life. Medical research has allowed me to have a life and to do many things I would not otherwise have been able to do.

But there is still much work to be accomplished. There still is no cure for arthritis, a disease that affects more than 40 million people in the United States and impacts the economy to the tune of over 65 billion dollars a year in lost wages and medical expenses. Although arthritis can strike at any age, the aging of the baby boomers is expected to result in over 60 million Americans with some form of arthritis by the year 2020.

We need to stop this disease now and the only way to do it is to step up our medical research efforts. Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

NANCY KAWANO.

SAN DIEGO, CA.

DEAR REP. CUNNINGHAM: In November 1997, we received the awful news that our beautiful, active 21-year-old daughter, Beth, had been diagnosed with acute myelogenous leukemia. While I had worked with cancer researchers for 10 years, nothing prepares a parent for the magnitude of such a diagnosis.

Beth was immediately hospitalized and started on chemotherapy while her physicians at UCSD Thornton Hospital raced to put her into remission. This is a devastating illness and, in her case, carried with it a low probability for survival. Her best chance for life depended on quickly locating a suitable donor for bone marrow transplantation,

treatment that was only possible thanks to research funding that had been provided to her doctors.

Chances of a parent matching closely enough to be a bone marrow donor for their child are exceedingly small—only 3 percent. Miraculously I matched, though not perfectly. A less-than-perfect match meant Beth's body would reject the life-giving cells. Thanks to new research, however, the physicians were able to employ advanced techniques to purge certain rejection-causing cells, called T cells, from my donated bone marrow before transplanting it into Beth.

After my stem cells were purged and ready for infusion, Beth underwent total body radiation to remove any possible cancer from her body. She was again hospitalized, given more chemotherapy and, several days later, given my stem cells.

It was a difficult journey, but on June 24, 1997, she was given a second chance at life. Now two years later, thanks to the technology and the National Institutes of Health-funded research that preceded her care, she is alive, well and thriving.

We are forever grateful to the UCSD Bone Marrow Transplant team for their tireless efforts. And we appreciate the support of you and your colleagues for increased medical research funding—so that the children of other parents will also be cured, and live the fruitful lives that they were meant to live.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY GONSOWSKI.

DEL MAR, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. RANDY CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: There is a war raging within the brain of my twelve year old son, Skyler. His attacker is epilepsy, an insidious neurological disorder for which there is currently no cure. Seizures, ranging from massive convulsions to momentary lapses of attention are the hallmark of this enemy which afflicts an estimated 2.5 million Americans. Epilepsy doesn't discriminate; it can affect anyone, of any gender, ethnicity, at any age, at any time.

My son was a perfectly healthy and normal child until the fateful day eight years ago when he was gripped by his first 'grand mal' seizure. To this day, diagnostic workups have failed to uncover a cause. Systematically, anticonvulsant medications were tried but were unsuccessful in controlling the seizures which over time have continued to increase in severity and frequency, stealing away the health and safety of my child, his capacities to learn and develop; the frequent assaults damaging his developing brain.

Epilepsy is a major unsolved health problem in our country. Despite recent advances, 750,000 cases, like Skyler's are virtually resistant to current drug therapies. For many patients whose seizures are controlled, the side effects of the medications can be debilitating, even fatal. A chronic condition, not only does epilepsy often require a lifetime of continual medical treatment, it provides a formidable barrier to normal life, affecting educational attainment, employment and personal fulfillment. The social and psychological consequences of epilepsy, forever fraught with stereotypes, misunderstanding and negative attitudes, are enormous. The economic burden shouldered by families, local and federal government agencies is estimated to be \$12.5 billion in direct and indirect costs.

Mr. Cunningham, all treatment options for my son's epilepsy have been exhausted. Yet

he continues to have seizures every day and night of his life. I would gladly sacrifice my life to give Skyler a healthy brain. His health, cognitive functioning, and his life, however, are solely dependent on future breakthroughs in epilepsy research which can only be realized through increased funding to the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. I applaud your support of the goal of doubling the federal medical research investment over the next five years, which I truly believe will bring more effective weapons for the prevention, eradication, detection and management of the heinous disorder, epilepsy. My son's future depends on it.

Sincerely,

TRACEY J. FLOURIE.

AMERICAN PUBLIC
HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC

CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: Prevention research, in contrast with biomedical or clinical research, takes place after a scientific discovery is made, and seeks to determine whether the discovery is working as intended, or if not, why not. Also, in contrast to biomedical research, which receives more than \$15 billion annually in NIH funding alone, prevention research received its first congressional appropriation only this year, at the level of \$15 million. The nation's prevention research program is administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and actual research takes place at the national level as well as in local research settings, primarily known as prevention research centers. Because prevention research is the "follow-through" element of scientific discoveries—ensuring that our new findings are having the intended results—it is highly deserving of federal funding. Following are four specific examples of the integral link prevention research provides with other research and other pieces of the public health continuum:

Measles Elimination—An outbreak of measles across several cities in the late 1980s showed with painful clarity that children were not being effectively vaccinated against this preventable disease. Although we had invested in the discovery and testing of the measles vaccine, we were not achieving the hoped-for result: eradication of the disease. A prevention research campaign was undertaken to ascertain why measles had again taken hold. Two factors were discovered: not enough preschool children were receiving their measles shot, and a single vaccine against measles was, in many cases, insufficient to prevent the disease. Based on this information, CDC adopted a two-dose vaccination policy for all children, and set a nationwide vaccination goal of 90 percent immunization for all two-year-olds. These strategic changes have brought about the highest measles immunization coverage levels ever achieved (91 percent), and the interruption of measles transmission in the United States. In this example, without prevention research, an extremely effective tool—the measles vaccine—would have gone underused because we would not have known the proper dosage for protecting the public health, nor would we have known that the critical age for preventing transmission of the disease is age 2.

Preventing Perinatal HIV Transmission—According to CDC's most recent estimates, each year more than 6,000 HIV-infected women give birth in the United States. An investment in biomedical and clinical research resulted in the finding that zidovudine (ZDV), given during pregnancy,

labor and delivery, and to infants after birth, could reduce the risk of mother-to-child HIV transmission by 66 percent. Subsequently, the Public Health Service issued two sets of guidelines: first, that all pregnant women receive HIV counseling and voluntary testing, and second, that ZDV therapy be provided to pregnant infected women. Although these guidelines have had a significant positive impact, nevertheless, about 500 children are still born HIV-infected in the United States annually. Prevention research studies are underway to evaluate the relative contributions of a number of factors—for example, the lack of prenatal care, poor provider adherence to the guidelines, poor patient adherence to the therapy regimen, and ZDV resistance—to the ongoing problem of perinatal HIV transmission.

Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. When the need to increase utilization of lifesaving breast and cervical cancer early detection services for underserved women became a priority in the 1980s, the barriers to early detection were believed to be primarily financial, and in fact many women avoided screening, at least in part because they could not pay for the services. But prevention research has demonstrated that a variety of factors affect women's screening behaviors. Some of these factors are complex, like cultural and individual beliefs about health and health care. Research also shows that such simple factors as whether physicians recommend screening to their female patients also play an important role in whether women are screened for breast and cervical cancer. CDC now recognizes and incorporates all these findings in its breast and cervical cancer early detection program. Without the benefit of these prevention research discoveries, our investment in the ability to detect and treat breast and cervical cancers would go underutilized among a substantial percentage of the population whom these scientific advances were designed to benefit.

Using New Tools to Understand Old (and New) Diseases. At the CDC research station in western Kenya, scientists are using GPS (global positioning systems) to map 7,500 households, rivers, roads, and medical facilities within a 75-square-mile area. By linking the map to an epidemiologic database, the GIS program (geographic information systems) provides information on how many cases of malaria occurred in each household, whether the malaria strains were drug-resistant, whether mosquito breeding grounds were present, and whether children died. Epidemiologists will use this map to answer questions that couldn't be easily answered before: Does proximity to mosquito breeding grounds increase child mortality? Does proximity to a medical facility decrease child mortality? Is drug resistance spreading in a predictable pattern? Public health officials can also use the map to target intensive vector control measures to households that harbor large numbers of mosquitoes. These same tools can be used to shed light on newly emerging public health issues, as well as persistent problems. This research is clearly not biomedical nor clinical in nature, yet it is as essential to the prevention of disease as is understanding the pathogen itself.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these examples of prevention research. Please don't hesitate to call if you have questions or wish additional information about any of the items listed here.

Sincerely,

DONNA CRANE,
Director of Congressional Affairs, American
Public Health Association, Washington,
D.C.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO,
La Jolla, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: As the director of the National Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure (NPACI), led by the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC) and the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), I strongly endorse the increase in the budget for medical research as proposed in the bill HR-89 you are cosponsoring. As you no doubt know, the NPACI/SDSC mission is to advance science and we do this through engaging in computational science research and supporting the computational science research community nationwide, including many involved in medical and related research. Researchers associated with NPACI/SDSC are working on solving problems ranging from mining information from large data sets to unlocking the mysteries surrounding Alzheimer's disease. Researchers gain access to NPACI/SDSC resources through the peer review process and requests for access to our computing resources exceed those available by factors of two to four. Excellent computational science at the basic research level is being turned down for lack of available funding and resources.

We are also participating in cutting edge research in enabling technologies for computing such as advanced networking and security, visualization, data-intensive computing, and scalable parallel computing. These technologies now more than ever are the cornerstone for further advances in the applications of medical research.

On a personal note, I have witnessed first hand the results of medical research having severely fractured my leg in a skiing accident several years ago. Through advances in orthopedic medicine and a lengthy physical therapy, I'm now back close to 100% functionality, which was very much in doubt initially. We still have a long way to go in this area however, so I personally reiterate my support for the funding increase.

I can be of any assistance to you as you contemplate this and other legislation in scientific or technological fields, please do not hesitate to contact me at 619-534-5075 or skarin@ucsd.edu.

Sincerely,

SID KARIN.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO,
La Jolla, CA, June 20, 1999.

Hon. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: As we enter the next millennium we must ask two questions: What do we most want to provide for our children and grandchildren? What should our most important national goals be? I believe that our most important National priority should be to invest in the long-term, and difficult, fight against disease by doubling the budget for biomedical research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Each year one million or more of our citizens die prematurely of diseases that could be cured if we simply understood more about their origins, causes, and progression, or if we had the knowledge and understanding to construct desperately needed engineered organs and tissues to repair damaged ones. Millions more of our citizens are disabled, or unable to realize their full potential because of the ravages of disease. For them too, hope lies in better understanding of the basis and treatment of disease. Only the Federal government, through its support of the NIH, can win these battles by illuminating the secrets hidden inside human cells, understanding the

chemistry and biology of living organisms, and using that information to design cost-efficient and effective preventative and therapeutic measures for disease.

In my view, our society has a moral obligation to aggressively seek the treatments that our desperately ill citizens need. However, in addition to the moral imperative to fight disease and promote health, there is also compelling evidence that solving health problems will be economically beneficial to our Nation. Restoring lost productivity to those incapacitated by disease will save billions of dollars annually, and will also relieve many of the overwhelming financial burdens on Medicare and other health care programs that our society has created to help those who are ill. For example, expensive, and ultimately treatable diseases of the elderly such as Alzheimer's, diabetes, and cancer play a large and growing role in skyrocketing medical costs to our society. Finally, two of the most economically promising long-term industries where our Nation has a substantial competitive advantage are the biotechnology and pharmaceutical industries. These industries are driven by the Federal investment in biomedical research in the public sector, which in turn leads to discoveries that are developed and brought to market by the private sector.

I know how passionately you believe that we must not waiver in our battle against disease. I stand prepared to fight with you to persuade your colleagues in the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE S.B. GOLDSTEIN, PH.D.

MOLECULAR MEDICINE 2020: A VISION FOR THE
FUTURE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH AND HUMAN
HEALTH*

What will medical practice and patient care be like in 2020? We believe that "Molecular Medicine" can be the basis for human health in 2020, but only if the U.S. expands its investment in biomedical research by significantly increasing funding for the NIH.

The practice of Molecular Medicine will consist of new prevention, diagnosis, and treatment methods that directly target the molecular, cellular, or physiological defects causing disease. These medical methods will be based on precise, non-invasive imaging and diagnostic techniques. They will be implemented with directed, rationally designed molecular and pharmaceutical therapies, and they will be rooted in a deep understanding of normal human cellular and molecular physiology and genetics.

