



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2001

No. 66

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 15, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 802. An act to authorize the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 39. An act to provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 166. An act to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-554, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) to the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of

the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission, vice the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the majority whip limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

### LINDA SHENWICK

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, having some concern by the recent UN votes that denied the United States a seat on both the Human Rights Commission and the Narcotics Trafficking Commission, many of my colleagues are again questioning how the U.S. should approach its participation in the United Nations.

In reality, while there is sufficient reason to assess blame on certain functions within the UN, we should also look to our own government. In 1999, during the State Department authorization debate, I brought to the attention of my colleagues the treatment of a dedicated State Department employee, Ms. Linda Shenwick.

Ms. Shenwick is an exemplary public servant, having served in the United States mission to the United Nations handling personnel and budget issues. She quickly carved out a reputation for diligence and hard work.

She earned three consecutive outstanding ratings and a promotion to

the Senior Executive Service. Ms. Shenwick's reputation earned the respect of other UN member states resulting in her election to serve on the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in 1991 and again then in 1993.

In her position she repeatedly found evidence of deliberate waste, fraud and mismanagement at the UN. Her reports, however, were largely ignored by the previous administration.

Without recourse to address these incidents on her own, Ms. Shenwick began notifying key Members of Congress regarding her discoveries. As a result of her work, Congress forced the UN to create an Office of Inspector General to end such fraud and mismanagement.

So how was one of the most valuable civil servants rewarded? Certain government officials and department employees embarked on a campaign to sabotage her career.

Ms. Shenwick has endured false accusations, unsubstantiated poor performance reviews, and the ultimate and, I believe, illegal removal from government service.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues that when former Secretary Madeline Albright refused to renominate Ms. Shenwick to the UN Budget Committee, negating 5 years of experience with the Byzantine UN budgetary bureaucracy, the U.S. ended up losing its seat on the Budget Committee for the next 4 years.

In all honesty, I do not think we would be seeing current problems at the U.S. mission if we had more employees like Linda Shenwick. Ms. Shenwick is a person that believes in the United Nations and wants to serve to bolster the influence of the United States and to strengthen the organization as a whole.

The problems of waste, fraud and mismanagement have been highlighted by most of my colleagues here on the House floor over the years.

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.

H2149

Why, then, do we not insist that the Department of State staff the U.S. mission with those individuals who know where to look for these problems and have the courage and have the dedication to serve and to report them to Congress?

Ms. Shenwick should be reinstated to her former position, reimbursed for her personal expenses, and we should have her personnel files expunged of any unsatisfactory reviews or other false evidence to justify those reviews.

I will be sending a letter to President Bush requesting reinstatement of Ms. Shenwick so the United States can again benefit from her expertise, her diligence, and highly exemplary service.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing a concurrent resolution to the same effect. I hope my colleagues will join with me in signing this letter to the President and also cosponsor my legislation.

#### ENERGY CONSERVATION SHOULD BE FOUNDATION OF OUR NATIONAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is for the Federal Government to be a better partner with individual citizens, their State and local governments; our communities more livable, our families safe, healthy and economically secure.

Having a dependable supply of energy and using it wisely is critical for a livable community. The current controversy surrounding energy is an excellent opportunity for this administration and this Congress to give thoughtful consideration to the impact that energy decisions can have on the livability of our communities and to develop a more rational approach to energy utilization.

Unfortunately, the President, his chief spokesperson, and most recently the Vice President, are setting up a false policy conflict for Americans. They would like us to somehow believe that being more thoughtful about use of energy and the Federal Government's role in promoting a better approach is somehow an assault on the American way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, America works best when we give people choices so they can determine what works best for them. A country that disregards the value of conservation, that ignores fuel efficiency for all automobiles, that seeks to maximize production of energy at the expense of environmental quality is not protecting the American way of life, nor is it doing American families or businesses any favors.

Energy conservation is not just a matter of personal virtue, but if it

were, there is nothing wrong with formulating energy policy that recognizes the importance of this virtue.

Energy conservation should be, with all due respect to the Vice President, the foundation of our national policy. It is the only way we will provide significant amounts of energy in the near term. Furthermore, it is an approach that has already proven effective and has received bipartisan support.

All the hotly debated talk about drilling in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge and building a new power plant a week is not going to alleviate the problems facing consumers now. Instead of cutting the budget for environmental conservation, we need to set policies that actually encourage it.

There are simple conservation measures we could be taking today. Number one, extending fuel efficiency standards to all vehicles, including SUVs, light trucks and minivans. An increase of 3 miles per gallon in the fuel efficiency of SUVs will save more oil than drilling in the Arctic would ever produce, and we will get the benefits long before we ever get any Arctic oil.

Two, encouraging higher building standards that are more energy efficient, such as colored roofs, which reflect heat rays and lower home temperatures by as much as 5 degrees.

Three, we should be promoting new technologies and alternate fuels. We should not force people who want a 70-mile-per-gallon vehicle to have to buy one from overseas. By providing incentives and Federal support for developing and deploying energy-efficient technologies here in the United States, we can provide new and lucrative markets for American businesses.

Four, we ought to restore the higher standards for energy guzzling appliances. The Bush administration should allow the saving standards issued by the Clinton administration to stand, not be rolling them back.

Businesses are already realizing these benefits. A DuPont plant in New Jersey, for instance, which refused energy use per pound of product by one-third, cut global warming pollution per pound of product by nearly one-half, and as production rose 9 percent, the total energy bill fell by \$17 million a year.

But we need to get help to the people who perhaps cannot afford it.

Five, helping low-income people with today's skyrocketing energy bills and helping them install energy savings appliances seems to make sense. If we can afford, as some suggest, up to \$2 trillion in tax cuts, there is no reason that Congress cannot put some money on the table now that will help reduce the demand for energy production and help low- and moderate-income people save money over time.

We should have policies that reduce the extra costs for low-income people who may not have the money to replace appliances that in the long term will pay for themselves many times over. The long-term benefits accrue not

just to those low-income households. The community and the utilities will benefit huge savings by not building unnecessary power plants.

Yesterday's poll in USA Today showed that the American public understands this problem and an overwhelming percentage favor conservation over production.

We should invest in alternative energy, retrofit existing buildings with new technology, help lower-income people cope today and conserve for tomorrow, and all of us should embrace conservation.

These principles should be the basis of a national energy policy, an approach that will unite us in Washington, D.C., because it is what the people want and it is the quickest path to building more livable communities.

#### PARENTS' ROLE IN TEEN PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined on the floor of the House today by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who is my very dear friend and colleague. The gentlewoman and myself and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) have been very active on the issue of teen pregnancy, and work closely with the campaign to end teen pregnancy to bring attention to the issue throughout the Nation.

The newest data shows a very interesting fact: Teens listen to their parents. Often parents think their teenagers only listen to their teenage friends, and sometimes parents give up talking to their teenagers about difficult subjects like sex and sexuality and sexual activity amongst teens.

But when your child is in their teen years, that is a time when you need to talk with your child. You need to listen to your son or your daughter. You need to hear what pressures they feel and face, because it is only through that conversation that you can help your teenager understand their own growth.

Of course, they are growing in sexual awareness, but they are also growing emotionally towards independence and intellectually towards a level of personal power necessary for them to fulfill their dreams.

When we talk to our kids about sexuality, we rarely talk to them about the terrible danger teen pregnancy poses to their growth and development, their ability to parent, their ability to provide for their child in the way they would want to. We rarely talk to them about the sheer lunacy of teen sex because of the devastating impact it can have on their lives. For young girls,

particularly, inappropriate intimacy stunts their growth.

Teenagers, by their nature, spend their teen years weaning themselves from their parents. That is what growing up is all about. It is about gaining your independence, gaining a sense of yourself, developing your own skills so that you can be your own person in the decades ahead.

□ 1245

As one weans oneself from the control of one's parents, one also must gain that control oneself. For young women particularly, premature sexuality has the effect of transferring control to the young man. It is simply more true for young girls than it is for a young man. Yet, we do not talk with our girls about this at all.

We do not help them to see that, if they want to succeed in the project of growing up, if they want to be their own person, if they want to be intellectually strong, they want to be morally strong, they want to have a sound body, a sound mind, a sound heart, they have to take responsibility for themselves.

In seeking to leave their parents, it is particularly dangerous for young girls to shift that power of control through sexual intimacy to a young man. That is unfortunately exactly what happens, and we do not even talk about it.

So it is important to talk to one's teens. It is important to listen to the pressures they face. It is important not to be afraid of those pressures because, through discussion, one will arm one's child with an understanding of the power that abstinence provides them over themselves and gives them in shaping their future.

Now, growing up has always been tough. It is tough all through one's life to really grow up well. But it is particularly tough in teen years and during that process of adolescence. If we, as parents, cannot talk straighter with our children and cannot listen at a level that allows us to listen to things we never thought we would hear our kids say, then we cannot, with them, help them guide themselves through the difficult waters of adolescence in today's world and the many pressures that growing up imposes on teenagers.

So kids need to talk to their folks and folks need to listen to their children. We hope that, by investing money in the research necessary to better understand teen sexuality and teen growth, we will be better able to help kids understand how it is that one becomes empowered to be oneself and to determine one's own course and how it is we establish healthy, strong, loving relationships throughout one's lifetime. By investing money in this very important research project, we will be able to talk from an increasingly sound and strong basis of knowledge ourselves.

But we also hope that, through sheer publicity, we will be able to help teens

understand that premature sexual intimacy is destructive of their future.

I am delighted to be here with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) today.

#### PARENTS' ROLE IN TEEN PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am also delighted to join the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) as we serve on the House Caucus for the Prevention of Teenage Pregnancy. I am delighted for many year reasons; one, because this is an opportunity, and the month of May is an opportunity to raise the awareness.

Over the last several years, I have spoken out often and devoted a lot of time and energy to this effort. But no more time is more rewarding than talking to young people themselves and talking to community leaders about this issue.

This week alone, I spoke to three different schools. It included a high school and two junior high schools. What I am finding out is that young people themselves have views, opinions, and they are part of a leadership, too. They should be engaged in this issue.