While unimaginable only 25 years ago, Molecular Medicine is now achievable because of recent rapid progress, and an enormous burst of new scientific opportunities emerging from years of sustained public investment in NIH-sponsored basic biomedical research. Thus, we are already beginning to gain ground in our fight against many dreaded diseases, including cancer, cardiovascular disease, and stroke. As we look forward, we can realistically hope to develop increasingly effective treatments and preventive measures for these diseases, as well as for the scourges of Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, obesity, degenerative diseases of aging, and emerging infectious agents. To realize these goals, and to capitalize upon past investments and many recent discoveries, we must renew our National resolve and reinvigorate our research efforts, so that we can accelerate the arrival of the new era of Molecular Medicine.

To hasten the earliest possible development of Molecular Medicine, and to ensure

*Preamble to a Report from a FASEB Conference on Priorities for an Expanded NIH Budget (<http://www.faseb.org/opar/MolecularMedicine.html>), chaired by Dr. Lawrence S.B. Goldstein, April, 1998.

that it becomes a reality by 2020, we must act now to expand the foundation of biomedical research and discovery. This foundation can only be built by: a) Developing new interdisciplinary methods, insights, and understanding; b) Attracting, training, and sustaining the most talented and vigorous young research scientists; and c) Nurturing the vitality of a scientific effort that has never held more promise. This augmented research base will lead directly to ever more precise diagnostic, prevention, and treatment methods based upon research in Biology and Medicine in collaboration with Chemistry, Physics, Engineering, and Computation. Most important, increased investment could launch new and far-reaching initiatives in Functional and Physiological Genomics. These new projects would have the goal of understanding the normal functions of the many genes discovered in the complete genetic blueprints of humans and diverse model organisms by the Human Genome Project. Such an effort will lead to a detailed understanding of normal cellular, molecular, and integrative organismal physiology, which in turn will allow us to create therapies targeted directly to the cellular, genetic, and physiological defects that cause disease and organ dysfunction. These new efforts will also allow us to defend our citizens against the ever-present and increasing danger of emerging pathogens and viruses by developing the next generations of vaccines and antibiotic drugs. All of these advances will depend upon new partnerships in technology development and clinical translation carried out by outstanding scientists with access to the most innovative and developing instrumentation.

Our country is poised to take full advantage of the last 50 years of steady investment in biomedical research and the many resulting opportunities created from recent rapid progress. Significant new investment now will dramatically accelerate the rate of discovery and lead to the imminent creation of a Molecular Medicine to combat our most dreaded diseases.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY
PREVENTION COALITION,
SAN DIEGO, CA, June 19, 1999.

Rep. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: The San Diego County Prevention Coalition wishes to express our support for your goal of doubling our federal medical research investment over the next five years as recommended by H. Res. 89. Most of our 230 organization members who are working with at-risk substance abusers appreciate the wonderful medical research coming from the National Institutes of Health, specifically NIDA. Their research has had a great impact on addicts and many of their families.

We are an alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention organization with a five-year track record of fighting abuse and the unifying voice of prevention for San Diego County. We have substantial community support from our 310+ members representing 230 local organizations and agencies. We have the support of Senators, Congressmen, the State Deputy Director for Prevention Services, the San Diego County Sheriff, Supervising Juvenile Judge, the County Health Director, the County Board of Supervisors, numerous business and community leaders, law enforcement officers and educational officials.

We thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

ALAN SORKIN,
Executive Director.

PARENTS & ADOLESCENTS RECOVERING TOGETHER SUCCESSFULLY,
San Diego, June, 19, 1999.

Rep. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC.
DEAR DUKE: Parents and Adolescents Recovering Together Successfully (PARTS) is a non-profit organization dedicated to reducing the number of child addicts and believes that proactive prevention and intervention within the family is the best solution for fighting the devastating long-term effects of teenage substance abuse. Much of what we teach is based on federal medical research.

We wish to support your goal of doubling our federal medical research investment over the next five years as recommended by H. Res. 89. The National Institutes of Health, and specifically NIDA provide valuable medical research to us and impact many of our families.

My Best,

ALAN SORKIN,
Executive Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SAN DIEGO,
LaJolla, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR REP. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you for taking the time to highlight the important benefits to patients of the research funded through NIH and other agencies. I believe our gene therapy research outlines the value of that funding.

Recent developments in molecular medicine have made possible the use of gene therapy as a weapon in the fight against cancer. Here at UCSD, we have been able to genetically modify human leukemia cells in a way that induces a powerful, killing response from the immune system. In laboratory experiments, we found that the immune response prompted by the modified cells destroyed active leukemia cells lurking nearby. When we moved from the laboratory to Phase I clinical trials, we focused on patients who have chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), a currently incurable condition afflicting more than 50,000 people per year in the United States.

The Phase I results were very encouraging. Eleven patients were each treated with a single injection of their own modified leukemia cells, and all but one had a significant drop in the number of leukemia cells found in their blood, and a reduction in the size of their lymph nodes. This was the first time that a response this dramatic had been seen in the history of treating this disease with a single treatment. A San Diego Union-Tribune article describing the first phase research—and highlighting some of the ways that breakthroughs in medical research literally shape the lives and futures of our patients—is attached.

We are now working on the larger, Phase II study that will involve multiple injections over time. Although this study has not yet begun, we have already been contacted by about 200 people from around the world seeking to serve as volunteers.

Thanks again for all the help and support of you and your Congressional colleagues for supporting increased medical research funding. These dollars make possible the cutting edge medical research we hope will some day lead to cures of terrible diseases like CLL.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. KIPPS, M.D., PH.D.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL BARNES MOODY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and great American, Mr. Samuel Barnes Moody. Sam Moody, who was my very special friend and was very special to me personally, was born on June 2, 1920.

Last week, Sam Moody passed away in central Florida. I first met Sam Moody in my civic activities in central Florida some years ago. However, I never really knew much about his background until some years ago when I invited Sam and several other veteran leaders to a small luncheon gathering.

As we sat together, I asked each of the veterans to relate some of their military service recollections after lunch to our group. Sam Moody started off rather hesitantly but he began telling an incredible story.

Let me say a little bit about Sam Moody. He joined the old Army Air Corps on November 15, 1940. After his basic training, he was shipped out to Manila in the Philippines where he arrived on Thursday Thanksgiving Day, 1941. Some 18 days later, World War II broke out. Sam Moody and his group found themselves on Bataan and eventually they ran out of food and supplies in April of 1942.

Sam went on to tell the story that on April 9, 1942, he and more than a thousand others took part in the famous Bataan Death March. Over 10,000 men, women and children died. Somehow God spared Sam Moody.

He was then cast on a ship, a transport. This story is relayed in his autobiography from this event entitled *Reprieve From Hell*, and I strongly recommend that to every American, particularly every young American. In this transport, hundreds of other Americans were crammed into the hull of a ship that was torpedoed by an American submarine. Many, many, many died. Somehow Sam survived. God spared Sam Moody.

Also as a prisoner of war, Sam Moody served under incredible conditions when he arrived in Japan, under torturous and malnutrition conditions, along with hundreds and hundreds of others. Of 36,000 American servicemen, less than 10 percent survived, but somehow God spared Sam Moody.

In 1946, after his release and return home, Sam Moody went back to Japan to testify for the American government at the International War Crimes trial. Sam was probably the only enlisted survivor to testify in these trials to help bring justice to those who had killed and tortured so many.

At these trials, Sam Moody met Madeline, who was working for General MacArthur. They married and have two wonderful children, Betty and Steve.

Sergeant Sam Moody leaves behind a wonderful family, to whom I extend my very deepest sympathy. Sergeant Sam

Moody also leaves behind a record of incredible service and devotion to our Nation and a country he dearly loved.

Sam Moody also leaves behind an incredible record of his service and survival from World War II and the Bataan Death March, which I recommend again to every Member of Congress and every American. It is called *Reprieve From Hell*.

□ 1745

Sam Moody went to be with his Maker last week. We will miss him.

THE NECESSITY OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), who is from my committee, for allowing me to interrupt his one hour special order.

Mr. Speaker, today the Independent Counsel statute expires. There has been a real heralding by many people in the legal community for the demise of this law. I would like to tonight talk just a little bit about that law and why something like it is absolutely necessary.

For the past 3 years my committee has been investigating illegal campaign contributions. We are now involved in investigating espionage and lack of security at our nuclear laboratories, and the possibility that these things had something in common.

One of the biggest problems that we have had has been a reluctance by the Justice Department, under Janet Reno, to cooperate with our committee. It has been extremely difficult to get the Justice Department to work with us to get to the bottom of these scandals.

If we have an administration that has broken the law, if we have an administration or people in an administration who have become corrupt, and we have an Attorney General who is appointed by the President who is blocking for the administration, how do we administer justice? How do we get to the bottom of illegal activities, if we have an administration that has broken the law and a Justice Department that is controlled by the administration who will not bring those who broke the law to justice?

I think that that is what we have today. We have had a number of people that have taken the Fifth Amendment. Our committee has faced over 121 people who have taken the Fifth Amendment or fled the country in the campaign finance scandal, 121 people. That is unparalleled in American history.

We have asked the Justice Department and Janet Reno time and time and time again to work with us to bring these people before the committee to explain to the American people why Communist China, Macao, Egypt, Taiwan, South American countries, have been giving campaign contributions to the Democrat National

Committee and the President's reelection committee, and we have gotten absolutely no cooperation from the Justice Department.

In fact, if Members look at the administration and the Justice Department, we will find they have, in effect, erected a stone wall between what happened and the American people. How do we break through that stone wall? What mechanism do we use to bring people to justice who broke the law, who may have even endangered America's national security?

The only way we can do that is to have somebody outside the system investigate and prosecute those people who have broken the law. Unfortunately, now that we no longer have an Independent Counsel statute, we have no mechanism with which to do that.

Maybe the Independent Counsel statute was flawed, maybe there were some problems with it, but it should have been perfected, in my opinion, so there was a mechanism to investigate people in an administration that might be corrupt without going through the person that they appoint to be the Attorney General who might be blocking for them, as I believe has been the case with this Attorney General and this Justice Department.

So tonight I am one of those voices, I am sure, that is crying in the wilderness, because I believe we need something like an Independent Counsel statute to ensure that justice will be done in this country.

Right now, now that the Independent Counsel statute has expired, if we have a president now or in the future who breaks the law or if we have people in his administration who break the law, and the President has appointed an Attorney General who is willing to block for him and keep the facts from coming out where there might have been corruption, then there is nothing that can be done for the American people to count on to bring these people to justice.

So I would just like to say that although the Independent Counsel statute may have had some flaws, we should not have junked the whole thing, we should have found an alternative. I am sorry that we did not.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN AMERICA, AND INEQUITIES IN THE NATION'S MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. This evening I hope to touch on some issues that are not often discussed here on the floor of the House, and along with me I am happy to welcome the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

I want to begin by touching on an issue that I believe is perhaps the most important issue facing this country. It

is not talked about enough, but it is something that all of us should be deeply concerned about. That is, Mr. Speaker, in the last election, 36 percent of the American people voted. That means almost two-thirds of the American people did not believe it was important enough for their future to come out and vote.

What is even more alarming is that among people 24 years of age or younger, we had, if Members can believe it, 18 percent of those people voting. Eighty-two percent said they were not interested in voting. That is frightening unto itself, but it bodes very poorly for the future because there is very good evidence that if young people do not vote, it is much less likely that they will vote in the future.

So what happened in recent elections is that fewer and fewer people are participating. The vast majority of low-income people do not vote. Most working people do not vote. But then, on the other hand, we have upper income people who do vote, and upper income people who contribute heavily to both political parties and into the political process. So the voices of working people and low-income people are virtually not heard in this institution. Their needs are not taken account of as legislation is dealt with.

But for those folks who have the money, the wealthiest one-quarter of 1 percent who make 80 percent of the campaign contributions, Congress continuously does their bidding, pays attention to their needs. I think we have a vicious circle, that as Congress pays more and more attention to the needs of the wealthy and not to working people, not to the middle class, then the vast majority of the people turn off even further from the political process and say, hey, this Congress does not represent me. Why should I vote?

Tonight I want to touch on a number of issues. But before we get going, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, following on that point, the question really is, for whose benefit is the country run and the economy run?

If we ask, and I have asked, groups of students in my district, now, who do you think has the most impact on the economy in the United States in government, most people would guess the President. Some talk about the Secretary of the Treasury. A few guessed the Congress, the House and Senate. But virtually none say, well, Congressman, I know who it is, it is the Federal Reserve. It is that appointed, unelected, group of extraordinarily wealthy individuals, for the most part, who meet in secret.

Today they met in secret downtown in Washington, D.C., in their marble palace, sitting at their exotic long boardroom table, marble, with nice exotic hardwoods, and they made a decision that I suppose does not sound that important to most people, but the impact will be tremendous.

Again, it goes essentially to who really runs this country. They decided to raise interest rates by one-quarter of 1 percent. That does not sound like a lot, except there are tens of millions of Americans who tomorrow will wake up to find that their mortgage rate went up, their credit card rate went up, their adjustable car loan went up.