I am convinced if one is effectively to reduce teenage pregnancy, we must, indeed, bring the awareness to the community of the consequences of teenage pregnancies, not only to the families, the young people themselves, but also to the community. But more importantly, we must, indeed, engage our youth, because they are factored in resolving this issue.

We have good news. Since 1990, teenage pregnancies have gone down. It has been a steady decline. So we should celebrate that as a Nation. We deserve to be proud of that activity. But in spite of our good efforts and success, still, yet today, more than 1 million children, young people, indeed, become pregnant each year, those younger than the age of 20. Nearly 1 million every year now, although it is going down, there is a steady number of persons, indeed, who are teenagers who are becoming parents before they reach their 20th birthday.

Also, in my part of the State, eastern North Carolina, the rate is not going down as fast. In fact, I have several of my counties where the rate is higher than in my State. So I am, indeed, concerned about that.

May, as I say, is an opportunity where we can bring the awareness to both the community and to the young people. The thing we want to emphasize to our young people that teenage is a time when they should be concentrating on education. They should be having fun. They should be talking

about their career. They should be growing up and not focused on pregnancy or being a parent prematurely.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to join the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) recently when the National Campaign to Prevent Teenage Pregnancy released their report. As the gentlewoman has already commented, that report emphasizes several things, both around parents and teenagers; and that teenagers really wanted to talk to their parents.

Sometimes parents thought teenagers wanted to talk to teenagers and were getting all the information from them. But they really thought they should get that information from the parents. Both parents and teenagers agree more often than one would think. Ninety-five percent of parents felt that abstinence was absolutely what should happen. Ninety-three percent of the teenagers thought, now one would not have thought that, but 93 percent of the teenagers themselves thought abstinence should be.

Both those same groups also felt that, but a lesser degree in terms of the parents, that, indeed, contraception should be a part of the story, and that they were not necessarily in conflict with each other; that abstinence should be emphasized; and, indeed, that contraception information about that should be a part of that as well.

Also, there was consensus about the role of the school. Both parents and teenagers felt that the primary role of the school was not necessarily to teach the values or the appropriateness, but there was a role for the schools, and that the school should be engaged in that process; that the primary responsibility should be the parent. If both parents and teenagers believe that, something must be missing in this game. It means that parents and teenagers are not talking to each other.

Now, many of the parents, as I said earlier, on one hand believe that contraception information and abstinence may give a dual message that may be in conflict. But the teenagers did not believe that. They did not see it. They felt that abstinence, indeed, the 93 percent believed it; but also a vast majority of those teenagers also felt the information about contraception was very, very important.

In fact, I personally believe that abstinence is the most important. But I also know that young people are very active sexually. So we must be engaged in providing the critical important information to teenagers so they can make the decision. I believe if we empower young people, they will make the difference.

Over the last several years, I have spoken out often and devoted a lot of time and energy to teen pregnancy prevention. My most meaningful efforts have involved a host of meetings and discussions with youth and community leaders where the focus has been on prevention and development activities in my congressional district. This week, I visited three different schools including a senior high school and two middle schools.

I am convinced that if we are to effectively reduce teenage childbearing, we must do more to raise the awareness level of this issue in our communities and actively engage our youth. Our youth have ideas, opinions and can provide leadership in our efforts to reduce teenage pregnancy.

Since the early 1990s, teen pregnancy and birth rates have steadily declined. As a nation, we deserve to be proud of the progress we have made. Yet, despite these impressive gains, 4 out of 10 girls in this country still get pregnant at least once by age 20—nearly 1 million adolescent pregnancies each year. Also, in eastern North Carolina, the rate has not gone down at the same time as the Nation, several counties in my district are among the highest in the State. In other words, we have a long way to go.

May is Teen Pregnancy Prevention Month. This is the most opportune time for all of us to redouble our efforts in convincing young people that adolescence must be a time for continued positive growth in the areas of education. It is the growing up and having fun stage for youth, not the time to dwell on pregnancy and parenthood. I was happy to recently help the private, nonprofit National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy release two new important reports (including a large nationally representative survey of adults and teens) that should provide comfort to parents and schools while challenging.

First, and perhaps most importantly, the survey released by the National Campaign clearly shows that the American public has a very common sense view of the teen pregnancy problem despite the often-extreme rhetoric that surrounds the issue. The overwhelming majority of adults and teens believe that teens should not be sexually active but those who are should have access to contraception. The survey also reveals, however, that the public does not view abstinence and contraceptive use as equally attractive options. A clear national consensus exists that school-age teens should not have sex—more than nine of ten adults (95 percent) and teens (93 percent) said it is important that teens be given a strong abstinence message from society.

The consensus position seems to recognize that the continued debate over abstinence versus contraception is counter-productive and misses the more critical issue of motivation. Teens will do neither unless they are highly motivated to avoid pregnancy in the first place.

Parents who feel that they have lost their children to the influence of peers and popular culture should note that teens say their parents influence their sexual decisionmaking more than any other source. Parents, on the other hand, believe that peers wield the greatest influence on these matters. This generational divide must be bridged. Parents need to know that their children really do want to hear from them about sex, love, and relationships, even if they don't always seem like it.

Schools are also clearly part of the solution to teen pregnancy. When asked where they have learned the most about preventing teen pregnancy, more teens said teachers and sex educators than other sources. Once again, however, both adults and teens take a common sense view of how much of the sex education burden schools should shoulder. Nine out of ten adults disagree that sex education is primarily the responsibility of schools and

few adults or teens believe that schools are responsible for fixing the problem of teen pregnancy.

So what should be done? What do these findings and others from the National Campaign suggest? Here are some simple recommendations for continued progress in preventing teen pregnancy:

Abstinence should be strongly stressed as the best choice for teens because of its effectiveness and its consistency with the beliefs of adults and teens. But giving teens information about—and access to—contraception is still important.

Arguments over which strategy is better—sexual abstinence or contraceptive use—are recipes for stalemate. More of both are needed. In a diverse country, a number of difference approaches to preventing teen pregnancy is absolutely essential.

Parents can do much more to help. Kids want to hear from their parents about sex and values but often do not.

Effective programs to reduce teen pregnancy should be expanded, but it is unrealistic to assume that community programs alone will solve this problem.

The good news about declining rates of teen pregnancy and birth is that progress on this seemingly intractable social problem is possible.

I was delighted by the comments and suggestions made by youth during my recent visit to neighborhood schools. Youth are concerned about the lack of productive after school activities. Youth leaders would like to become more active in prevention activities with other youth, and would like to know that contraceptives are provided hassle free.

I believe that devoting more energy resources and funding to prevention teen pregnancy would not only improve the health, education, and economic opportunities of our Nation's youth, but it would save money in the long run.

We cannot overestimate the far-reaching effects of teen pregnancy. We must continue to pursue ways to develop pregnancy prevention programs that educate and support high-risk youth and their families through comprehensive social and health services.

Young people who believe that they have real futures to risk, have real incentives to delay parenting. That is why when we demand responsible behavior we have reciprocal obligation to offer a real future beyond early parenting and poverty.

I strongly support abstinence education and feel that abstinence programs are critically important for pre-teens as well as teens; we, however, cannot ignore the fact that so many of our teens are already sexually active. Therefore it is important that teens hear both messages, abstinence and contraception. Good, factual information is empowering to our youth, especially with guidance from their parents. I encourage each community to help determine how best to address this critical issue.

#### TRIBUTE TO GLADYS HARRINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to

what I consider a great American lady, a woman who has witnessed firsthand World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the invention of television, the microwave, and the World Wide Web.

On May 29, Gladys Harrington, who is a real friend of mine, a true pillar of the Plano, Texas community, is celebrating her 100th birthday.

She has lived an abundant life. She moved to Plano in the early 1900s when 1,500 people lived there. Today, Plano is home to 230,000 plus and growing.

She married Fred Harrington in 1919 in Plano, Texas and gave birth to two sons, Joe Harrington and Conner Harrington. Conner Harrington actually ran for Congress against a Democrat icon, Sam Rayburn, who was a friend of mine as well. She is the proud grandma of four children, Connie, Cynthia, Mary Lou, and Freddy, as well as two great grandchildren, Sage and Emily.

It is obvious that she has touched the lives of those around her and blessed everyone with her passion for life and zest for service. As a member of the First Christian Church, she taught Sunday school, led the Christian Women Fellowship and served as a deaconess.

In addition, they helped found what is now the Gladys Harrington Library in Plano. What started as a one-room temporary facility has now blossomed into one of the leading libraries in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I may not even be standing here today were it not for the hard work and selfless dedication of my dear friend Gladys. I say that because Gladys helped me run my first campaign for Congress in 1991 and every time thereafter.

Every Republican knows that one cannot do anything Republican in Texas without Gladys Harrington. She has volunteered countless hours of her time and dollars to help the party rise to the best that it is today. Think about it. Every Statewide office in Texas is now Republican. The Texan in the White House is even a Republican, too; and Gladys helped him as well.

Gladys helped lay the essential groundwork for the grassroots efforts for this amazing fete. She has mobilized ground troops, attended conventions, paid her dues and then some.

In addition to giving her time to the Republican Party, she gives so much to those around her. In fact, she continues to go to a book club and to the Plano Chamber Orchestra. She keeps scrapbooking, detailing the many years behind her and saving room for more to come.

I think America needs more good people like Gladys Harrington. She is a great American in my view, and I am proud to know her. I just want to wish Gladys a happy birthday. Plano would not be the same without Gladys.

## TEENAGE PREGNANCY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House this afternoon because I care about our communities and our young people. I want to give an ovation to the honorable gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) to support this teenage pregnancy month and certainly to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), who had another engagement and had to leave, because it is imperative, I believe, to raise the awareness around the crisis of teenage pregnancy.

Nearly 1 million teenagers in this country become pregnant every year. One in four of these teenagers will have a second baby within years of the first child. In Indiana, from which I hail, if you will, we have 37,340 teenage girls who become pregnant every year. Just imagine, 37,340 teenage girls become pregnant every year. Eighty-eight out of every 1,000 girls age 15 to 19 become pregnant in Indiana every year.

When a teenager has a baby, it reduces her chances of completing high school. It reduces her chances of earning a decent wage. Her access to health care will decrease, which will contribute to poor nutritional health for her and her baby. In so many cases, because she cannot afford a baby-sitter, this young woman either loses her job for missing days to stay with a child or is forced to leave her baby in situations that are totally undesirable.

In addition, my recent bill, the Responsible Fatherhood Act seeks to address many of the fathers who are either unwilling or unable to be a source of support, both financially and emotionally, for their children. The effects of teenage pregnancy may also have negative effects on young fathers.

I would hasten to add, however, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of teenage girls who become pregnant have not had relationships with young boys. The babies are fathered by men who are not teenagers.

□ 1300

Some studies suggest, on the other hand, that teenage fathers obtain somewhat lower education levels, suffer from loss of earnings on the order of 10 to 15 percent annually, and are more likely to end up in prison. This too causes long-term consequences for society as a whole.

There are no easy answers to solving teenage pregnancy, and our approach must be comprehensive and multifaceted. I would like to acknowledge the successful efforts that have been made as a result of communities working through a variety of programs that coordinate parents, schools, communities, and religious organizations.

I would like to recognize the important work of the National Campaign to

Prevent Teen Pregnancy. The organization does a tremendous job because it recognizes the broad consequences for society and the individuals directly involved when children continue to have children. We must empower and support the brave individuals all over the country who are working with programs at the grass-roots level to reduce teenage pregnancy. It is programs such as these that give our young people a fighting chance and an alternative to engaging in destructive behavior.

We believe that if young people have a strategy for the future and have hope about their career and have economic security, they are more likely to value the need to develop themselves, rather than getting involved in behavior that is self-destructive, including premature sex.

I would like to recognize an important bill introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). This bill, the Mentoring for Success Act, will provide grants to expand mentoring through new programs and existing programs throughout the country, hopefully reaching around 200,000 young people.

As the gentleman from Nebraska mentioned, studies have shown that young people who are mentored will be 50 percent less likely to skip school, 50 percent less likely to begin using drugs, 36 percent less likely to lie to a parent, 30 percent less likely to commit a violent act of any kind, and certainly they are less likely to drop out of high school.

Mr. Speaker, let me add in closing that I stand here as a Member of the United States Congress and am the product of a teenage pregnancy. However, the amount of community support, religious support, and school support that I received as a young person has boded well in terms of my future. I hope that we can work together in Congress to pass important pieces of legislation and to offer the necessary resources to counteract this pandemic.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 2 p.m.

## PRAYER

The Reverend Gene Arey, New Harvest Ministry, Waynesboro, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Father God, we acknowledge You as the Ruler of all nations and we pray for peace and justice in our world.

We pray First Timothy 2:1-4, "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings; and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

Father, I pray for our President and the First Lady. Bless them this day and give them the wisdom to do all that is set before them.

I pray for these Representatives, to have the wisdom of God to accomplish all that is set before them to do. Bless them for their commitment to serve the people of our Nation and carry out their duties.

Father, in Jesus' Name I call this United States of America blessed in Jesus' Name.

God bless America. 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.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALLENGER. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. EVANS 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.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND  
GENE AREY

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to say a word about our guest Chaplain who is also my constituent.

The Reverend Gene Arey, who was born and raised in Waynesboro, Virginia, has served as copastor of Waynesboro's New Harvest Worship Center with his wife, Linda. The couple cofounded the church, located at 535 West Main Street, more than 7 years ago. Reverend and Mrs. Arey, who are active in foreign missions, recently returned from Romania, where they also serve as church leaders. Reverend Arey was ordained by Archbishop Silas Owiti of Kenya, Africa, and Dr. Decker Tapscott, pastor of Faith Christian Church in Warrenton, Virginia. Reverend Arey is joined in Washington today by his wife, his son Larry, daughter-in-law Kay, and granddaughter Olivia who live in Greenville, Virginia, also in my district.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the President will be in St. Paul, Minnesota, on Thursday to unveil his vision for a national energy policy. Minnesotans understand the value of a balanced approach that needs to be part of an energy policy which embraces our environmental qualities. We must have clean fuels, renewable energy and improved energy efficiency and invest in alternative energy resources. The Vice President said conservation is a sign of personal virtue, but not a basis for policy. In Minnesota, conservation is common sense. It means saving energy and money by using our resources more efficiently. Improved energy standards for consumer products would eliminate the need for an additional 180 new power plants. Energy efficiency standards have already saved American consumers \$50 billion this past decade. Minnesotans expect conservation to be an important part of any energy policy that balances today's energy needs with the needs of future generations.

H.R. 1 EXPANDS CHOICE FOR  
PARENTS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, children should not be trapped in failing schools where they cannot possibly reach their fullest educational potential. That is why H.R. 1 includes a school choice program that enables parents to remove their children from schools that, as President Bush says, do not teach and will not change.

Before giving parents the option of sending their children to another school, H.R. 1 gives low-performing schools the chance to improve by offering them financial assistance to increase student achievement. If these schools do not make adequate progress after 2 years, parents will be able to send their children to another public school. After 3 years of chronic failure, disadvantaged students will be eligible for private school scholarships.

H.R. 1, it should be noted, aims to bolster failing public schools by giving them special financial help. But more funding cannot be the final remedy. There must be a safety valve that allows children to escape continually low-performing schools.

It goes without saying that we are all committed to improving the quality of our Nation's schools; but first and foremost, students themselves should be our most pressing concern. And it is our responsibility to empower parents to make the right decision for their children's future.

CALIFORNIA'S ELECTRICITY  
CRISIS

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, we now know what GOP means. It means gas, oil and petroleum. What is the administration's answer to the electricity crisis confronting the West and soon the rest of the Nation? Drill for oil in the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, cut research into renewable energy research, cut conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the answer for the western electricity crisis. We must conserve. We must move more into renewable sources. We must do more research. But most of all, we have to bring down the criminal prices that are being charged for wholesale electricity in California and the rest of the West. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, this Congress, this administration, must act now. It is the prices that are killing the California and western economy. It is the prices that are going to kill the rest of this Nation's economy. California is being bled dry by electricity wholesalers. We are being charged \$2.5 billion a month for our electricity. This cannot stand. It is time for Congress, it is time for this administration to act. Let us get away from a gas, oil and petroleum policy for this administration.

INCREASED SPENDING JEOPARDIZES  
FUTURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY  
AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the so-called transition cost for Social Security, if we do nothing, if we make no changes, is \$120 trillion over

the next 75 years. If we start now by developing the kind of bridge that will bridge the gap between expected revenues and expenditures that is necessary to increase the returns over what Social Security will otherwise be able to pay, we can do it. The average return that is paid in in Social Security taxes is now estimated by the Social Security actuaries to be 1.7 percent return on that so-called investment, or those taxes. In a perfect congressional world, we would not have a tax cut, we would stop the dramatic increase in spending of this Congress that jeopardizes not only the economy but leaves our kids with a huge debt and jeopardizes the future of Social Security and Medicare. Let us hold the line on increased spending.

TIME TO INVESTIGATE THE FBI

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. What is the big surprise, Mr. Speaker, in the McVeigh case? The FBI has been hiding evidence for years. Think about it.

If you really believe that two Libyan mules blew up Pan Am 103, you are on Prozac.

If you really believe that the best FBI sharpshooter just happened to accidentally shoot Mrs. Weaver right between the eyes, you still believe in Mother Goose.

Congress, if you believe the Waco jury heard the whole truth from the FBI, you still believe in the Tooth Fairy.

And, Congress, if you still believe the propaganda about the assassination of JFK, by God, you still believe that Mae West is a virgin.

Beam me up. It is time for an investigation into FBI hiding and concealing exculpatory evidence on criminal defendants.

I yield back the FBI corruption from Boston, Massachusetts to Youngstown, Ohio.

MILITARY WEAR

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some Members of Congress are working on legislation which will tell the United States Army what kind of headgear to wear. I believe this action is micromanagement at its worst and makes Congress the fashion police.

For those of us who have strong ties to the military community, this entire episode has been a whirlwind of emotions. Like most of my constituents, I too felt the issuance of a black beret, the modern-day symbol of excellence in the United States Armed Forces, to all soldiers was ill-advised. As I have related to senior Army officials and my constituents, this action is analogous to issuing a letter jacket to all high

school seniors regardless of whether they played ball or not. This problem has been worked out, however, by allowing the Rangers to wear a different color beret to distinguish their unique contribution.

Even though I believe the Army is spending too much money on berets, \$30 million and climbing, and even though I have problems with where they are made, particularly in China, although that contract has been canceled, I believe Congress does not have the time or the charter to meddle with what the Army does or does not wear. If we can trust the chief of staff of the Army to command our young Americans in wartime, certainly we can trust him to determine what kind of uniform they will wear.

#### CONGRATULATING DENISE QUINONES AND TITO TRINIDAD

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

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate two Puerto Ricans that in the past weekend made all of us very proud. I am talking about Denise Quinones, who won the Miss Universe contest held in Puerto Rico last Friday, and Felix "Tito" Trinidad who on Saturday added the middle-weight championship to his already amazing resume.

Denise and Tito, as we call him down there, make us proud because they represent some of the best qualities of the Puerto Rican people. Denise is much more than a beautiful face. She is extremely bright, well educated, fully bilingual and ready to meet the challenges of the future. Denise is a true role model for our youth.

We also celebrate the triumph of our champion Felix "Tito" Trinidad who is the best pound-for-pound boxer in the world. Tito embodies the talent and discipline of Puerto Rican youth. His unbreakable will in the ring reflects the strength of the Puerto Rican people.

Today, Puerto Rico celebrates two real stars. Denise and Tito remind us that we can accomplish anything through dedication and perseverance. Felicidades a ambos. (Congratulations to both of you.)

#### SUSPENSION OF UNLAWFUL AND UNNECESSARY REGULATIONS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, industries around this Nation continually are burdened by unfair and unnecessary regulations. However, last year the mining industry faced an additional and unnecessary burden, an unlawful regulation.