In fact, it is computed that that one-quarter of 1 percent increase will cost a family money. Here is a family that has a \$100,000 mortgage, a \$15,000 4-year car loan, and \$2,000 on a credit card. It sounds pretty middle class to me. It will cost them \$6,913 for the mortgage, \$84 on the car loan, and \$16 on the credit card; \$7,013, that one-quarter of 1 percent rate.

I suppose that would be justified if there was a reason to do it. What is the reason? Are we worried about inflation, which is at or near historic lows? I do not think so. It might be that the Fed is worried about higher wages. The gentleman and I have talked about that previously. Sometimes the Federal Reserve gets worried when the unemployment rate drops below 5 or 6 percent.

They had a rule for years saying it should not go below 6 percent. Then they said maybe 5 percent. They get worried, because what happens if unemployment drops?

Mr. SANDERS. What will happen is then, horror of all horror, wages may go up. Let me just touch on that very important point.

We hear every day on the television, we hear it on the radio, we read it in the newspapers, that we are living in the midst of one of the great economic booms in our history. Maybe that fear that with low unemployment wages might go up has in fact prompted the Federal Reserve to do what it did today.

But I want to, for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, give a chart which very clearly belies this nonsense that there is an economic boom for the middle class or for working people.

According to information assembled by the Economic Policy Institute, and I do not think there is a lot of debate about this, in 1973 the weekly earnings, the real average weekly earnings of workers in the United States, was \$502, okay? In 1973, the weekly earnings, average earnings, were \$502.

In 1998, in the midst of a great economic boom, the weekly earnings were \$442, a 12 percent reduction in real wages. The reality is that in order to compensate for the lowering of real wages, the average American today is working significantly more hours. People are working two jobs, people are working three jobs.

So if the Fed thinks that they have got to once again increase unemployment to dampen wage increases, I would have very strong disagreement, because in reality today the average person in the middle class is struggling. The gentleman and I have discussed it before. It is true in Oregon, it is true in Vermont.

How many people that we know are working two jobs, three jobs, 50, 60, 70 hours a week to pay the bills? The idea that anybody in a public position of trust would take action which would result in lowering wages, forcing people to work even longer hours, is to my mind an outrage.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, let us think about this again. If this unelected group, the Federal Reserve Board who meets in secret, some of whom work for banks and in fact can individually profit their employer without any conflict of interest rules, if they raise interest rates, and they did not raise them because wages are running away and people are seeing big increases in their wages, they must have had another reason.

The pundits tell me that perhaps that other reason is that they are worried about the bubble in the stock market. I have a little problem about that. The question is, if you whack the people on Main Street by raising again, as these statistics show, their payment for their \$100,000 mortgage, \$15,000 car loan, and \$2,000 credit card, and a lot of folks have more than that on their credit card, if they are going to pay \$7,000 more for those loans because of this one-quarter of 1 percent increase, how is that going to somehow translate to a message to the people on Wall Street, the speculators, who are driving up, what did Greenspan call it, irrational exuberance on Wall Street?

If he is worried about this irrational exuberance on Wall Street, why did he not do something about Wall Street? They have the tools. Right now on Wall Street with just a \$1,000 investment, you can on margin go out and buy a whole bunch more stock. They could control that. There are steps they could take to directly control that.

But no, they are going to whack the people on Main Street and say, see, we are going to cause some of you to lose your jobs, drive up unemployment, maybe we will drive down wages. We are going to cause this disruption in the economy, and we are hoping that will percolate up to Wall Street. This is kind of a bizarre way to run an economy, but I think it has something to do with who they work for, the major banks, and what lack of control the Congress has.

No one knows what the Federal Reserve does or why they do it. It is all secret.

□ 1800

Congress has ceded all authority to them in the making of money and controlling interest rates and basically managing the economy. They are managing it for their banker friends who are deathly afraid of inflation or deathly afraid of higher wages for the corporate CEOs, but not for average folks.

I think that is an extraordinary turn of events. I think it brings us back again to who makes the contributions, who basically runs this organization when it comes to election time, and to

whom are many of our colleagues beholden. It, unfortunately, is not the average people on Main Street, but it is those people on Wall Street. It is those people in the banking industry, the pharmaceutical industry, the insurance industry, and others.

In fact, I noted today in the paper that, in this presidential race, George W. may not even take public matching funds because he has raised so much money and intends to raise so much money, obscene amounts of money is flowing in so fast, they cannot count it, that he just does not think he will need those public matching funds and those constraints on spending.

Now, one has got to wonder who those people are contributing all that money and what they expect to get in return.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt the gentleman from Oregon, if I might, by giving some facts and figures. Mr. Speaker, I will also include for the RECORD, information about campaign contributions and lobbying expenses.

Last week, and I hope to get into this a little bit, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I talked about the issue of pharmaceutical drugs, about the crisis that exists all over the United States where we have elderly people and people with chronic illnesses who cannot afford the high cost of prescription drugs.

We talked about the fact that the same exact drug manufactured in the United States of America is sold for significantly lower prices in Canada, in Mexico, and in Europe, and that the American consumer is being ripped off.

We talked about the huge profits of the pharmaceutical industry and the fact that the United States is perhaps the only major Nation on earth that does not regulate the price that pharmaceutical companies can sell their product. Lo and behold, apropos of what the gentleman from Oregon was talking about, now let us just see how money works and the relationship to the very high cost of prescription drugs in this country and to lobbying expenses and campaign contributions.

It turns out that, for the first 18 months of the last election cycle, the pharmaceutical industry had lobbying expenses of over \$74 million and made more than \$7 million in campaign contributions, which put them at the very top of any industry in America.

So if consumers want to know why we are paying so much more for the exact same prescription drug in this country as the Canadians and the Mexicans and the Europeans do, then they might well look to the reality that the pharmaceutical industry is pouring huge sums of money, not only into Congress, but into State legislatures throughout this country.

They are number one. They are at the very top of the list of people who spend money on lobbying expenditures or campaign contributions, followed, I might add, not very far behind, by the

insurance industry, which might help us explain why we are the only Nation in the entire industrialized world that does not have a national health insurance system.

So whether the issue is banking, whether the issue is interest rates, whether the issue is the high cost of pharmaceutical drugs or all of the other absurd priorities that exist in this Congress, I think one of the important factors to examine is who makes the campaign distributions, who puts money into lobbying; and that tells us a whole lot about the end results which we see.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Vermont raised the insurance industry, some of our colleagues spoke at an earlier hour about the need for a Patients' Bill of Rights. As the gentleman pointed out, the insurance industry is the second greatest funder of congressional campaigns and has been particularly generous to the majority party.

We found in the last Congress that we were able to get a very truncated Patients' Bill of Rights through the House, and the Senate did not act at all because of the fear on the part of the insurance companies that it might impinge upon their profits.

Let us just talk for a minute about what that means. I have talked to some folks from the Heart Association who are very concerned. They spent years educating Americans to, when they have got that pain, they should go to the emergency room. Well, guess what, now with an HMO, one does not go to the emergency room, one is supposed to call the insurance company first in some plans and talk to a clerk somewhere who one may have awakened from their late evening nap, and ask them for permission to go to the emergency room. Sometimes it is denied. Take an aspirin and call the doctor in the morning.

The Heart Association is very worried about the message we are sending here. So part of the Patients' Bill of Rights is called a prudent person rule. If one has got an extreme pain in one's chest and one thinks one is having a heart attack, one does not have to call a clerk who works for the insurance company to get permission to go to the emergency room.

Of course, they say they do not deny permission, they just will not pay for it if one goes. Now, how many Americans can afford a \$500 or \$1,000 visit to the emergency room? Not very many. So this is extraordinary. So that is one thing in the Patients' Bill of Rights.

There is another case in Virginia, a young woman who fell off a cliff, broke her back. They medivac'd her by helicopter. When she got to the hospital, they worked on her right away. She was in serious condition. Her insurance company later refused to pay because she lacked prior authorization.

I asked, when was she supposed to make the call? On her cell phone as she fell through the air? Or perhaps she

should have asked to use the radio in the helicopter while she was being medivac'd.

No, these are absurd things. These are no brainers for the American people. We should have the right, we pay our insurance premiums, to have that kind of fair treatment. But guess what, the insurance industry does not think so, and a majority of my colleagues here in Congress do not think so, because they are much more attentive to the insurance industry than they are to the needs of their constituents. That is an outrage, and that should change.

I am one of many who have signed a petition here in the House to force a Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor of the House because the Republican leadership refuses to let the bill be heard.

We have over 180 people on that bill, and I tell my colleagues we will not be denied; and if the American people would begin to speak up to their representatives, they would not. But again, we are back in this circular situation where the people who fund the campaigns have more at risk and are more likely to be heard than the people who are being denied the care in their insurance plan.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oregon touches on perhaps the most fundamental issue that we can discuss; and that is, in the midst of all of the media hoopla about how great the economy is doing, the reality is that there are tens and tens of millions of people who are hurting very badly and, in many ways, are in worse shape today than they were 20 or 25 years ago. The gentleman is touching on one area, and that is the area of health care.

Now, I want to know one simple thing. It would seem to me that, if the economy is booming, what that would translate to, among other things, is an improved health care system for all of the people. It makes sense to me. The economy is booming. That means that more and more people have health insurance, better quality of health care, better able to go to the physician of their choice, the specialist of their choice, more access to prescription drugs. That is what a booming economy would seem to me.

But the reality, as the gentleman has just indicated, is very much not that. The reality is that we have some 43 million Americans who have zero health insurance. The reality is that we have tens of millions of Americans who have very large deductibles and co-payments. That means that, if they get sick, they hesitate to go to the doctor, because they do not have the cash to pay for the visit.

The end result of that is that doctors now tell us that the patients that they are seeing are far sicker than the patients that they used to seeing because people do not have the money to pay because they have high deductibles.

In terms of prescription drugs once again, at a time when the average profits in 1998 for the 10 largest pharma-

ceutical companies in this country were \$2.5 billion, that was the average profits for the 10 largest pharmaceutical companies, we have people in the State of Vermont, people all over this country, elderly folks, sick people who literally have got to make the choice as to whether they purchase the prescription drugs they need to keep them alive to ease their pain or whether they heat their homes in the winter, whether they buy the food that they need.

Ah, but the pharmaceutical industry, enjoying huge profits has all kinds of money available for campaign contributions to maintain the status quo.

I will submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a chart which I think the American people would be interested in hearing about which talks about how much more senior citizens in the United States pay for prescription drugs than do seniors in other Nations.

If a product used, one of the more commonly used prescription drugs in this country used by seniors, cost \$1, in Germany that product costs 71 cents; in Sweden, 68 cents; in the United Kingdom, 65 cents; Canada, 64 cents; France, 57 cents; and Italy, 51 cents.

But once again, getting back to the gentleman's point, if we are talking about a so-called booming economy, I would think that what the health care system would be doing is making it easier for people to get in, making it easier for people to get the quality care. As we both know, as a result of the growth of managed care and HMOs, that is very often exactly the opposite of what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, part of the problem there, I want to go back to the point about seniors and the cost of drugs. But just on the issue of access to health care and the fact that so many people have been deprived to access to health care, part of the problem is the fact that more and more Americans are working in temporary jobs.

In fact, the number of Americans in the last 25 years holding temporary jobs without benefits instead of full-time jobs with benefits has gone up by a factor of eight, eight times as many people. The largest employer in America now is not General Motors. It is not Microsoft, it is a Manpower, Inc., a temporary employing employer.

Now, those people are forced to take jobs, generally at wages lower than what they earned in their last full-time job, with no benefits, including no insurance benefit. Now, that is a crisis for many families in this country, and that is something that needs to be dealt with.

They say, well, if they had insurance at their last job, they can purchase it under COBRA. That is right. We did provide relief for a few people with the Federal law that says they can purchase the same health care they had. But guess what? When people lose their jobs, most people cannot afford \$350 a

month premiums to come out of their unemployment insurance and still put food on the table, pay the rent, and pay the light bill. They cannot afford that.

But talking about that, I have done recently, with the help of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), a survey of seniors in my district in terms of the prices they are paying for commonly prescribed drugs for seniors. The results are absolutely extraordinary. I will be releasing the survey next week. But it turns out that many seniors are paying 4 to 7 times as much as people who have health insurance, full health insurance for exactly the same drugs over the counter.

Now, there is something wrong with that. The insurance companies have gone to the pharmaceutical industry and bargained a good price. They are getting a great price. A senior walks in and buys the same prescription over the counter, sometimes they need essentially a life-saving prescription, and they pay 4 to 7 times more. They cannot afford it.