Previously, Congress called for the National Academy of Sciences to study and assess the effectiveness of the ex-

isting 3809 regulations that affect the mining industry. That study, authorized by Congress, concluded that the existing laws were effective in protecting the environment. Yet the Clinton administration last year promulgated new 3809 regulations in spite of the National Academy's findings and in direct violation of Federal law.

□ 1415

In fiscal year 2000, the Interior appropriations bill clearly prohibited the promulgation of any new 3809 rules except those "which are not inconsistent with the National Academy of Science studies."

Thankfully, President Bush realized the error of President Clinton's ways, and now we have only to roll back the unnecessary and unlawful 3809 regulations proposed by the previous administration, which do not protect the environment or the American people.

#### PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 2001.

#### CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-71)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this pro-

vision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to Burma is to continue in effect beyond May 20, 2001. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on May 19, 2000.

As long as the Government of Burma continues its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, this situation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force these emergency authorities beyond May 20, 2001.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 2001.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such record votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

#### EXPEDITING CONSTRUCTION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1696) to expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1696

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

#### SECTION 1. EXPEDITED COMMENCEMENT BY AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION OF CONSTRUCTION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL.

Section 2113 of title 36, United States Code, as added by section 601(a) of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106-117; 113 Stat. 1576), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION.—(1) The requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and all other laws pertaining to the siting and design for the World War II memorial having been met, the Commission shall expeditiously proceed with the construction of the World War II memorial at the dedicated Rainbow Pool site in the District of Columbia.

"(2) The construction of the World War II memorial authorized by paragraph (1) shall be consistent with—

"(A) the final architectural submission made to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission on June 30, 2000, as supplemented on November 2, 2000; and

“(B) such reasonable construction permit requirements as may be required by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service.

“(3) The decision to construct the World War II memorial at the dedicated Rainbow Pool site, decisions implementing this subsection, and decisions regarding the design for the World War II memorial are final and conclusive and shall not be subject to administrative or judicial review.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. 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 material on H.R. 1696.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago this month, the original authorization for a memorial on the Mall honoring the World War II veterans was signed into law, and still construction has not yet begun. H.R. 1696 will be the sixth bipartisan piece of legislation Congress has sent to the White House for approval, attempting to move the process along.

Over the past 6 years, 22 public hearings have been held on the site and design of the memorial in compliance with the Commemorative Works Act. The memorial site and design have received the endorsements of the Historic Preservation Officer of the District of Columbia and four endorsements from the D.C. Historic Preservation Review Board. The Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capitol Planning Commission has each rendered approval for the memorial five times. This site was approved by both the Secretary of the Interior and the President. And still construction has not begun.

Two other very important things have also been happening since Congress first authorized this memorial. Through the leadership and hard work of former Senator Bob Dole and Academy Award winning actor Tom Hanks, the memorial fund has now raised over \$170 million. There are no taxpayer funds involved in this memorial. Financial support has come in from half a million Americans, hundreds of corporations and foundations, dozens of civic, fraternal and professional organizations, 48 state legislatures, over 1,000 schools, and numerous veterans groups representing millions of veterans.

Unfortunately, something else has been happening since the memorial was

authorized, Mr. Speaker. Millions of World War II veterans have gone to their eternal rest. According to VA statistics, 3 million World War II veterans have died since this memorial was authorized in 1993.

Once begun, construction of the memorial will take approximately 30 months. In that time, nearly 1 million additional World War II veterans will pass away. Each day of delay tragically adds 1,100 more. And still construction has not begun.

Why? Because a small group of opponents are desperately using litigation to challenge prior decisions and delay construction so they can drag the memorial back through a mind-numbing bureaucracy. The opponents are not satisfied by more than 20 public meetings over the past 6 years resulting in endorsements and approval of all agencies required by law. They wanted to go back to square one.

This is truly bureaucracy at its worst. It has literally taken twice as long to go from Congressional approval to construction of a World War II memorial than it did to fight and win World War II in the first place.

Once again, it is up to Congress to get the job done and save the memorial from what an article in the Washington Post called “A bureaucratic form of double jeopardy.”

A New York Times article recently quoted the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission as favoring Congressional action to “clarify the issue and moot the question by saying the Commission’s actions were in fact valid.”

H.R. 1696 does exactly that. It states that the memorial has met all legal requirements and that construction should begin expeditiously. This legislation has the support of virtually every service organization in the country, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joining with the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). I am glad to have him back working on veterans’ issues, if just for one day.

This measure, H.R. 1696, will expedite the construction of the new national World War II memorial in the District of Columbia. I commend my friend from Arizona for his leadership on this issue and am honored to manage this measure with him. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) is one of the heroes of World War II. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) and the other members of his generation, we all say thank you for your service and sacrifice; it is time to build a memorial to honor your actions.

Mr. Speaker, a national World War II memorial will honor all Americans

who served in the Armed Forces during World War II, as well as the millions of other Americans who contributed in countless ways to the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the time to construct this memorial is now. More than 50 years after the end of World War II, there does not exist in our Nation’s Capital a fitting memorial to the service and sacrifices of millions of Americans who preserved democracy and defeated totalitarianism during World War II. The time to construct this memorial is now.

Mr. Speaker, in a longer statement I will submitting for the record at the end of my statement, I review the history of the World War II memorial. The memorial has been the subject of repeated reviews, hearings, public examinations and official actions. It is time to build this memorial now.

Mr. Speaker, the national World War II memorial will be located between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. Some critics of the memorial argue the memorial would “clutter up an already crowded site.” A prominent memorial to honor those who served and sacrificed, this memorial is not “clutter.” The time to build this memorial is now.

I expect there will always be some opposition to this memorial by its scope, its location and design or by some individual group. Ironically, the right to oppose this amendment was defeated and preserved by those who fought for and defended this country in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, let us expedite the construction of the World War II Memorial, and construct it now.

Mr. Speaker, John Ruskin once said “our duty is to preserve what the past has said for itself, and to say for ourselves what shall be true for the future.” This statement is an appropriate guide for our deliberations today as we consider H.R. 1696, a bill that will expedite the construction of the National World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia.

In 1993, Congress passed legislation authorizing the creation of a National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC. President Clinton signed the legislation into law on May 25, 1993. The memorial is intended to honor all who served in the United States Armed Forces during World War II. It is also intended to honor the entire nation’s contribution to the war effort. The future National World War II Memorial will be an integral part of the Washington, DC landscape. The memorial will not only appropriately honor and pay tribute to those who sacrificed so much, but will educate future generations to some of the costs of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, 14 years after Congress authorized the construction of this memorial, and six years from the first of 22 public hearings on its site and design, the memorial’s construction remains delayed by a lawsuit filed by a small opposition group and a procedural issue involving the National Capital Planning Commission (NCP), one of the agencies required by law to approve the memorial.

NCP decisions of the past two years, including its approval of the National World War II Memorial, have been placed in question because the former NCP chairman continued to

serve on the commission after the expiration of his term. The legislation that established the commission permitted the chairman to serve until replaced, but when the law was amended this language was inadvertently omitted. The NCPD has scheduled yet another public hearing on the memorial for June 14, 2001. Meanwhile, court action on the lawsuit is on hold pending resolution of this issue, which may take several more months to conclude.

Mr. Speaker, more than 16 million Americans served in uniform during World War II. More than 400,000 gave their lives, over 670,000 were wounded, and millions more supported the war effort on the front here at home. Of the 16 million who served, only five million remain alive today. World War II veterans, who saved democracy and served heroically, today are battling the diseases and disabilities of older age. Today, our World War II veterans are dying at a rate of 1,100 per day. With more than 400,000 veterans dying each year, every delay in memorial construction ensures that hundreds of thousands of World War II veterans will never witness the completion of this memorial. H.R. 1696 will expedite construction of the memorial and make it possible for many of our World War II veterans to be able to see the memorial with their own eyes.

H.R. 1696 would declare that the National World War II Memorial complies with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Commemorative Works Act, and any other governing laws pertaining to the memorial's site and design. H.R. 1696 would direct expedited construction of the memorial, consistent with reasonable construction permit requirements of the Secretary of Interior and the National Park Service. In addition, H.R. 1696 would mandate that the decision to construct the memorial at the Rainbow Pool site and decisions regarding the design of the memorial are final and conclusive and shall not be subject to administrative or judicial review.

The Commemorative Works Act of 1986 governs the process of establishing memorials in Washington, DC. The Act gives the authority for final site and design approval to the Commission of Fine Arts, the NCPD, and the Secretary of the Interior. In total, eight sites were considered for the memorial. The final Rainbow Pool selection was the consensus choice as the only site commensurate with the significance of World War II in American and World history.

Since 1995, the memorial site and design have been the subject of 22 public meetings that resulted in the endorsement of hundreds of Members of Congress, an endorsement from the State Historic Preservation Officer of the District of Columbia, four endorsements from the District of Columbia's Historic Preservation Review Board, five approvals from the CFA, and five approvals from the NCPD.

In other words, the National World War II Memorial is the product of an open and democratic process, in full compliance with all applicable laws. The site and design were debated in the media and in 22 public meetings since 1995. No party has been denied the right to be heard, and critics have had full opportunity to state their positions.

On May 28th of this year, many of us will attend Memorial Day observances. We will with humility and thanks, pay sincere respect to those whose sacrifices and dedications have

protected the ideals on which America was founded. In this spirit, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1696. The time is overdue to begin construction on this meaningful tribute and symbolic monument that will immortalize the defining moment of our history forever.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of our Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this bill, which will expedite the construction of the national World War II memorial at the Rainbow Pool site on the Mall. I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) for the action he has taken on this.

It has been nearly 60 years since the people of our great Nation were called upon to defend democracy from the tyranny threatening to engulf the world. The best of America's sons and daughters heeded the call, and with the Nation united behind them, they changed the course of history. Now as America's greatest generation is in their twilight years, it is time to erect a fitting memorial to them on America's Mall as a testament to their sacrifices and their triumphant victory.

The American Battle Monuments Commission has met the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Commemorative Works Acts, and all other laws dealing with the site and design of this memorial, yet the memorial remains mired in administrative procedure, which continues to delay the construction.

It is time to set aside the bureaucratic obstacles and do what is right. We owe nothing less to those who gave so much for their country and the world.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is anxious to see a memorial to the women and men who secured our freedom with their personal sacrifices and their lives. We can assure a memorial on the present timetable or sooner without passing this radically destructive bill that will do irrevocable harm to the World War II memorial itself by eliminating indispensable oversight for the largest and most significant memorial on the Mall since the Lincoln Memorial was constructed almost 80 years ago.

We can keep a memorial on schedule without destroying the Commemorative Works Act, signed by Ronald Reagan 16 years ago specifically to assure oversight of all construction on the Mall.

Those of us who wanted the extraordinary vista between the Washington

Monument and the Lincoln Memorial left unobstructed lost that battle several years ago. This bill responds to press reports that left the impression that the National Capital Planning Commission, the NCPD, would reconsider the entire World War II memorial project.

Both the NCPD and recent press reports have corrected this erroneous notion. The matter is before the NCPD again only because the Justice Department spotted a legal flaw that a hold-over member had called the vote into question. That would have imperiled the memorial.

This bill is not only unnecessary, it throws out the baby with the bath water that has already been eliminated. The only overreaching left now is in this bill. It would leave a huge memorial to rise on the Mall, without any Federal law or agency with the power or the expertise to assure that the memorial builders meet their commitments and that the many problems that have been identified are caught and avoided.

Here are some of them: Assuring that contaminated groundwater would be pumped out continually and treated before continuing into the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay inasmuch as the memorial is to be built below the groundwater table;

Protecting the structural integrity of the Washington Monument's wooden foundations as groundwater in its subsoil is pumped out;

Replacing the groundwater upon which the old growth trees that beautify the Mall depend;

Assuring that helicopters have a place to land without putting helicopter pads on the memorial, a National Park Service proposal which was recently stopped by the NCPD;

Accommodating tour buses off the Mall area;

Assuring that the vital 17th Street artery of the District used by Virginia and Maryland commuters and tourists alike near the Tidal Basin is not closed to traffic;

Ensuring oversight of the nighttime lighting plan still to be developed;

Ensuring oversight of the sculptural elements of the memorial and any inscriptions on the walls;

Ensuring compliance with what has already been approved.

This bill, which had no hearing and is informed by no meetings with relevant agency personnel promises serious unintended and counterproductive consequences that could be both embarrassing and disastrous for the memorial.

In the past, the Congress has always avoided the precedent this bill would set; using our power to tamper with the detailed oversight necessary to assure the integrity of the Federal presence.

Vote no. The NCPD has already gotten the message.

□ 1430

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), who has been a real leader in this effort; and I appreciate what he has done.

I just want to say a couple of things. I cannot get into the architectural or the engineering problems here. I remember in 1939, I am old enough to remember that, that they had the same arguments as far as the Jefferson Memorial. It would be ruining the tidal basin and everything like that. I do not believe that for a minute, and it has not proved to be so.

I enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in May of 1944. I was proud of that. There are an awful lot of us who are still around, a dwindling number, who want to see something. We have the Vietnam Memorial, we have the Korean Memorial, but we do not a World War II memorial.

Frankly, there are hundreds of thousands of people who believe this and who have contributed: fraternal organizations, foundations, corporations. I have a VFW post, number 524, in my little town of Corning, which is about 12,500 people, which has raised more money than any other small VFW post in the whole country. They really believe in this. There are people out there, not intellectualizing about this, but who have a piece of their skin in this issue. They want to have something done. I would like to have something done, and I would like to have something done before I die.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Stump legislation to construct the World War II memorial exactly where it should be, as a memorial to the victory of liberty over tyranny in the 20th century, between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, exactly where it should be placed, so that freedom from the 18th, the 19th, and 20th centuries will be celebrated along our avenue of democracy. It has now taken longer to approve this memorial, three times longer, actually, than it did to fight the war.

It is time for America to say "thank you" to our greatest generation, and to make it more than words. The public has a new-found fascination with the World War II generation, thanks to Tom Brokaw's book, movies such as "Saving Private Ryan," and other commemorations of our Nation's finest hour.

Outside the beltway, more than half a million Americans have responded to a national fund-raising appeal by contributing more than \$150 million to the World War II Memorial project. In fact, just this past week, in my district, I returned to accept a check from schoolchildren, 7th and 8th graders at Anthony Wayne, Jr. School for \$2,154 to contribute to the memorial's construc-

tion. Young people, the children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren who have been given the freedom we have today are contributing across this country. We owe them and their predecessors the kind of thanks that a grateful Nation expresses. Unfortunately, this project has been snarled in a new round of political tussling and legal wrangling inside this beltway.

I do not question the motives of the memorial's opponents, but it is time to move forward. There have been 22 public hearings by organizations like the National Capital Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission approving the construction of this memorial. The money has been raised and it is on deposit. All the respective legislation has been passed. Both Chambers of this Congress have said yes, yes, yes. Over 8 years, we have said yes. The ground has been dedicated. It is time to move forward with construction of the World War II memorial at the Rainbow Pool site. I say that not just as a Member of Congress, but as a city planner that helped take a look at the site, that has worked with the architects to make sure that the design was appropriate, blocking no views; and all public input has made this a better design than we began with originally.

Of the 16 million veterans who served during World War II, approximately 5 million still survive. Every day, approximately 1,100 World War II veterans pass away, never to see the memorial in Washington that will stand as testimony to what they did for us, with the heroism and the self-sacrifice that have given us a new generation of children of freedom.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to move forward with construction of the World War II memorial. The time for delay is over. We not only honor our World War II veterans during this Armed Services Week in doing so, but we also say, we understand the cause for which they fought and it deserves recognition on the central part of our mall, complementing what we have done for the 18th century, the 19th century, and finally, the 20th century.

Support the Stump bill, H.R. 1696.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to say that myself and the other two Members that have spoken on this side of the aisle all joined World War II when we were 17 years old. My wife and I have read on a daily basis the number of World War II veterans that are dying at the rate of 1,000 a day; and those that do not believe that, just look at the obituary columns in the newspaper.

Let me cite some of the reasons people give for not building this wonderful building. Critics claim that the memorial was approved behind closed doors by a small group of individuals without regard to the law. That is not true.

Critics claim that the memorial would desecrate grounds made sacred by the civil rights movement and would greatly impede and prevent future public gatherings and marches in the vicinity of Washington and Lincoln. That is not true.

Critics claim that the memorial will block the mall's open space between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, inhibiting pedestrians from walking through this part of the mall. That is not true. The design allows open flow of visitors between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

Critics claim that the memorial would destroy the historic Rainbow Pool. That is not true. The Rainbow Pool will be lowered and rebuilt in its historic configuration. The pool's waterworks, which have not functioned for decades, will be restored to their original splendor. The Rainbow Pool will earn greater historic significance as the centerpiece of the only memorial to a 20th century event commemorated on the main axis of the mall.

Critics claim that the design echoes the Nazi Fascist architectural language of triumph and public spectacle. That is not true.

Critics claim that the World War II memorial is being built on ground that is part of the Lincoln Memorial, and that is not true.

I say to my colleagues, there are millions of reasons why this should be done, but every day there are fewer and fewer of us around that really can deliver the purpose that these people died for. I would like to say we have waited long enough. It is time that we pass this bill. Let us vote for it.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I, first of all, want to rise in strong support of H.R. 1696, which would expedite the construction of the World War II memorial in Washington, D.C. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), for his leadership in bringing this very important resolution to the floor today. I would also like to recognize the other World War II veterans who are still in the House of Representatives, including the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), who did spend some time in Guam during World War II, and especially the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who also spent a significant amount of time in Guam during World War II.

The generation of Americans that fought and sacrificed during World War II deserve proper meaningful, and immediate recognition. A national monument should memorialize the spirit and the sacrifice and the unit of the American people in what was a chaotic and challenging time in world history; and after several years of planning, organization, massive public input, and creative efforts by various groups, this

resolution seeks to make this monument a reality.

Time is against us, as has been already pointed out, as the veterans of World War II are dying at a rate that exceeds 1,000 every day; and if we do not act now, we may miss the opportunity to finally ensure proper remembrance for those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation and indeed preserved the Nation. It is one of the great monuments, when we look at what has happened on the mall, where we have the Washington Monument, which in a sense honors the founding of this Nation; and we look at the Lincoln Memorial, which preserves the national division from within.

We have in this memorial testimony to preserving the Nation in the face of challenges from abroad. So it is entirely fitting and proper that as we go through the sequence of American history, we take the time to honor those important events which this Nation experienced and in which this Nation thrived.

The World War II memorial will be discussed mostly in the sense of what happened during the battles of World War II, and I hope to make my own contribution to that. But we should always be mindful as well that World War II represented the maturation of our country as a world power, which has continued to the present. It is more than simply the battles of World War II; it has really shaped and reshaped the destiny of not only our Nation and the years subsequent to it, but indeed the entire world.

My own part in this memorial was to try to bring recognition to the people of Guam who experienced a terrible occupation during World War II as the only American territory with civilians still present who experienced occupation during World War II, and the Chamorros, who were American nationals at the time, remained steadfastly loyal to the United States, and this resistance to conquest only exacerbated the brutality which they experienced. So for the people of Guam, this has a very special significance as well.

One of the immediate challenges that we faced in trying to deal with the memorial was that there were an anticipated 50 pillars, each loosely reflecting each one of the 50 States. And one of the lessons that we tried to work with as the memorial underwent some rethinking and underwent public input was to finally expand the number to 56 so that indeed all States and territories would be included in the commemoration of World War II. I believe that the people of Guam are not only grateful, but deserve this recognition and attention. The people of Guam not only suffered the indignities of a Japanese occupation. Hundreds were executed and many, many more died as a result of the battle, as a result of deprivation, as a result of hunger.

One of the biggest holidays in Guam, even today, is July 21, which commemorates the landing of the U.S. Ma-

rines on July 21, 1944, which commemorates and celebrates the arrival of their fellow Americans to free the island from the hands of the Japanese and, more importantly, to cement a very strong relationship which exists to this day.