The President is trying to deal with that in his proposal with a minimal beginning of prescription drug coverage. That would be an improvement over the current system. But much more can and should be done dealing with the prices these insurance companies charge.

The gentleman from Vermont has tried for a number of years to make a very simple point, a lot of drugs are developed after the public has spent a lot of money developing the research for particular drugs. In fact, one drug that is very effective for uterine cancer was developed by the National Institutes of Health. All the research was done, all the processes on how to make it. The bark out of which the first drugs were made before they developed an artificial process came off of Federal land.

So we have taxpayers pay to discover and develop the process for the drug. Taxpayers own the property from which the natural substance, the bark, is coming from. Guess what, the Federal Government gave an exclusive right to Bristol-Myers Squibb to market this drug with no price caps. Guess what? With no sunk costs, they did not go through a lengthy development process, and very low cost to get the product. They were charging outrageous prices because women desperate with this type of cancer needed the drug.

Now, the gentleman has proposed a simple principle. They should repay the Treasury for that research. They should repay the taxpayers. Now, has that become law? It seems to me most Americans would agree that would be fair.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the pharmaceutical industry, which spends over \$80 million in the last election cycle in opposition to any serious reform was successful in helping to defeat that proposal. But we will be back, and we are going to be back with another good proposal.

That is that one of the outrages that currently exists, as I mentioned earlier, is that the same exact prescription drug manufactured by an American company is sold in Canada, Mexico, and around the world for far lower prices than it is sold in the United States.

I know the gentleman intends to release a study in Oregon, but we have already released one in the State of Vermont. What we found is that, for the most commonly used prescription drugs that senior citizens need in Vermont, those drugs cost 81 percent more than in Canada and 112 percent more than in Mexico.

□ 1815

And in response to that absurdity, I have introduced legislation which would allow American pharmaceutical distributors to be able to purchase their products from Canada, from Mexico, and from any other country to take advantage of the lower prices so they could resell those products back in the United States at far lower prices than is currently the case.

I know the gentleman knows that the problem here is not with the independent pharmacist. That person has no choice but to sell the product for a high price because he is purchasing it for a high price. Well, now we are going to let competition reign. Now we will let the distributors buy at a lower price in Canada, Mexico or anyplace else. This is exactly the same product that is sold in the United States for a far higher price.

And I should mention that, as a matter of fact, on July 7 I intend to take a van of senior citizens and people with chronic health problems to Canada. It is only an hour and a half away from us. We are going to go to Montreal and we are going to purchase prescription drugs and we are going to show the degree to which prices in Canada are so much lower than they are in the United States.

In my State already many people are going over the border to Canada to take advantage of the lower prices. I know in the southern part of this country people are going to Mexico. That is an absurdity. Americans should not have to skip over the border, north or south, in order to get a discount on drugs manufactured by American pharmaceutical companies. That is an outrage. And we are going to do everything we can to see that the American consumer is treated the same way that the Canadians, the Mexicans, and the Europeans are treated.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Is the gentleman telling me these are exactly the same drugs? These must be generics or something like that.

Mr. SANDERS. No, these are the same drugs manufactured in the same factory, often in the same bottle, often in Puerto Rico. The same exact products.

I want the pharmaceutical industry to tell the American people why if they

go to Europe, if they go to Mexico, if they go to Canada they can purchase the product that they sometimes need to stay alive. The gentleman and I both know of the horror stories of people struggling to combat their illnesses, a question of life and death, and not being able to afford these outrageously high prices.

And as the gentleman indicated a moment ago, to add insult to injury, the taxpayers of this country pour huge sums of money into research and development. And then, when they develop the product, instead of saying to the pharmaceutical company that is going to distribute it, that is going to sell it, that they have to sell that product, because it was developed with taxpayer money, they have to sell that product at a reasonable price, instead of that the NIH gives the product over to the pharmaceutical industry who then sells it at any price that they want, meaning that the taxpayer who helped to develop the drug often cannot even afford to purchase the drug that he or she developed, which is an issue that must be addressed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have also recently found out, which causes me great concern in my district, that there is a problem with retired military getting their prescriptions filled. We have no active military base in Oregon, and they are not eligible for a mail order program which is maintained by the military, so what they have been doing is pooling together with volunteers to go up to Washington State with all their prescriptions, and then have a person go and fill a couple hundred prescriptions and load them in a van and drive them back down to Oregon.

Now, this is another example of Americans who have been made a promise, in this case veterans, that we would take care of them; that we would take care of them for life, and now they are not getting their prescriptions filled. In fact, the military has proposed that they do not want to have this volunteer van service anymore. And I said, well, then, how about making these people eligible for mail order prescriptions? I have a Blue Cross/Blue Shield card, so I can get some product out of a pharmacy in Florida for an absurd price if I want to wait a week or 10 days. So I said, how about the military setting up something like that. Well, that is difficult. We are still fighting over that.

But that is just another category of people that are getting hit. They cannot afford to go to the pharmacy and buy these things. They have to get them through the military, and now they are being told they cannot do that.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman touches on an issue I know both of us have worked on, and that is veterans' rights, and this gets again back to the issue of the so-called booming economy and the priorities being established in the Congress.

Now, it seems to me that in terms of veterans, these are men and women

who have put their lives on the line. They did what their government asked them to do. They signed a contract, sometimes in blood, with the United States Government. And I regard it as completely unacceptable that the government reneges on the contract that it signed with those people.

And when we talk about priorities and we talk about the so-called booming economy, I find it hard to understand how any Member of this Congress could support on one hand huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, who in recent years have seen extraordinary increases in their wealth, and then with the other hand say to the veterans of this country, well, gee, I guess we are having problems with prescription drugs, we just do not have the money to help. We may have to downsize the VA hospitals. We may have to cut back on the quality of care that we give.

Now, what a sense of priorities it is to say to millionaires and billionaires, oh, we hear your pain, we are going to give you huge tax breaks; but to the veterans of this country, to the senior citizens of this country, to the working people of this country, gee, we are sorry, we just do not have the funds to help in your hour of need.

Now, we have talked about health care, we have talked about prescription drugs, we have talked about the Federal Reserve, and we could go on and on, but the bottom line is that what goes on in this country increasingly is that the people on the top are doing extraordinarily well, the people in the middle are working longer hours for lower wages, and the people down below are hurting very severely.

I find it basically wrong, and there is no other word that I can use, that in the United States of America today we have the most unfair distribution of wealth and the most unfair distribution of income in any industrialized society. We have a situation in which the wealthiest 1 percent of the population now own 40 percent of the total wealth of this Nation, which is more than the bottom 95 percent. We have just 1 percent or more wealth from the bottom 95 percent.

As the gentleman knows, in recent years, we have given huge tax breaks to upper income people at the same time as we have cut back on the needs of our veterans and we have cut back on the needs of many, many other people. So when I go back to Vermont, people say to me, middle class people say, gee, we cannot afford to send our kids to college; how can you be in a Congress which can provide huge tax breaks for those people who really do not need it?

So I think we have to get our priorities right. And what our priorities should mean is that we should join, in my view, the rest of the major countries in this world and say that health care is a right of citizenship, not a radical idea; that every man, woman, and child should be entitled to health care

because they are citizens of this country; that we should be putting more money into higher education so that middle class families do not have to go deeply into debt to send their kids to college; so that the young people do not have to get out of college \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000 in debt.

So I would suggest that maybe the Congress would want to start focusing on the needs of ordinary people rather than just those people who make the campaign contributions.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I am surprised we got back to campaign contributions, but I think the gentleman is making an excellent point. Again, the question is on behalf of whom does this body make policy day in and day out and to whom is the majority behold- ing?

They are talking about a vision. They have a vision for a future, a tax system, which the gentleman was just talking about, and it is an interesting vision. And the vision is that we should do away with death taxes. Of course, in the last Congress we acted so that anyone with assets of less than \$1 million in the very near future will be subject to no death taxes. But they are worried about those people with assets of over \$1 million; that they might have to pay taxes upon transferring them to their heirs. So their vision is we would do away with all inheritance tax and then would reduce the capital gains tax to zero.

Now, here is the ultimate absurdity, and this is not about wealth envy or something else, it is about everybody carrying their fair share of the burden in our society, and somewhat that depends upon the ability to pay. We can only squeeze so much out of a minimum wage worker. But if someone has a lot of discretionary income, they can afford to pay a little bit more. But in their vision that they have put forward to us, there will be zero inheritance tax and zero capital gains tax.

Now, let us just say if someone was lucky enough to be, well, let's say Bill Gates' child, that person, and he says, by the way, that he is going to give most of the money away to charitable undertakings. And that is wonderful, and I think the American people will appreciate that gift. But let us just say he reserves a billion dollars for his child, and the child gets a billion dollars when they graduate from college. Well, under this vision of the future, that child would pay zero dollars on taxes for the inheritance. And if that child chose to invest the money for a living as opposed to working for wages, they would pay zero dollars in Federal taxes, zero dollars in FICA taxes.

So it sort of begs the question, as the elite make more and more of their money off unearned income, why is it that wage-earning people have to pay 28 or 31 percent, or even the people at the top, 39.6 percent of their income in taxes, but these other people who do not have to work for wages, who are lucky enough or skillful enough to just

live on unearned income, pay at the rate today of 18 percent with a vision of going to zero?

Mr. SANDERS. Let me see if I understand what the gentleman is saying. It is a very radical concept. Is the gentleman suggesting that somebody who works by the sweat of their brow for 50, 60, 70 hours a week trying to make \$25,000, \$35,000, or \$40,000 a year to maintain their family at a level of dignity and decency, that those people should be paying less in taxes than people who make millions of dollars investing in the stock market?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I was not even taking it that far, but that is an interesting point.

Mr. SANDERS. It is radical, I know.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That is pretty radical. The gentleman sometimes is known to be out there a little bit.

But I will take it back to a simpler prospect. A person who works 50 hours a week, say a retail clerk, and brings home \$40,000, \$50,000 a year in a good union job. That is possible. Let us not even go to the issue of someone with a very large income and someone with a modest income. Let us say two people earned \$40,000 a year. One earns \$40,000 a year by investing money they inherited, the other earns \$40,000 a year by working 40 hours a week in a wage-earning job. The person who earns \$40,000 a year is paying taxes at about the rate of 28 percent and the person who invests for a living is paying 18 percent.

Now, I have a hard time understanding why that is fair; why the person who does not work for wages pays a lower rate. And, of course, if the person who works for wages is self-employed, not only do they get socked with a 28 percent rate, they also get socked with paying the FICA tax on both sides, so their tax rate suddenly jumps up around 40 to 50 percent. But their vision for the future is that 1 percent or so who can just live off investments should pay no taxes to the Federal Government.

Now, my question would be how then are we going to maintain the government and who is going to pay?

Mr. SANDERS. Well, I think while it is certainly not fair, it is understandable. Because once again we have got to deal with the reality that the wealthiest one-quarter of 1 percent of the population make 80 percent of the campaign contributions. Unless I would be very mistaken, and I do not think I am, when these guys kick in \$50,000 or \$100,000 or \$1 million, and their corporate friends kick in huge sums of money to both political parties, maybe that is the reason that they are making those contributions.

After all, imagine just trying to live on a couple hundred million dollars a year when one can get a tax break and earn even more money. My guess is that when they go to these \$50,000 a plate dinners, they are not sitting there saying, raise the minimum wage, that is why we contributed \$50,000; ex-

pand the Pell Grants; provide health care to all people; cut the cost of pharmaceuticals so that ordinary folks can afford it.

□ 1830

My guess would be that people who contribute huge sums of money to the political parties are not quite so interested in the needs of the middle class and working families of this country but rather their own interests. And one of their own interests is to pay less and less and less in taxes, and that certainly has happened in recent years.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, certainly, then, we can expect that we will take up campaign finance reform soon here on the floor of the House.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, we certainly would like to do so. But once again, money is talking.

The American people in poll after poll say they want changes in the obscenity of the current campaign finance system. But the monied folks, hey, they like the system the way it is.

See, in a democracy we have one person, one vote. If we have money, if we do not have money, we get one vote. But in the current system, we have one person, one vote. But then the other person has one vote plus the ability to contribute endless sums of money and have access and impact on the legislative process. So for those folks who have the money, they do not want to see campaign finance reform.

It is a real outrage that the House leadership has refused to bring back onto the floor a reasonably conservative bill that would ban soft money that passed overwhelmingly here last year. They do not want to bring it back. And they are going to wait and wait so that it will become impossible for the Senate to act and will continue this charade by which big money pours into both parties and to the presidential candidates and which Government continues to work on the needs of upper-income people rather than the middle class.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an excellent point there, and it is very disturbing to me and many other Members of this chamber.