So this is a monument in which it is in the right place. I can think of no better place for it to be. Because when one comes to the Nation's capital, the whole Nation's history should be before us; and it would be a great testimony to the World War II generation.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of this measure, H.R. 1696, a bill expediting the construction of the national World War II memorial here in our Nation's capital, and I urge my colleagues to join in lending their support to this legislation. I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, who is to be commended for his long-term diligent efforts to bring this measure to fruition.

This legislation states that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, the Commemorative Works Act, and any other laws pertaining to the citing and design of the memorial, have been fully met.

□ 1445

This measure allows the American Battle Monuments Commission to proceed expeditiously with construction of this long overdue veterans memorial to our World War II veterans at the dedicated Rainbow Pool site.

Moreover, the measure mandates that the decision to construct this memorial at the Rainbow Pool site and decisions regarding the design of the memorial are final and conclusive and should not be subject to any further administrative or judicial review.

Mr. Speaker, despite being authorized by Congress 8 years ago and having broken ground last year, which I was pleased to participate in, the construction of the World War II memorial has been delayed indefinitely. The decisions on location of the memorial and on its design were the subject of an open and dedicated process that included 22 public hearings over the past 5 years.

Despite these extensive reviews, there remains a small but vocal opposition that is prepared to block construction of the memorial on the Mall at all costs. The majority rule and the democratic process apparently means nothing to many of those opposed to the memorial, some of whom have succeeded in blocking construction with a

pending lawsuit and a minor procedural issue.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that these petty delays will deprive hundreds of thousands of World War II veterans of the opportunity to ever review or visit the memorial. Only 5 million of the 16 million veterans who served in the Second World War remain with us, and we lose, as it has been indicated earlier today, 1,100 World War II veterans each and every day.

As a World War II veteran, I take offense at this small-minded opposition who want to block construction at all costs. What they forget is that it was the contributions of those who fought in World War II that permits them to freely voice their obstructionist views.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the opposition has had ample time to speak. When subjected to a democratic vote, the location and design of the memorial was approved. It is now over time, long overdue to move forward with the construction of this important memorial for our World War II veterans.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we have all been here this afternoon talking about honoring our World War II veterans, the greatest generation. We have all talked about how long it has taken to honor these veterans, how many have died, even in the planning process.

Mr. Speaker, there is one group of veterans of World War II that has waited 55 years to be honored. This Congress can proceed to do so. The previous speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and I have introduced legislation called the "Filipino Veterans Equity Act."

In 1941, this country drafted all of the regular and irregular forces of the Philippine army and guerilla units. They fought in World War II. They fought in World War II. They held up the advance of the Japanese army. They surrendered with our forces at Bataan, suffered through the Bataan Death March, bravely defended our last forces at Corregidor. They stopped the Japanese timetable for many, many months, allowed us to regroup, and allowed MacArthur time eventually to return and take back the Philippines.

Yet, in 1946 this country, this Congress in 1946, decided to take away all the veterans' benefits that were promised to these brave heroes of World War II. It has been 55 years since that action was taken. It is time to restore the honor and dignity of the Filipino veterans. It is time to give them back the honor and the benefits that we promised but just took away.

We talk today about honoring our World War II heroes. We talk today about the freedom that they have given us and our Nation. As we talk about

the heroes that we are going to commemorate on the Mall, let us not forget the Filipinos who were drafted into our Armed Forces, fought, and died for this country's freedom, and had this Congress take away their benefits in 1946.

Let the 107th Congress truly honor our veterans, restore their benefits, and pass the legislation, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act of 2001.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 1696. If ever there was a memorial that should be built, this is it. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, there is no memorial more befitting than to honor our World War II veterans and the tens of millions of people who were affected by World War II.

In fact, we in Congress agreed to honor the men and women of World War II when we passed and the President signed the act to authorize the construction of the memorial. Yet, here we are, 8 years later, with nothing to show for it. The only reason we have nothing to show is that the memorial construction has been stonewalled time and again by lawsuits and litigation by a small group of Washingtonians who do not want any additional memorials on the Mall, not even one to acknowledge what is arguably the most important event of the 20th century.

The sad fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the meantime, over the 8 years, almost 3.4 million World War II veterans have died. With each passing day, over 1,000 more veterans die, men and women who deserve this memorial who will never see it. As this process drags on, we lose 30,000 more each month and 400,000 a year. We simply have to get construction started and completed on this memorial.

I want to add that this bill is not something we are trying to ramrod through at the last minute; quite to the contrary. There have been 22 public hearings, five approvals from the Commission on Fine Arts, and five approvals from the National Capital Planning Commission. There has been overwhelming national support, and over \$170 million has been raised or pledged by over half a million citizens, hundreds of corporations, 1,100 schools, and hundreds of veterans groups.

Mr. Speaker, all the requirements of both the National Environmental Policy Act and the Commemorative Works Act have been met. All of the approvals have been made. The site has been established and is in the proper, rightful, and fitting place. We must end the delays and get on with the construction of the memorial, which pays homage to the brave men and women who fought for our country and sacrificed their lives to keep this country and the world free.

Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed at the delay that has taken place. I strongly

urge passage of H.R. 1696 so we can finally bring the stonewalling to an end and ensure that this deserving memorial will be constructed.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 1696, a bill to expedite the construction of the World War II memorial on the Washington Mall between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. This artist's rendition to my left shows the dignity and grace that this memorial will provide and in true memory of those men and women who served so ably and so courageously on behalf of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the design and site for the memorial have been carefully studied. My good friend just a moment ago spoke to the number of hearings. This has been an exhaustive process. It has been approved over a period of some 6 years, a longer time than it took to win World War II.

The Allied victory in this greatest war in world history represented the triumph of the human spirit and began the march of freedom and democracy across the world that continues even today.

More than half a century has passed, Mr. Speaker, but America's World War II veterans still have no national memorial to honor them. They have been called the greatest generation; and even recently, popular movies like *Saving Private Ryan* and the *Thin Red Line* have served to remind us of their incredible bravery and sacrifices. Yet, they have no memorial, and their generation is passing away at the rate of over 1,100 people per day. How much longer can they wait?

Eight years ago, Congress passed the authorization for the World War II memorial. Today we have a site selected and a design approved through an exhaustive process that ensured careful consideration of all the relevant factors before the decisions were made.

Unfortunately, no process can ensure unanimity. A litigious few are now attempting to block both the site selection and design in the courts on legal technicalities. Oh, yes, they too support a memorial. They just cannot agree on when or where or in what form, and they have no concern about how long that process might take.

Mr. Speaker, despite a full and fair opportunity to have their opinions heard, they argue that the process was not perfect. The truth is, they do not like the result so their strategy is endless reconsideration and delay. They apparently do not care whether World

War II veterans live to see their own memorial or not. The irony is that they live in a free society, exercising rights secured by the blood of our World War II veterans and other veterans.

I frankly think this situation we find ourselves in today is unconscionable. I would like to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), now chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, himself a World War II combat veteran, for leading the way on this legislation. There is nobody more able and more qualified in this Chamber to be offering this resolution than my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona. I want to associate myself with his remarks, and note that he is a former chairman, chairman emeritus, of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, like many in this Chamber and many who may be viewing these proceedings, I regret that my own father, a combat veteran who saw horrific action in New Guinea during World War II and elsewhere in the Pacific, including the Philippines, never got to see this memorial, having passed away a few years ago. He, like those 1,100 who die every day, will never see this memorial. Again, like I said a moment ago, that is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the co-sponsors, this is a bipartisan effort to try to get this very important memorial moving. I think it shows that there will be and I hope should be broad support across the spectrum for this.

Let me just finally say that delay is denial. Again, 1,100 veterans die every day, 1,100 of the greatest generation. If we delay this another day, it is denial for them to see what this country has said in gratitude. It is a small token, but nevertheless it is an important token. I hope that everyone unanimously supports this important resolution. I salute the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank all my good friends who have spoken in favor of this resolution today. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), as chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and his ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for all their help and support; along with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), chairman of the Committee on the Interior, which has jurisdiction over the Mall, and his ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), as well as the leadership for allowing us to move expeditiously on this.

In closing, let me say, let us not get into another bureaucratic wrangling and delay any further. The number of 1,100 World War II veterans has been mentioned here that are dying every day. Translate that into the time we have been on this floor. We have been on the floor approximately 1 hour. We

have debated this bill for about 50 minutes. Sadly to say, Mr. Speaker, in that time, another 45 World War II veterans have passed away.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1696.

This bill would expedite the construction of the already-approved World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington, DC.

In short, World War II veterans have waited long enough. When the long dark shadows of aggression appeared and threatened to cloak liberty, it was the World War II veterans that ensured liberty, freedom and the rule of law. It is time that all Americans express the gratitude and admiration that our nation's World War II veterans rightly deserve.

Our World War II veterans are truly special. While many have served this great nation in varying capacities, it is the World War II generation that ultimately changed the course of history.

In return, this Congress must ensure the United States government remains steadfast in its commitment to provide World War II veterans and their families a memorial that they so richly deserve. We must act now.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1696, legislation to fast-track the Construction of the World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C. This bill is necessary because it takes into account the crucial element of time; time that is running out for many veterans. Every day, we lose more than 1,000 World War II veterans. Today, less than 6 million remain alive.

The intent of the World War II Memorial is to honor the 16 million Americans who served in uniform during the war, the more than 400,000 who gave their lives, and the millions who supported the war effort on the homefront. World War II was a point of transition in American history, a point at which America's adolescence ended and a mature American mission emerged. This mission, as defined by President Franklin Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, was a call to all Americans to work to end tyranny and poverty wherever it is found.

World War II also marked a time of rapid advancement for America. In order to meet the materiel needs of the worldwide war effort, America's factories manufactured goods at an astronomical rate. To sustain this level of production while so many American men were putting on uniforms and going off to war, women entered the workforce in mass numbers for the first time. This forever changed the face of American industry, while also changing the way many women saw themselves and their role in American society.

The benefits provided to returning veterans, including financial assistance for education and home purchases, allowed many Americans to attain a level of freedom and independence that was not even imagined before the war. The Montgomery GI Bill provided countless veterans with a college education. In many cases, these veterans were the first in their family to go to college.

Above all, World War II was the moment in history when the United States helped save the world from fascism and tyranny. And, as Senator Bob Dole said, "It is time to thank the World War II veterans for doing what they believed was their duty—to help their country save the world. We must build a monument to bear them witness. Witness to young men who, armed with courage, liberated whole con-

tinents from tyranny. Witness to young soldiers who willingly died for a future they would never see."

As a testament to the urgency of this matter, I read in today's Washington Post, the obituary of Barbara Lazarsky. During World War II, Ms. Lazarsky served in the Women's Air Force Service Pilots. She contributed to the war effort by ferrying planes across the United States so that men were free for combat overseas. When the WASP program was disbanded after the war, Ms. Lazarsky became an aircraft accident analyst for the Air Transport Command. In 1947, she became a military and air attaché in India. Her recent death demonstrates the necessity of expediting the construction of the World War II Memorial.

This World War II Memorial honors those who served, and those who gave the "last full measure of devotion," while also commemorating the indelible mark left on American society. It is time to create a lasting monument to the legacy of those who gave so much and asked for so little. While we may disagree on the style and form of the memorial, we all agree on the moral imperative to honor those who served their country in its hour of need. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1696.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1696, legislation that would expedite building the World War II Memorial at the expense of protecting our National Mall. I inadvertently voted in support of this legislation earlier today. While I believe it is important to recognize the important contributions and sacrifices that our fighting men and women made during this turning event in world history, I do not support legislation that would do irrevocable harm to the World War II Memorial itself and to the national mall. If any precious national treasure deserves protection by Congress, it is the National Mall. H.R. 1696 would eliminate indispensable oversight for the largest and most significant memorial on the Mall since the Lincoln Memorial was constructed almost 80 years ago.

I oppose this legislation because not only is it unnecessary, but its provisions could seriously compromise the water quality and surrounding cultural and historical landmarks of the city. Congress should not promote legislation that would eliminate or reduce oversight on already agreed to provisions that the City and National Planning Commission have developed. Such critical provisions not addressed by this bill include not allowing contaminated groundwater to be pumped into the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay, ensuring the structural integrity of the Washington Monument, and providing tourists with the ability to appreciate this Memorial and the Mall without suffering severe traffic congestion.

Congress should let the National Planning Commission deal with building the Memorial in a more appropriate manner, one that is already underway and which befits the important legacy that this Memorial is designed to honor.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that future generations always remember the sacrifices for freedom made by the World War II generation. A tribute to the men and women who helped win that war, both overseas and on the home front is long overdue. It's for this reason that I'm working to expedite construction of the memorial and why I will vote with my colleagues in

the U.S. House of Representatives to pass legislation that directs work on the World War II Memorial begin as soon as possible.

The construction of the country's first national memorial dedicated to all who served in the armed forces and Merchant Marine of the United States during World War II on the National Mall is a fitting tribute to their courage. I am disappointed by the efforts of those to delay construction of the World War II Memorial, but the real victims of the indefinite delay are the members of that generation, who now must wait even longer for it to be completed. It is a harsh reality, but of the 16 million who served in uniform during the war, it is estimated that only 5 million are still alive, and of whom, we lose 1,100 each day.

Throughout a lengthy, open and democratic approval process, the American people have expressed their overwhelming support for the construction of the National WWII Memorial on our nation's mall. Hundreds of thousands of individual Americans, hundreds of corporations and foundations; dozens of civic, fraternal and professional organizations; state legislatures, and veterans organizations have joined the effort to say thank you to America's WWII generation.

Each year, millions of visitors come to the nation's capital to appreciate its monuments to our country's founding fathers, great presidents, and places of government. Home to our nation's cherished symbols of freedom, the memorial will beautifully complement the green vistas of the Mall and its existing monuments. They story of the World War II generation is an inspiration for us all. Once completed, this memorial will be a visible and timeless reminder of what they did to protect freedom and democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1696.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1500

#### COMMEMORATING DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 116) commemorating the dedication and sacrifices of the men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement officers, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 116

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 700,000 law enforcement officers, both men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace;

Whereas these peace officers are on the front line in preserving the right of the children of the United States to receive an education in a crime-free environment, a right that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas 151 peace officers lost their lives in the line of duty in 2000, and a total of nearly 15,000 men and women serving as peace officers have made that supreme sacrifice;

Whereas every year, 1 in 9 peace officers is assaulted, 1 in 25 is injured, and 1 in 4,400 is killed in the line of duty; and

Whereas on May 15, 2001, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in the Nation's Capital to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) all peace officers slain in the line of duty should be honored and recognized; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to honor and recognize such officers with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 116, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the House consider H. Res. 116, legislation introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), my colleague.

This rule commemorates the dedication and the sacrifice of the men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement officers. By adopting H. Res. 116, the House will express its belief that all peace officers slain in the line of duty should be honored and recognized.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this resolution urges the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling on all Americans to honor and recognize such officers with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

Mr. Speaker, every day more than 700,000 law enforcement officers risk their lives and their safety to protect us. They patrol our most dangerous streets, and they deal with the most violent elements of our society. Increasingly, law enforcement officers

are also called upon to preserve the right of our children to receive an education. They then pay a high price to defend all of our liberties.

As the resolution states, Mr. Speaker, 1 in 9 peace officers are assaulted every year; 1 in 25 are injured; and, even more sadly, 1 in 4,400 are killed in the line of duty.

In my own great State of Idaho, Mr. Speaker, we have lost 56 brave men and women in uniform who were protecting our families and our friends and our neighbors.

These, all of them, are heroes and they have put their lives at risk, put their families in danger, and have done something remarkable that we do not see too often today: They put society's safety ahead of their own.

Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1988, Officer Linda Huff, an Idaho State Police Officer, was shot in the parking lot of her patrol station while walking to her car. The assailant fired 17 rounds from a high-powered hand weapon at point-blank range. She was able to return fire and injured her assailant before dying.

The injuries Trooper Huff inflicted on her assailant led to his eventual arrest. More recently, on January 3 of 2001, two more peacekeeping Idahoans lost their lives while serving a search warrant. Corporals Anderson and Moulson were both wearing bulletproof vests when they were met with gunfire from the suspect inside the home. Sadly, not only are these men and women protecting us; in that process, they have become targets themselves by the criminals.

Over 15,000 officers gather at our Nation's Capitol today to join with the families of these recently fallen comrades and recognize the supreme sacrifice that so many others have made in giving their last full measure.

The courage and sacrifice displayed by our law enforcement officers is being honored by Congress through the establishment of the National Law Enforcement Museum. This museum will ensure the stories of heroism and sacrifice of these police officers are always remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this resolution to offer their votes, first, in appreciation to the fallen heroes, and, second, as a vote of confidence for those who still today serve.

This House should make plain its appreciation for the critical and often unappreciated sacrifices these men and women make in preserving the peace.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for introducing this resolution honoring our law enforcement personnel.

Mr. Speaker, the first recorded law enforcement fatality in the performance of duty in this country occurred on May 17, 1792. The officer, Isaac Smith, a sheriff's deputy in New York City, was shot to death while attempting to make an arrest.

Since that time, more than 15,000 other officers have been killed in the line of duty, and today roughly 740,000 officers continue to put their lives on the line for the safety and protection of others.

May 15 is Peace Officers Memorial Day, and it is fitting that this resolution, honoring the men and women of this country who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement officers, be brought before this body today.

According to the National Crime Victimization Survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1997, there were 31.3 million crimes committed in the United States, an average of one crime every second. That is how often law enforcement officers put their lives on the line; every second of every hour they are on duty protecting the American people. And so it is for this reason that in 1984, Congress authorized the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

The memorial honors Federal, State and local law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty and recognizes the service and sacrifice of all officers.

Completed and dedicated in 1991, the memorial, which is located here in Washington, D.C., has the names of more than 15,000 officers who have been killed in the line of duty inscribed on its blue-gray marble walls.

The names of seven fallen officers from Illinois were added to the memorial this past Sunday. Of those, Roy Costello, John Kearney, and Alane Stoffregen were from the Chicago Police Department.

Their watch over the city ended at various times: Mr. Costello in 1945; Mr. Kearney in 1909; and Ms. Stoffregen last year. But they served one common purpose: to keep the district that I represent safe.

Mr. Speaker, I salute them and those that serve today for their dedication and commitment.

Since 1854, a total of 417 Chicago police officers have lost their lives while serving our communities. For 40 years, the Chicago Police have held the St. Jude parade to honor fallen police officers of the previous year. More than 8,000 participants, including law enforcement officers and employees, marched the streets of Chicago.

This year's march honored 30 fallen officers, including the last officer killed in action, James Camp, who was shot while investigating a car theft.

Soon a museum will be built near the memorial to tell the story of law enforcement's proud history and to serve

as a research repository to promote law enforcement safety.

The memorial, the future museum, and this resolution will ensure that the heroism and sacrifice law enforcement officials make every day will be remembered and revered, so I would urge all Members to give support to this resolution.

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

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, law enforcement officials from around the country have come in these last few days and today to Washington, D.C. to commemorate and honor fellow peace officers slain in the line of duty.

The National Peace Officers Memorial Day serves as a solemn reminder of the sacrifice and commitment to safety that police officers make on our behalf. The National Peace Officer Memorial Resolution, H.R. 116, which is cosponsored by 81 of my colleagues, expresses the gratitude of the House of Representatives for the work that these officers perform.

Law enforcement officers face unprecedented risks while protecting our communities and our freedoms. Today over 700,000 men and women place their lives at risk to serve as protectors of law and order.

Throughout U.S. history, more than 15,000 men and women serving as peace officers have sacrificed their life for their Nation and community. In the year 2000 alone, 151 Federal, State and local law enforcers gave their lives in the line of duty. To date, 54 have died in 2001; 3 of these 54 come from my home State of Colorado.

Law enforcement officers face enormous risks while protecting our neighborhoods, our families, our freedoms; yet there is often an attitude of indifference. Every community has been impacted by the work of officers, yet most citizens have little direct contact with peace officers. Therefore, the sacrifices of these brave Americans go unnoticed and often underappreciated.