I believe the gentleman has probably signed what is called the discharge petition. That is, a majority of Members of this House if made to vote would vote for campaign finance reform, but the leaders of the Republican party are attempting to protect their Members from making that vote.

In the last Congress, Speaker Gingrich managed to delay and delay and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) managed to offer many, many, many mischievous amendments. But ultimately, finally, the House passed its judgment. As the gentleman says, overwhelmingly, faced with the obscenity of today's campaign finance system, an overwhelmingly majority of this House said we have to take these minimal steps towards reform. Our constituents demand it.

But now here we are a little more than a year later, same place, a majority support reform, but we cannot get a bill to the floor of the House. The Speaker says, well, I will only bring it up later in the year, late enough so that we know it will not go anywhere in the Senate and then we will be launched into the presidential campaign year. And we all know that we are not going to reform campaign in the middle of the most expensive presidential campaign in the history of the United States.

Mr. SANDERS. What is really very clear, I do not think there is any debate on this, is the Speaker and the House leadership understands that if that bill came before the House, as the gentleman has just indicated, the vast majority of the people would vote for it because they would be embarrassed to go back home and say, "we voted against campaign finance reform." But if it does not come before the floor of the House, they do not have to make that vote.

Now, we are running out of time. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has recently made I think a very important contribution in terms of this whole discussion over Social Security. As the gentleman knows, we hear very often about how Social Security is going bankrupt, there is no money in it, and blah, blah, blah, which happens to be untrue.

Right now, if the United States Congress does nothing, which I think is not a good idea, I think we should act, Social Security will be able to pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 34 years. So that is not a system on the verge of bankruptcy. But as we become an older society and as people live longer, there are problems that we must address.

I know the gentleman has just recently introduced very, I think, interesting Social Security legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yes. Just one point beyond that for people who are being stampeded into the idea that we have to destroy the system to save it.

Even if Congress did nothing, as the gentleman says, for 35 years Social Security could deliver on 100 percent of promised benefits and after that 73 to 75 percent of promised benefits into the indefinite future. That means it has a 25-percent that starts 35 years from now.

Does that sound like a system we need to destroy, the most successful social system this country has ever seen that has been responsible for lifting tens of millions of seniors out of poverty?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I find it very ironic and interesting that time and time again, and I guess we are not going to have time today to talk about corporate control over the media, a very dear subject to me, but I find it amazing that we hear Social Security crisis, bankrupt, no money available, and the young people by and large believe us by now because they have

heard it so much, when there is no debate.

If the Congress does nothing, Social Security will pay out every nickel owed to every eligible American for the next 34 years.

We have crises today. We have people sleeping out on the street. Elderly people cannot afford their prescription drugs. Veterans are not getting the health care they need. But those, apparently, are not crises. But this non-crisis is now being subjected to a situation where people want draconian response which would destroy the system.

But maybe the gentleman wants to say a few words.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would pause at something, but I do want to explain my plan, that that has something to do with the fact that if it were broken up into 70 to 80 million pieces that there would be an awful lot of commissions out there for brokers. And all the intense pressure here in Congress to break Social Security up and make it into individual accounts is coming from Wall Street, the same people of course who are contributing tremendous amounts of monies to people's campaigns.

But let me explain a simple fix for Social Security. About half the American people pay more in Social Security taxes to the Federal Government than they do income taxes. We should deal with that issue. We should give them some tax relief.

Now, we also want to make certain that the system is solvent for the future. So I put those two ideas together. If we did one thing, if we lifted the cap, right now if they earn \$72,600 they pay Social Security on every penny they earn. If they earn \$15,000, \$20,000, \$40,000, up to \$72,600, Social Security on every penny they earn. If they earn a million dollars, they only pay Social Security on the first \$72,600. That means their effective rate of tax is less than one percent; and it is over 6 percent for Social Security alone, not the Medicare portion, for individuals who earn \$20,000 a year.

So lift that cap. If we lift the cap and say fair is fair, everybody will pay the same amount on all they earn, that sounds like the flat tax that my colleagues over here are always pushing, then that would raise more than enough money to fix the system and make it solvent forever.

But I want to take some of that money and invest it in tax relief. We could also exempt the first \$4,000 of earnings for every wage-earning American. That means everybody who earns less than \$72,600 a year, that is 95 percent of wage-earning Americans, would get a tax break under this proposal. And then with a few other changes in Social Security, investing some aggregate amount of the surplus, taking away from Congress which borrows it and spends it and replaces it with IOUs into index funds and other investments, we could ensure, and I have a

letter from Social Security saying my plan would do this, the solvency of Social Security for 75 years, which is as far out as they project it, while providing tax relief for 95 percent of Americans.

I also deal with two other problems. I give five child care dropout years so that the families that cannot afford child care or choose to stay home with their kids in their formative years will not be penalized in their ultimate Social Security benefits; and then finally, a slight increase in benefits for people over the age of 85 who are at a very high rate of poverty.

We could do all that by lifting the cap on the wages. That is, everybody pays the same amount. But, unfortunately, I believe that a lot of people who are talking about financing campaigns are probably in that same category.

Mr. SANDERS. Very interesting. They do polls and they ask the American people, how do you think we should deal with the Social Security situation?

The one alternative is to raise the age at which they get benefits. The other solution is to cut back on benefits. And the American people respond. Then they said, what about raising the cap, exactly what are my colleague is talking about. Poll after poll shows the American people think that is a very good idea. They think it is appropriate.

As the gentleman just indicated, if they raise the cap, not only can they create Social Security solvency for the 75 years that the actuaries actually want, they could actually have a tax deduction for low and medium income workers, which makes a lot of sense to me.

But amazingly, despite the fact that this is an idea that the American people want, how many people in the Congress are even prepared to talk about that idea? Not a whole lot.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, I am circulating a letter to all our colleagues this week asking them to sign on to the bill, which I will introduce when we return from the July 4 break.

I think that certainly there will be many who will be interested in a progressive Social Security reform, a way to cut taxes for 95 percent of wage-earning Americans and assure the future of Social Security for generations to come. It sounds like a pretty good deal to me. And we will see if, for once, we can overcome the influence of those few wealthy people who spend so much financing the campaigns, particularly on the majority side of the aisle here.

Mr. SANDERS. I think we are coming toward the end of our time. I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for all of the work that he does in the Congress and for his participation this evening.

I would like to conclude on this note. We have touched on a number of problems, but that does not make us pessimistic. It is my belief, and I know I speak for my colleague as well, that if

working people and middle-income people and young people get involved in the political process, if they let the Congress and the President hear from them, if they make the political leaders of this country understand what their needs are and they will get involved, we can turn this country around.

We should not be proud that the wealthiest people have seen huge increases in their income and their wealth at the same time as we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any industrialized nation. We should not be proud that 43 million Americans have no health insurance and that we are the only country in the industrialized world without a national health insurance system. We should not be proud that the CEOs make over 300 times what their workers make and that in the midst of the so-called economic boom, the average American worker today is earning less than was the case 25 years ago.

But ultimately to turn that around, to make the Government of the United States work for the middle class, work for working families, rather than for upper-income people, people are going to have to get involved in the process. They are going to have to vote. They are going to have to be informed about the issues. They are going to have to run for office. They are going to have to revitalize American democracy and pay tribute to the founders of this country who gave us the radical concept of democracy.

So I would hope that all of our people, especially the young people who are turning their backs to our Democratic system, get involved and stand up and fight for the rights of ordinary people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me this evening.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

COLORADO CATTLE CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite those Members of the Republican Conference who may be monitoring tonight's proceedings and have something that they would like to add in the next hour during this special order to come on down to the floor and join in. I secure this hour every now and then on behalf of the Republican Conference just for that purpose.

One of the topics I wanted to discuss was with respect to some good news in agriculture over the last couple of weeks. Because while the bull is still loose on Wall Street, months after the

analysts and pundits first began warning in earnest of overpriced stocks and certainly financial meltdowns, another young crop of fresh-from-college-20-somethings with a computer and a catchy slogan has launched their initial public offerings and made millions.

Granted, short of cashing in their stock options, their net worth is only on paper and few Internet start-ups have yet to post real profits. But the investor cash fueling the IPO madness is real, and leading economic indicators suggest no predicted slowdown in the economy.

□ 1845

Consumer spending is up while unemployment rates are down. Business sector productivity, personal income and new home starts, all important indicators, are all on the rise.

Yet while that bull stampedes through the streets of New York, many of the cattle along the dusty cattle roads of eastern Colorado are going nowhere. That just might change soon. Until this month, the Clinton administration has done little to help America's cattle industry and cattle ranchers in their decades-long trade dispute with the European Union over U.S. growth hormones which meant that Colorado's cattle intended for slaughter and export to European consumers were banned and banned on the basis of dubious science.

Under prior World Trade Organization rulings, the European Union was required to drop its ban on U.S. beef imports absent risk assessments and scientific justification by May 13, 1999. The European Union refused to do so and in response the United States was notified of the World Trade Organization's intent to impose a 100 percent retaliatory tariff on approximately \$202 million of European Union products. This level of retaliation is estimated to be far short of the true value of U.S. beef that would be exported to the European Union absent the ban, but it is enough to get the attention of those nations which might utilize unfair trade tactics in the future.

Colorado agriculture increasingly depends upon the export market to expand sales and increase revenues and to expand world trade and agriculture has a significant impact on both the U.S. trade balance and on specific commodities and individual farmers. The cards are stacked against farmers and ranchers to begin with. No sector of the economy is subject to more international trade barriers than agriculture. The import quotas, high tariffs, government-buying monopolies and import bans imposed by other nations coupled with the overwhelming number of trade sanctions and embargoes imposed on other countries by our own government cost the American agriculture industry billions of dollars each year in lost export opportunities. These barriers continue to grow despite the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, and the North American

Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. Without question, they are devastating the ability for American producers to compete effectively, particularly at a time when exports now account for over 30 percent of U.S. farm cash receipts and nearly 40 percent of all agricultural production.

This particular dispute over the presence of growth-promoting hormones dates back to 1989 when the European Union put into effect a ban on the production and importation of meat containing such compounds. Growth-promoting hormones are widely used in the United States as well as other top meat exporting countries to speed up growth rates and produce leaner meat for consumers who display an increasing preference for reduced fat and cholesterol diets. Hormones used within the U.S. are regulated by the United States Department of Agriculture and are ones which occur naturally in an animal's body or that mimic naturally occurring compounds. The European Union banned the production and importation of meat derived from animals treated with hormones following an incident where a young boy was harmed after ingesting a concentrated quantity of an unregulated hormone produced in Europe. Citing extensive scientific evidence that U.S. growth hormones have been proven safe, the United States challenged the European Union's ban on the basis that it violates a 1994 Uruguay Round agreement on sanitary and phytosanitary measures. The sanitary and phytosanitary standards agreement requires a scientific basis for measures which restrict trade based on health or safety concerns. The World Trade Organization ruled in 1997 that the ban did indeed violate several provisions of those sanitary and phytosanitary standards agreements and ordered the European Union to eliminate the meat hormone ban by May 13, 1999. When the ban was not lifted last month, the United States decided to take action in the form of retaliatory tariffs.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to pick up a newspaper today without reading about the extraordinary resilience of the United States economy and the significant profits being reaped by corporations and investors alike. Yet it is also difficult for me and other Members of Congress representing rural districts to talk with our neighbors back home, conduct town meetings or read through our constituent mail without learning of yet more foreclosures, defaults and farm auctions. Most of these people are not sharing in the windfall. Indeed, farm country is still in serious trouble and there is no evidence things are getting better. Low commodity prices, disease, weather-related problems, coupled with declining export opportunities, weak demand and overregulation have taken a devastating toll on agriculture. Real farm income has fallen dramatically over the last 2 years and real families are feeling the effects. While Congress recently helped

stave off disaster in rural America with an emergency assistance package, it is evident that more needs to be done and more needs to be done to establish real long-term solutions across the board. That is why the decision to retaliate against the European Union for its unfair ban on U.S. beef, even if for just a fraction of the overall monetary damage to the U.S. and U.S. producers, is a step in the right direction and a significant win for Colorado ranchers and farmers, and I would submit for ranchers and farmers throughout the rest of the country.

It is abundantly clear that in addition to free trade, America must guarantee fair trade. If I, other members of the majority and my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture can continue to compel the Clinton administration to pursue additional rightful corrective actions like this one, it might just give our farmers and ranchers back home a fighting chance and allow them to run with the bulls.

I recently had an opportunity to hear back from a number of State legislators in Colorado. Their concern on the floor of the Colorado House of Representatives was one for another economic issue, in this case the cause of balancing our Federal budget. As State legislators, my former colleagues and current friends in the General Assembly realize that it is important for the Federal Government to get its financial house in order. The State legislature recently sent to Congress a resolution that it adopted in both houses of the State legislature. It is a House Joint Resolution, 99-1016. It is based on a number of items. The resolution was drafted and offered by State Representative Penn Piffner from Colorado and also State Senator Ken Arnold from Adams County in Colorado. It concerns the General Assembly's support for legislation that would require a balanced Federal budget and the repayment of the national debt.

They cite a number of statistics, that the Federal Government has accumulated a \$70 billion budget surplus in 1998, the first surplus since 1969, and is considering policies for using that 1998 surplus and expected surpluses for 1999 and future years.

The Federal Government has amassed a national debt of more than \$5.7 trillion and in 1999 Federal tax dollars will be used to pay \$357 billion in interest just to the national debt.

The costs of servicing the national debt have become an increasingly large portion of the Federal budget, rising from under 10 percent of the budget back in 1978 to 22 percent of the budget in 1997.

Paying down the national debt will relieve future generations of the burden of paying the costs of servicing the national debt, says the Colorado State General Assembly, and they are right.

Paying down the national debt does not exclude the use of Federal moneys for tax relief or for saving Social Security for future generations.

Paying down the national debt will foster economic growth and stability.

The American Debt Repayment Act which provides for budgetary reform by requiring a balanced Federal budget for each year beginning with Federal fiscal year 2000 and requiring a repayment of the entire national debt by the end of Federal fiscal year 2029 has been introduced in both houses, here and in the other body across the hall.

The Colorado General Assembly urges the Congress in the following way. It says:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 62nd General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

Number one, that we, the members of the General Assembly, support the objectives of the American Debt Repayment Act to pay down the national debt and maintain a balanced Federal budget; and, two, that the members of the General Assembly strongly urge the United States Congress to commit to a plan to repay the national debt before approving a budget resolution.

These kinds of resolutions, Mr. Speaker, are important. States adopt these kinds of resolutions in their State General Assemblies on a routine basis. This is just one example. It is signed in this case by the Speaker of the House, Russell George, and the President of the Colorado State Senate, Ray Powers. These resolutions are taken to heart and utilized by many of us here in Washington. These are the voices of the front lines when it comes to government. In our strong tradition of federalism, we, of course, have separated the duties and responsibilities of governing our great Nation into generally three levels, the local level, the State level and the Federal level, and I am one who fundamentally believes as the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution suggests that it is States that bear the greatest responsibility in organizing and leading our societies through the political process. And so when States issue memorandum such as these and memorialize Congress to act in a certain way, Members of Congress should take heed, Members of Congress should pay attention, Members of Congress should respect the opinions of those who truly are on the front lines of leading our society. Those 50, as a Supreme Court Justice once observed, laboratories of democracy, the States, really do understand the importance of a strong economy and a responsible Federal budget and a responsible Congress when it comes to managing the fiscal affairs of the entire Nation.

I want to jump to another subject for a moment. This is a much more personal one but one that is being carried out in a public way. I met a woman recently, I was speaking at an education conference in the State of Florida and a woman after the conference came up and gave me her business card and gave me some information about a program that she runs, because in the discussion

about education and looking out for the future and the well-being of our children, she has a program that she has initiated and is carrying out with great success in Florida that she told me about and asked me if I would not come to this floor at some point in time and share her thoughts and her objectives of her program with my colleagues. Her name is Tina Hesse. She is the abstinence coordinator for the Brandon Crisis Pregnancy Center in Brandon, Florida. She is one who comes to this particular mission of hers with tremendous commitment and compassion. She is one who has a personal story to tell and one who found herself at a young age to be with child and her credibility on the matter is one that she utilizes in a very positive way now to reach out to a number of young children all across Florida and hopefully even tonight throughout the country, because when she gives her presentation on teen sexual abstinence in high schools, her message is a personal one.

She says, and I quote, I had a teen pregnancy when I was in high school, so I know where kids are in terms of their contemplation of sexual activity.

She is 31 years old now and delivers a very powerful message to children, primarily in schools but in other settings as well. Her program is called "Be the One" which began as a West Palm Beach pregnancy center program in the early 1990s. Hesse said the program title means be the one to wait to have sex.

There is a quote in an article that I am referencing here from the Tampa Tribune, May 20, 1999:

Hillsborough Secondary Education Supervisor Tom Schlarbaum, who approved the abstinence program, describes Hillsborough's present sex education program as abstinence-based compared to the abstinence-only approach of "Be the One" but he says, "The abstinence-only focus gives teachers another way to get a different message across." In his opinion it is an important one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to point out on the subject of welfare reform just how well our country has done since the welfare reform.

Approximately 42 percent of the people who were on welfare in 1994 are off welfare now. We kind of take it for granted, well, welfare reform is working, but if we go back and we look at the struggle we had getting common sense welfare reform that was compassionate in that it wanted to help people, not push anybody out the door, not cut off anybody's insurance benefit or transportation or housing, yet at the same time say if you are able to work, you ought to be required to work. Yet despite that, the President vetoed the bill twice. The minority leader, Dick Gephardt, said this on the floor of the House in March 1995:

"A Republican welfare bill will throw millions of children out on the street

without doing anything to move people from welfare to work.”

□ 1900

The gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) said on July 17, 1996, it grieves me to be here this evening to see the end of a period of almost 60 years in which this country's belief in its responsibility to the poor is going to be shattered. This is not reform. This is destruction of the basic guarantees of our democracy.

Here is Representative Sam Gibbons on the floor, March 21, 1995: If Attila the Hun were alive today and elected to Congress, he would be delighted with this bill that is here before us, and proud to cast his vote for H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act. It is the most callous, cold-hearted, just listen to this rhetoric, the most callous, cold-hearted and mean-spirited attack on this country that I have ever seen in my life; just fighting that kind of irresponsible rhetoric to the rolls decreasing that were on welfare, people working, people feeling good about themselves, the teen pregnancy rates going down, the crime rates going down; people like this woman who are back in the education system or back in the workforce feeling good, happy, independent, no longer shackled by this government system which encourages dependence.

Mr. SCHAFFER. If the gentleman remembers, at the time when that debate was unfolding here on the House Floor, the gentleman is right that a number of the more liberal Members of Congress, who view the government as the primary entity in organizing our society, believed that the American people really would not rally around the cause of helping the poor, of helping those who have become dependent on a welfare system, not just dependent but locked into a cycle of poverty that seemed to be never ending; that these liberals on the House floor who came to believe and approached the debate from the perspective that, my goodness, nobody else will be able to stand in the balance.

I appreciate the comments about the reduction in teen pregnancy and what a positive result that has had. People like Tina Hess have really filled the void where government once was viewed as the sole provider of these kinds of services. She is one who has found a way, through a nonprofit corporation, to go into schools and deliver a curriculum that is helping to continue to reduce these numbers.

Let me read one more final quote from one of the students. She said that the slides on sexually transmitted diseases show students how their lives can become miserable. A lot of teens think AIDS, or STDs, sexually transmitted diseases, will never happen to them but after a presentation at a school called Bloomingdale last week, one student wrote, and I am quoting the letter from the student, all this talk about pregnancy and STDs is going to make me stay a virgin until I am ready.

Now that is the kind of response that has really flourished throughout the country where those who have made some poor decisions, but who also take their role as citizens seriously, have managed to provide a real leadership role in the community to help drive these welfare case numbers down. It is remarkable.

In States like mine out in Colorado, over the last 2 years there are now 50 percent fewer families on welfare than there were just 2 years ago.

Mr. KINGSTON. In the testimony of the people, here is a bus driver in Milwaukee, when welfare reform first started there were a lot of complaints; people were afraid how they would fit in. Everything was new and different, but now many people have gotten into it and the morale and self-esteem has been boosted. We can tell they feel good. Most of the people are happy, too. Look into their eyes. They are happy. The eyes tell no lies.

Here is a former welfare mother: I could have succeeded long ago but I had kids and I was an over protective mother. I did take advantage of the welfare system, but now we are not living month-to-month running out of food. I earn \$11.49 an hour. I am still in poverty but I know it is not going to last forever. Just a total turnaround.

Here is an article from the New York Times, July 27, 1998: With caseloads falling at a startling pace for minorities as well as whites, taxpayers seem well satisfied with the new ethos of time limits and work demands, and yet here again going back to 1995 here was a quote from one of our colleagues, they are coming for the sick, the elderly, the disabled. I say to my colleagues, we have the ability, the capacity, the power to stop this onslaught. Another one said that welfare reform was like Nazi Germany.

So often we in our society seem to work ourselves up into a froth; fear of the unknown. What we need to do is to have a little more self-confidence and self-reliance.

I love the story from the gentleman about this educator also.

We have passed in this Congress, under Speaker HASTERT, the Educational Flexibility Act, which has already passed the Senate and signed by the President, but the ed-flex bill gives local school systems more control, less Washington micromanagement, less bureaucracy breathing down their necks. Now, even though that is successful, we are starting it and most school systems say, yes, we want to run our show locally, we are trying to go a little bit further and do something called Straight A. What the Straight A program calls for is a charter between individual States and the Federal Government, and basically the Federal Government says that if the States meet certain outcomes and have high results, then we will free them from certain Federal regulations.

My school boards in the 18 counties that I represent in southeast Georgia,

they are ready for that. They know they have the ability to educate children better in Georgia than Washington can educate Georgia children. So they are confident about it.

I am sure in Colorado, and I visited the gentleman's people, they are full of that good old western pride that made our country so strong and they are as independent as anybody. I am sure they are going to be delighted to get into this Straight As program.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Absolutely.

Our governor, Governor Bill Owens, is one who is looking forward to a day when there is greater flexibility to allow not only him but the rest of the Colorado General Assembly, and not to mention our school board leaders who are elected officials accountable directly to the people, these are the folks where they actually know the names of the students and the teachers and the administrators, all of these folks are looking forward to the day when they will be unleashed from the Federal rules and regulations that hamper their ability to teach children in an effective way.

We spend billions of dollars here in Washington and yet for the billions we spend the actual proportion of Federal funds that actually reach a classroom is relatively small, somewhere on the order of 7, 6, sometimes as high as 9 percent, in some needy or poorer school districts, but for that small, relatively small, portion of Federal funds that make up an overall classroom budget, the strings and the red tape and the requirements and mandates attached to that minority of cash is overpowering.

There are school districts in my State that have to hire people just to fill out the Federal paperwork so that they can get the money.

This is money that comes to Washington. The American taxpayers are working hard every day and paying their taxes. The money comes here to Washington, D.C. The Congress then, through its formulas and so on, divvies up this cash in a variety of ways and then there is this huge bureaucracy not too far from where we are now that then goes to work on this money. By the time that cash makes its way back to Colorado and back to the State of Georgia and every other State in the Union, there is just a fraction left for the kids.

That is what our Straight As proposal is designed to resolve, not to spend more money in Washington. We do not need to do that. We can actually increase the proportion of dollars that make it to a child by cutting all these silly rules and regulations.

I know there are people over there in the Department of Education who are nervous about this discussion, nervous about the debate and they oppose straight As, and with good reason. Our goal is to get rid of a lot of those people. I will be candid and frank with the gentleman and with them and with the American people. I frankly care more about my children in public schools

and all of the children of my friends and neighbors back in Colorado than I do about these people down the street here in the Department of Education. I want the money to get to the kids and to the teachers who know how to teach, rather than the bureaucrats who know how to provide paperwork and produce more headaches for communities around the country.

This Straight As proposal, it is a big thing. There are 760 Federal education programs. The ed-flex bill that we passed dealt with, I think, 9 of them; 9 significant ones. It was a big step in the right direction.

To follow up, to take the next logical step, to show the American people that we are serious about moving authority out of Washington and empowering our local communities, this Straight As proposal is a significant one.

I might add that we have almost 100 cosponsors now in this Congress, including on our side of the aisle, the Republican side, every Member of that committee is on board, every Member of our Republican leadership is on board. It is a bipartisan bill. We have Democrats who are cosponsors of Straight As. This is a big initiative and an exciting one, and the gentleman is right, before I turn it back over to the gentleman, to suggest that the education leaders in my State, and I would bet in the State of the gentleman also, and the other 48 states, are really getting excited about the prospect of receiving their cash back without Federal strings attached.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think that the question also on the subject of money is, do we want the dollars that we earn, that we work hard 40, 50, 60 hours a week for, do we want that money, those tax dollars, that portion of our income, to go to a bureaucrat in Washington or do we want it to go to a teacher in a classroom?

One of the things we have been pushing are more dollars to the classroom, not tripling the bureaucracy in Washington who is micromanaging our school system, and I think that is important. I think the local flexibility is the key, though.

In Colorado, the gentleman certainly had the big tragedy in Littleton that we are all aggrieved about, but we need to ask ourselves, maybe Washington is, in fact, part of the problem. Maybe pushing large, impersonal schools, where the teachers do not know the students as well, maybe the teachers are afraid to question kids who are acting suspicious or odd or peculiar because they are afraid of being sued themselves, and this kind of atmosphere really has been fostered by this large centralized government that has grown in the last 10 years in our country.

If people could run their own communities, their own schools and their own lives, I think we would have a much better society.

It is interesting, while this administration rushes out after the Littleton

tragedy to pass more gun control laws, they have completely ignored the fact that last year there were only 8 prosecutions for possession or discharge of a firearm in a school zone, and only 8 prosecutions for possession of a handgun or ammunition by a juvenile, and 6 prosecutions for the transfer of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile.

As the gentleman knows, in Littleton 23 existing gun control laws were broken. We have all of these on the books, but this administration is not prosecuting. What a difference it would make if they would prosecute. We do not know how it would have affected Littleton, but we do know that there are a lot of laws on the books that this administration, this Justice Department, has chosen not to enforce.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Right.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it could make a tremendous difference.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The whole theme here is one of local government. Local government is the closest to the people, the most accountable to those who are paying the taxes, and all three of these topics that we have discussed here really center around the theme of local authority and the notion that centralizing power and decision-making in Washington is a recipe for failure.

Going back to the welfare issue, when the debate took place on whether to reform the welfare system, the gentleman is right, there are people who said we cannot watch Washington give this authority up; it will hurt people.

We are seeing now in the debate on education reform the exact same dynamics. People here in Washington are saying, wait a minute; we cannot cut the Federal bureaucracy in Washington. That will hurt schools.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will stop there.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Sure.

Mr. KINGSTON. This particular president has been very wise in appealing to the population of the country. He talks about less Washington power and welfare reform, even though he vetoed the bill twice. He talks about more control of education locally. Now, unfortunately, we know, after 7 years that he does not always do what he says he is going to do, but maybe all politicians are that way, at least a little bit.

□ 1915

But it is interesting that members of his party are often out of step with what he is in fact saying himself.

In a case in point, in social security, we had a long debate about the lockbox concept, and the concept of a lockbox is so that the Federal government would quit mixing social security funds for peoples' retirement with operating expenses to run government agencies. We passed that after a long debate. There were a lot of procedural tactics to keep the bill off the floor, but once it got on the floor it was passed on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis.

It went to the Senate, which up until this week has not moved on the bill and had no plans to move on it until the President finally came around and said it. But it is that fear, the fear-mongering that we hear over and over again. It is the same people saying the same irresponsible things to scare America's educators, America's children, America's seniors, the environment, and whatever. It is just a fear-mongering tactic.

Somehow, once we get through there, it is not as bad as they thought, for some reason.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It is the culture of Washington that suggests to all of us here when we become a Member of Congress that no one in America can lead a successful life without somebody from the Federal government getting involved in their day-to-day affairs.

The gentleman and I came here as part of a new Republican majority to throw that type of mentality out of the city. It is taking a long time. That mentality that I just described has deep roots in this town. But systematically, day by day, we are proving them wrong. We are showing that trusting the American people is a recipe for success, and we are seeing it now with an economy that is just cruising along and doing extraordinarily well. We are seeing that now with a discussion on the House floor and over in the White House about what to do with surplus revenues, if Members can imagine that.

We are now talking about millions of Americans who are no longer dependent on the welfare system because we trusted local and State governments and the ingenuity of the American people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. We just helped the Federal government get out of the way. That works.

Listen to this quote, going back to the welfare discussion for a moment. "The AFDC world is very insular." I am reading a quote from a high school counselor in Milwaukee, AFDC being the Aid to Families With Dependent Children program, which is really one of the primary programs in welfare.

Mr. KINGSTON. Which incidentally is now temporary aid to needy families.

Mr. SCHAFFER. He says the AFDC world was very insular. "I don't think people left their neighborhoods. Now we are seeing a lot of mobility, people getting out more, families having a lot more exposure to services, like counseling and parenting classes. It seems like everywhere I go there is a sense of business in the streets, a lot of activity."

For a high school guidance counselor to make these observations in Milwaukee tells us where he is making these observations. He is seeing this in his children that he is serving. He is seeing this in the neighborhoods, where education becomes the important order of the day.

I think the message of this high school guidance counselor and others who make these same observations is a

message that needs to be told at the time we are debating education reform. It is the next step. If welfare reform worked by getting the Federal government out of the way, by empowering States, empowering local communities, and treating Americans like Americans again, perhaps we ought to try the same thing when it comes to schools: Get the Federal government and its 760 Federal programs out of the way, and let those principals and administrators and locally-elected school board members and teachers and parents do what they know how to do, which is teach children and care about them and build strong communities.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it has worked for welfare reform, and we need to, I think, be bold in our initiatives with social security, with Medicare, with tax relief, and all of our other issues that we are dealing with in this Congress.

The agenda, as the gentleman knows, that we are working on under the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) is the BEST agenda.

B is for building a strong military, one that can fight a war on two fronts, defend our country, one that is ready and modernized and has a good quality of life for the soldiers; E, E is for education, local control, excellence in education; S is for saving social security; and T is for lowering taxes through spending reductions and through revenue that does not go to social security.

One of the interesting things on the tax relief is that right now Federal taxes currently consume 21 percent of America's gross domestic product, the highest percentage in the history of our country.

Last year tax revenues grew by about 9 percent, and the average American now works 129 days in order to pay off their total tax bill. This is an all-time high. When the gentleman and I were raised, our parents, say in the fifties, paid 5 percent Federal income tax on average. In the 1970s it was 16 percent. Today it is 25 percent Federal income taxes.

What is really telling to me is that individuals and families who are earning \$50,000 a year pay about 82 percent of the total Federal income tax revenue. Let me repeat that. Individuals and families earning \$50,000, and I suspect that would probably be about 90 percent of the people who watch C-Span, they are paying 82 percent of the total income revenue, income tax revenues to the Federal government. That is a huge disproportionate tax burden.

Mr. SCHAFFER. They are overpaying, too. The interesting thing about Washington, and what may frustrate many of these taxpayers who are working hard and know where every dollar of their income goes and where their taxes hurt, I turned on the news yesterday and discovered that the President of the United States woke up yesterday and found \$1 trillion laying around, discovered that there is \$1 tril-

lion in additional surplus revenue that the Federal government has all of a sudden found.

That is a great thing, I think. What it shows is that the economy was even stronger than they realized over at the White House; that the entrepreneurial spirit of the American people is even more inspired than perhaps the White House gave it credit for.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this about that surplus that people often are missing in Washington. That surplus is projected on unrealistic spending restraints. We can say, we are going to have this surplus, but that is making a huge, a huge assumption that we are going to continue on a very moderate spending path which the gentleman and I know every day a new special interest group comes to us and says, break these spending caps, spend more than projected.

To me, that is one thing that is wrong with the surplus. The other thing is, as the gentleman has already pointed out, it makes a big assumption that the economy is going to continue to roll along at the current rate.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right. In order to make that happen and to encourage that kind of economic growth, the kind that we have experienced over the last 6 years, we have to make sure we do the right things that help foster economic growth.

I want to ask the gentleman, just in terms of speculation and knowing the nature of the city, when there are extra dollars laying around, whether they are real or perceived extra dollars, can the gentleman define for the House what the gentleman thinks the debate will be over the next few months or years around this \$1 trillion surplus that the President tripped over yesterday and accidentally discovered?

What does the gentleman think will happen next on the House floor? Does the gentleman think we will have the courage to give that money back to the taxpayers?

Mr. KINGSTON. There is a double-edged sword to bragging about the surplus. Number one, when we go out and talk about the surplus, we feel good politically because we say, look, some of our policies have worked, and for the first time since 1969 when Woodstock was held at Yasgur's farm, the budget now is balanced, or it is not in deficit. There is still this huge Federal debt, but just the annual spending is not a deficit. So there is a political punch to Democrats and Republicans about it.

But the down side is that we are also sending a signal out to the special interest groups that, hey, there is plenty of money here, come and get it, and wink wink, nobody will mind if we break our spending caps, the bipartisan budget agreement of 1997, because we have new money, and no one likes new money better than Washington's special interest groups.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is not unique to us at all. Every single day a new group

comes up and asks us to break that spending cap, that 1997 agreement. There are legitimate concerns. It is not just coming up with frivolous things, it is just that hey, we have legitimate concerns, and do we really have to go back and do the hard work of reinventing government or reinventing the status quo and figure out a better way to build a mousetrap? Can't you just give us more money this year? We hear it from health care, from education, from all kind of government bureaucracies.

I am very, very concerned that that anticipated surplus is not going to be as large as we want it to be because we are going to use it as an excuse to relax our austerity.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is actually the point I wanted to make, because I do not care who we are, whether we are a liberal over there in the White House or on the other side from where we stand, we do not just find \$1 trillion laying around. We either know it was there, or maybe a portion of it. We just do not magically wake up one day and discover, hey, we have \$1 trillion more cash than we thought.

The point I was intending to get to here is this: That waving that \$1 trillion surplus figure around to the American people really does send the green light, it sends the go signal to all of the lobbyists, all of the special interests, and even to many Members of this very Congress that, start smiling, it is time to spend again. We have money laying around.

We really do not have huge piles of cash laying around Washington, D.C. There are lots of games and lots of manipulations that go into bragging about the size of this debt.

There is no question that over the past few years, since the Republicans have taken over the control of Congress, we have slowed the rate of growth in Federal budgeting. We have done so to the extent that we have allowed the economy to catch up with us. But we do not have the trillions and trillions of dollars laying around Washington, D.C. to begin to start celebrating and spending.

Mr. KINGSTON. The odd part is, and just in a personal home, it is fun to buy a new boat or a new car. I have had one new car in my life, and I have never owned a new boat, so I really do not know the feeling, but I know it is a lot more fun to buy maybe a new TV or a new stereo than it is to buy a new drier or to get a new set of tires for your car.

In politics it is the same way, it is far more glamorous and sexy to go out and create a new government arts program or a new program for some special interest group that is going to help a limited number of people but it is going to sound real good to all, and we rush out and do that rather than pay down the debt.

With a \$5.4 trillion debt, I strongly urge, and I know the gentleman has been fighting for it, that we include not just debt service but debt payment

in every budget that we have. We should have, and last year our colleague, Mark Neumann, advocated I think it was a 25-year budget debt pay-down that would have paid off the national debt I think by the year 2025, or maybe even sooner than that.

That should be the center of the debate, not what are we going to do with this new money.

That debt right now, we do pay interest on it, and that interest I think is something like I believe \$500 per person, so a family of four pays about \$2,000 a year in taxes servicing the national debt. That is \$2,000 a year that could be used for college tuition, for groceries, for a vacation, for a couple of months of house payments.

That money is absolutely gone to the bondholders. It does not buy better education, better health care, better national security, it is just gone.

Mr. SCHAFFER. People in Washington like to take the credit for the strong economy and take credit for balancing the budget, and we deserve some credit, I think. As I mentioned, we did slow the rate of growth in Federal budgeting over the last 6 years. That has allowed the economy to catch up. But the American people are the ones that really deserve the credit.

We can help in a number of ways. There are many people here in Washington who believe that we were wrong to cut taxes over the last couple of years. We reduced the capital gains tax, we reduced inheritance taxes, we managed to provide a \$500 per child tax credit. There are an assortment of other taxes that we managed to knock down just a little bit.

We have not repealed them or pulled back the overall tax rate nearly as much as we can and perhaps should. But those people who criticized us for trying to reduce the tax burden and provide tax relief are also wrong, because what we found was that by leaving more cash back home in the hands and pockets of those people who earn it, we have inspired those individuals to become more productive with their own capital, with their own wealth. They have created more jobs. They have made wiser investments.

□ 1930

It is, in fact, that heightened level of economic activity that is saving the country today. That is the reason we balanced the budget. That is the reason the President believes that, if those American people continue to do the same things, make the same wise investments, perform strong economically as they have been, over the next 15 years, that there will be the surplus.

But it really means for us, I think, that we need to find more ways to ease the burden on American families and American business owners and people who are creating wealth and continue to shrink this government. Those are the assumptions the President has built into his numbers, but I do not believe that he has the commitment that

the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and I do and the rest of the Republican majority to actually stick to those budget caps and actually see the surplus grow.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we do not see any signs of it in the rhetoric that we are going to stick with this bipartisan agreement that everybody signed off on.

But to get back in terms of tax reduction, one of the big problems, and the gentleman from Colorado knows the expression, I think it is attributed to Jesse James, but I am not sure, "Why do you rob banks?" "Because that is where the money is." Why do the rich get tax reductions? Because they are the ones paying the taxes.

Now, I know that is real hard to accept when one builds political careers on class warfare and class division, as many politicians do. But the reality is, if one wants to give tax relief, one has got to give it also to the people who are paying the big taxes.

As I pointed out before, households earning more than \$50,000 are paying 82 percent of the income taxes right now. We have got to let them have some tax relief. But what is the benefit of that? Job creation. The entrepreneurs that the gentleman is talking about.

Ted Turner in Georgia makes a tremendous amount of money. Do my colleagues know what, in schools all over America, they should be teaching kids how they want to be an entrepreneur, they want to grow, they want to have capitalization, they want to be independent.

Now, not everybody is going to do that, be able to do that, and we want to have all kinds of jobs and options for people. We want to help those who never will be independent. But the reality is, let us do not punish Ted Turner when he gets to be where he is.

I mean, has it been good for the state of Georgia and Atlanta for CNN to be located there? Absolutely yes. Is it good, all those jobs? Yes. Are those people also, many of them who work for him, wealthy? Yes. Is that good? Yes. They buy lots of shoes and cars and stereos. They spend all kinds of money which creates jobs in Atlanta, Georgia.

But we go at this thing with the myopic that they are rich. It can only be attributed to luck, not hard work and enterprise. Therefore, there is an injustice about it, and we have got to punish them for being rich. We hear that over and over again.

But in this time of the surplus and the surplus, not all of it is coming from Social Security, but Americans are paying about \$500 a year more than the government needs to operate.

Now, I do not know anybody who likes overpaying a bill. I do not care who it is, if it is Bill Gates or the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), nobody like overpaying.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right.

Mr. KINGSTON. So one are overpaying one's taxes by \$500 more a year

if one is an average family than we need in this room, in this Chamber, in this Congress to operate one's government with.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It was Willie Sutton, by the way. Willie Sutton was the bank robber who told the judge, when the judge asked, "Why do you rob banks?"

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Colorado intimate with bank robbers? How does he know these fine things?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I remember that. It was Willie Sutton.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, I only remember Shakespeare and Winston Churchill, so the gentleman can correct me any time on bank robbers.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I remember that in particular because there is another Willie in this town who looks at obtaining cash in much the same way. When asked why he prefers taxes to be high rather than low and why he prefers additional spending rather than less, the answer is much the same way. We are going to continue to tax the American people \$500 more than they need to be paying because that is where the money is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has heard the old story about the man is driving down the road and sees a pig, and three of the pig's legs are wrapped up in bandages. Actually, he has three wooden legs. He says, what is the story about this pig.

He says, oh, that pig is a magic pig. It has really done a lot. He said, one time the family was burning, the House was burning, and that pig ran in and pulled us all out of bed and saved the entire family. Another time, my son was drowning, that pig dove in the lake, swam out there and picked him up and kept him from drowning and pulled him back from shore. On another occasion, my little girl was in an automobile accident, and the car was burning, and the pig leaped through the window and pulled her out and saved her.

The guy from the city said, well, that is amazing. That is a remarkable pig. But tell me, what about the bandages.

He said, well, it is obvious. You do not eat a pig like that all at once.

That is what the government is doing to the American entrepreneur, the American small business person, and the hard-working taxpayer in general, just grinding them down.

Some statistics that I wanted to say, the Census Bureau says that the average household now pays \$9,445 in Federal income taxes, which is twice as much as it was in 1985. The typical American family pays more in taxes than we spend on food, clothing, housing, and transportation combined. It is very similar to the story. You just do not eat a pig like that all at once, you grind them down.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the people who have the most at stake in this debate really are those American families earning less than \$50,000. They

already pay above 82 percent of the overall tax burden, and they constitute 91 percent of incomes.

When we talk about providing tax relief, trying to ease the burden on these very individuals, it will be the Democrats on the other side of the aisle that will come up here to these podiums and try to suggest that we are trying to reduce taxes on only the wealthy. Well, it is not the wealthy. It is 91 percent of all income taxes and 82 percent of the total burden being paid by those who earned \$50,000 or less.

I received a letter from a woman in Fort Collins who understands this full well. She says in one paragraph in this letter that she sent me, a woman from Fort Collins, Colorado, she says, "Although my family is not wealthy, it makes sense to me to give the extra money back to the people who paid it."

I think that she accurately sums up the sentiment of most Americans if we ask, where should this tax relief go? Where should this overpayment and cash revenues go? It should go back to those who overpaid.

Eighty-two percent of the taxpayers in America are those earning \$50,000 or less, and those are the ones that we think deserve their money back.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman's time is about to expire, so I will just close with this, that, again, under the leadership of Speaker Hastert, we are working on what we call the Best agenda. Again, the B is for the best, strongest military. E is for excellence in education. S is for saving Social Security. And T is for reducing taxes.

We are making a lot of progress. This year, for the first year in many years, the appropriations bills will be passed out of the House ahead of the cycle, ahead of the calendar, and we are making a lot of progress.

I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado allowing me to share some of his time tonight, and I look forward to working with him in the balance of the year.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia in joining this special order. America is good, not so much because of the Congress or our laws or things here in Washington. America is a great country because of the people and because of the philosophy of life that we have here in the United States. It is that philosophy and those people that we in order to honor more by not talking so much about growing Washington, but by shrinking the power of the Federal Government and encouraging and strengthening the lot of the American people.

TO MODIFY DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY) laid before the House the fol-

lowing message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) offers duty-free treatment to specified products that are imported from designated beneficiary developing countries. The GSP is authorized by title V of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

I have determined, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, that Gabon and Mongolia should be added to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the GSP.

I have also determined that the suspension of preferential treatment for Mauritania as a beneficiary developing country under the GSP, as reported in my letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of June 25, 1993, should be ended. I had determined to suspend Mauritania from the GSP because Mauritania had not taken or was not taking steps to afford internationally recognized worker rights. I have determined that circumstances in Mauritania have changed and that, based on a consideration of the eligibility criteria in title V, preferential treatment under the GSP for Mauritania as a least-developed beneficiary developing country should be restored.

This message is submitted in accordance with the requirements of title V of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1999.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1018

AFTER RECESS

The recess have expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 775, THE Y2K ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-213) on the resolution (H. Res. 234) waiving certain points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 775) to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the

year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-214) on the resolution (H. Res. 235) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE AND SENATE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY WORK PERIOD

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-215) on the resolution (H. Res. 236) providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PEASE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 1, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2799. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99-21), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2800. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report concerning defense articles that were licensed for export under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act during Fiscal Year 1998; to the Committee on International Relations.

2801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates—received May 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2802. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-51-AD; Amendment 39-11185; AD 99-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2803. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Credit Assistance for Surface Transportation Projects [OST Docket No. OST-99-5728] (RIN: 2125-AE49) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2804. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Engines [Docket No. 97-NM-89-AD; Amendment 39-11183; AD 99-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2805. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CF34 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-19-AD; Amendment 39-11179; AD 99-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2806. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-223-AD; Amendment 39-11186; AD 99-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2807. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Model 402C Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-21-AD; Amendment 39-11184; AD 99-11-13] (RIN: 2120-

AA64) received June 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2808. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Lake Champlain, NY & VT [CGD01-98-032] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2809. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA [CGD1-99-053] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2810. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Falgout Canal, LA [CGD08-99-035] received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2811. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Massalina Bayou, Florida [CGD08-99-033] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2812. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Muskingum River, Ohio [CGD08-99-020] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2813. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Harvey Canal, LA [CGD08-99-029] received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2814. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mandatory Ship Reporting Systems [USCG-1999-5525] (RIN: 2115-AF82) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2815. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anchorage Ground; Safety Zone; Speed Limit; Tongass Narrows and Ketchikan, AK [CGD17-99-002] (RIN: 2115-AF81) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2816. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; San Pedro Bay, CA [COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA; 99-003] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution waiving points of

order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 775) to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-213). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 235. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, and other financial service providers, and for other purposes. (Rept. 106-214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 236. Resolution providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period (Rept. 106-215). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BOYD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2389. A bill to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 2390. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create small, manageable, accountable classrooms with qualified teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WU, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FORD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

PASTOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 2391. A bill to establish a National Center for Research on Domestic Health Disparities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the authorization for the Small Business Innovation Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAIRD:

H.R. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide disaster relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:

H.R. 2394. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense prevailing rate employees in Georgia; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COMBEST (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. SCHAFER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THORBERRY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. OSE, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 2395. A bill to amend the Agricultural Market Transition Act to extend through fiscal year 2002 the authority for the advance payment, in full, of the payments required under production flexibility contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 2396. A bill to provide that the Davis-Bacon Act shall not apply to contracts for the construction and repair of schools and libraries; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs.

MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. INSLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. VENTO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 2397. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DELAY:

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify certain existing limitations on private business use of facilities financed with tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2399. A bill to establish a commission to recommend a strategy for the global eradication of disease; to the Committee on Commerce, to establish a commission to recommend a strategy for the global eradication of disease

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the low-income housing credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend the U.S. Holocaust Assets Commission Act of 1998 to extend the period by which the final report is due and to authorize additional funding; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PAUL, and Mrs. NORTHUP):

H.R. 2402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a 15-year recovery period for franchise property, to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements, to allow capital gain treatment on the transfer of a franchise in connection with the transfer of an existing business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2403. A bill to provide for payment in December 1999 of Social Security benefits otherwise payable in January 2000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 2404. A bill to protect the privacy of individuals by ensuring the confidentiality of information contained in their medical records and health-care-related information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote activities for the prevention of additional cases of infection with the virus commonly known as HIV; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 2406. A bill to reauthorize the Trade Adjustment Assistance program through fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to establish certain requirements regarding the approval of facilities for the disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 2408. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to prescribe a rule that prohibits the importation for disposal of polychlorinated biphenyls at concentrations of 50 parts per million or greater; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGAN (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 to earmark not less than \$150,000,000 for grants to reduce drug-related transactions and drug use in the one-mile areas surrounding elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 2411. A bill to abolish the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Science, Government Reform, Rules, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 2412. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 237. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to fibromyalgia; to the Committee on Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

148. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the President of the United States and Missouri's Congressional delegation to recognize the effort and resources expended by Missouri to promote and protect its interest throughout the litigation and negotiation of claims against the tobacco industry; to the Committee on Commerce.

149. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1157 memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to pass the important and far-reaching legislation that would help the elderly and, in turn, all Americans; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. COBURN, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 82: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 116: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 215: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 323: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 380: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 407: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 413: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 525: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 681: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 725: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 732: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 743: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 750: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 765: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 776: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 815: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 828: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 876: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 900: Mr. WEINER and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 925: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 997: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WISE, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1006: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1081: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1082: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1105: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1106: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 1127: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1130: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1163: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WU, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1168: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 1190: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1195: Mr. WATKINS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1332: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1358: Mr. KUYKENDALL and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1433: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1463: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1478: Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1487: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1503: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1525: Mr. DIXON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1531: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1592: Mr. QUINN, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1598: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1620: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1622: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1629: Mr. KLINK, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1660: Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LARSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOFFFEL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 1702: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1786: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1792: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1798: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1837: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. OSE, Mr. COOK, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1842: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1848: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1849: Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1867: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1922: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1932: Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 1933: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 1950: Mr. FROST and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1977: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1990: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1998: Mr. SABO and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 1999: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2015: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2028: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2060: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2088: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2097: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2120: Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2121: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SAWYER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2136: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 2156: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2159: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 2172: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 2211: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 2243: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2260: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 2265: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2277: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DIXON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2283: Mr. WYNN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2286: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 2301: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 2355: Mr. FOLEY.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. WATKINS.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. TURNER.

H. Con. Res. 78: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. PORTER and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. SHAW, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 41: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H. Res. 146: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. SANDLIN.

H. Res. 187: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 214: Mr. HALL of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

26. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Kirkwood Elementary School District, Tehama, CA, relative to Resolution No. 98/99-06 petitioning Congress, to continue statutory levels of state funding for special education and to permit increased federal funding for IDEA; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

27. Also, a petition of Dixon Unified School District, Dixon, California, relative to Resolution 99-1148 petitioning Congress to pay 40 percent of the costs of special education or remove federal mandates requiring the provision of these services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

28. Also, a petition of Municipal Council of the Borough of Ringwood, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 99-141 petitioning Congress to request federal assistance in committing Joanne Chesimard returned to jail in the United States, and support H. Con. Res 254; to the Committee on International Relations.

29. Also, a petition of the Municipal Council of the Township of Woodbridge, NJ, relative to House Resolution 1168 petitioning Congress to enact H.R. 1168; jointly to the Committees on Science and Transportation and Infrastructure.