Mr. Speaker, without the service of peace officers, our society is left unprotected. Law enforcement officers deserve to be recognized and honored for their work, their dedication, their sacrifice, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, their bravery in defense of our society.

I hope my colleagues will join me in expressing our appreciation to all peace officers and paying tribute to those slain in the line of duty and to their surviving families by supporting H. Res. 116.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), one who knows exactly what it means and what it is like to be a law enforcement official himself.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution in honor of law enforcement officers who were killed or disabled in the line of duty. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for sponsoring this important legislation and to all of those who cosponsored it to make it a reality here today.

Before coming to Congress in 1993, I served as a police officer for 12 years, both as a city police officer and as a Michigan State trooper. I have known personally too many officers who have been disabled or who have given their lives for the people they serve.

Each of us today understand the importance of the House of Representatives in undertaking this resolution to honor law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice. In this past year it has been 151 men and women.

We do not forget those officers who died in previous years. Mr. Speaker, in my case, I specifically think back about the funerals and where I was honor guard for the funerals of Darrell Rantanen of the Gladstone Post back in about 1974, or Craig Scott of the Lansing Post who died in 1983. Those officers died doing their job just like law enforcement officials do day in, day out.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, probably each one of us can name an officer that was killed in the line of duty either in our home districts or even here in the Capitol, which happened in 1998 with the deaths of Capitol Police Officers Chestnut and Gibson.

We do not forget the extreme sacrifice our Nation's law enforcement and public safety officers make to our communities and to the Nation every day.

This legislation, as simple as it is, recognizes the very important value our government places on the work of the men and women who serve us each day. It is important that we take this step this week to show our respect and recognition for the jobs that police officers do every day, in every town, in every township, and every county in America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in support of this resolution. It is the least we can do for those who work with us and work for us every day in this great Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that when one gives of themselves and gives of their life, they have given the best that they have had to give, and I would urge support for this resolution.

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

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for

introducing this important piece of legislation and for his efforts to bring it to the floor and see it through its passage. I wanted to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), of the Committee on Government Reform, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), ranking members, for working expeditiously for bringing this resolution to the floor.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just remind everyone that it is our law enforcement officers that provide for the construction of the community, provide for its safety. They are, indeed, community builders. It reminds me of a poem that I learned many years ago, and I should like to offer it in closing, Mr. Speaker.

It goes like this: "I saw a group of men in my hometown. I saw a group of men tearing a building down. With a heave and a hoe and a mighty yell, they swung a beam, and a side wall fell. And I said to the foreman, 'Hey, are these men skilled, you know the kind that you'd hire if you wanted to build?' He said, 'Why no indeed. To tear down a building, common labor is all I need. With common labor, I can tear down in a day or two what it took a builder 10 years to do.' So I thought to myself as I walked away, which of these roles am I going to play."

Mr. Speaker, men and women in law enforcement and in uniform today that build our communities deserve the vote, and I urge the Members to provide their vote and their support.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and join Americans across the country today in honoring those officers who have died or who were disabled in the line of duty. South Texans appreciate those men and women who walk that thin blue line every day.

As a former law enforcement officer, I have an intimate understanding of situations that can turn dangerous or deadly in a moment. The men and women who police our communities walk that line that separates the good guys from the bad guys. The work we ask our police officers to do is dangerous, dirty duty.

What people do not understand very often is that it is the inherent risk of what we might have to do that makes law enforcement so dangerous. We see the best and worst of our fellow human beings. It is not our job to judge them. That task is reserved judge and jury. Our job is merely to treat everyone equally.

Enforcing the law is a hard job. When people do something wrong, their first instinct is to find fault with the person who catches them. So being the guardian of our laws is never a simple endeavor. But in the end, it is the enormous satisfaction of protecting our neighborhoods and families that makes walking that line worth all the danger and criticism. It is the laughter of safe children, or the gratitude of someone whose life or property we protect, that makes doing this job enormously satisfying.

There are several South Texans who will be honored this week. Officers who made the supreme sacrifice include: Enrique L. Carrizalez,

Alfred Walter Basler, David Rucker, Susan Lynn Rodriguez, Ricardo Guillermo Salinas, Joseph Moon, Juan Prieto, Dan Bock, Roy Smith, John Sartain, and Ruben Almanza. These people are examples of the message set forth by Jesus Christ in John 15:13: "Greater love hath no one than this: than to lay down one's life for his friends."

Let us not forget the sacrifice made on our behalf right here in this building; our own Capitol Police Officers Chestnut and Gibson died defending Members of Congress and the public who populate this building. The House of Representatives joins families and communities across the nation to remember those members of the force who are no longer with us, who made the supreme sacrifice in the line of duty.

For the sacrifices to ensure the rule of law, the officers we honor today and their families have the eternal gratitude of a grateful nation. While today we remember and reflect on the last full measure of devotion of these brave peace officers, let us do better than that by remembering their sacrifice and respecting the danger our officers face each and every day on our behalf every other day of the year.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 116, to acknowledge the dedication and sacrifices of the men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement officers. It is fitting that we acknowledge and commend the courage and dedication shown by our law enforcement officers who have given their lives for their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, sadly in the past year, 150 law enforcement officers gave their lives in the performance of their duty. In my own district, although we have been fortunate not to have lost officers in the line of duty in the past year I pause to remember and recognize Randy Stevens, Steven Hodge, Richard Callwood, Dexter Mardenborough, Wilbur Francis, Allen William, and Patrick Sweeney who were all killed as they sought to keep the streets and communities of the Virgin Islands safe.

Mr. Speaker it was President Kennedy, who approved House Joint Resolution 730 in October 1962, which proclaimed May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the Week of May 15th Police Week. Our Police Officers are the defenders of our communities because they bravely protect us from mortal dangers, in some cases at the cost of their own lives. For that we owe them all our deepest gratitude and respect. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H. Res. 116.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 116. It is a long-awaited tribute to the hard working law enforcement community members.

Countless law enforcement men and women daily dedicate their lives to our country's protection. They face unbelievable danger to say nothing of the sacrifices: death, injury, disability and family stress. We must finally recognize their dedication and commitment to our communities, families and children.

They not only deserve our support and gratitude, but they also deserve protection under the law. That is why I cosponsored H.R. 218, the Community Protection Act. This bill, supported by police nationwide, allows law enforcement officers to carry concealed weapons. They need this as criminals know who the officers are, who their families are and where they live. Very simply: law enforcement officers need protection both on and off duty.

When law enforcement officers begin their day, the risk and danger are unknown. I cannot imagine a more unsettling feeling for both the officer and his or her family.

Therefore, I honor law enforcement officers nationwide, particularly those who serve Long Island.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 116, honoring law enforcement officers who have been killed or disabled in the line of duty. Often, the immeasurable contributions of our nation's law enforcement officers go unnoticed. The establishment of a Peace Officers Memorial Day would serve as a powerful tribute to slain officers as well as to those who continue to risk their lives each day to make our communities safe.

In one of the communities I represent, Glendale, California, four police officers and one sheriff's deputy have been killed in the line of duty. Many more have suffered work-related injuries and illnesses that have contributed to early deaths. This ultimate sacrifice deserves honorable recognition.

One of these fallen heroes is Charles A. Lazzaretto, a Glendale Police Officer, who was killed in the line of duty only four years ago. Chuck was born on October 5, 1966 and spent his early childhood living with his family in the California communities of Walnut and Montebello. In 1982, the Lazzaretto family moved to Burbank where his father served as city manager. While attending Glendale Community College in the mid-1980s, Chuck was appointed as a campus public safety officer and subsequently promoted to the rank of sergeant. In 1985, he volunteered for the United States Marine Corps Reserves and attended Officer Candidate School.

Chuck joined the Glendale Police Department on May 3, 1987 where he was appointed as a reserve police officer. In 1991, he received the rank of officer, working assignments in the juvenile, burglary, auto theft, arson, and robbery/homicide areas. Chuck's favorite pastime was spending time with his family. He often spoke of his love for his wife and two sons, Andrew and Matthew, as well as his parents and three brothers. Chuck was a community leader and family role model.

Police officers touch the lives of so many Americans. It is a long overdue tribute that we commemorate the courage and spirit of our nation's law enforcement officers with this resolution. I would also like to add my voice in support of H.R. 1727, which assists the families of those killed in the line of duty. May our fallen heroes and their families find solace in the national recognition of their sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 116, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### FALLEN HERO SURVIVOR BENEFIT FAIRNESS ACT OF 2001

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1727) to amend the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 to provide for consistent treatment of survivor benefits for public safety officers killed in the line of duty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 1727

*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 "Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act of 2001".*

#### SEC. 2. CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF SURVIVOR BENEFITS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

*Subsection (b) of section 1528 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-34) is amended by striking the period and inserting ", and to amounts received in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001, with respect to individuals dying on or before December 31, 1996."*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

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

Mr. Speaker, we cannot be considering this important legislation on a more appropriate day. Today is Peace Officers Memorial Day. Each year, on May 15, America honors the men and women in law enforcement who have given their lives to keep the American people safe in their communities and on their streets. More than 15,400 brave public safety officers have made the ultimate sacrifice since our Nation was founded.

We just considered a resolution honoring these fallen heroes. Now it is time to honor our public safety officers killed in the line of duty by offering tangible help to their loved ones left behind. This is exactly what the legislation before us does.

The Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act provides tax-free benefits to families of all public safety officers killed in the line of duty regardless of when the officer was killed. This bill, Mr. Speaker, includes law enforcement officers, firefighters, rescue squads, ambulance crews and employees working in disaster or emergency areas.

Under present law, a gross inequity exists because survivor benefits are treated differently, depending on when the public safety officer died. Currently, survivor benefits are tax free only if a public safety officer died in the line of duty after December 31, 1996.

This inequity, Mr. Speaker, arose from the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997

because of revenue constraints. Pursuant to an amendment to that legislation offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) and me, families of officers killed in the line of duty became eligible to receive survivor benefits tax free for the first time.

Unfortunately, however, because of the revenue limitations at the time, the tax-free benefits were limited to officers killed after December 31, 1996.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, families of our law enforcement heroes, our fallen heroes, are being treated differently by the Tax Code depending on when the officer was killed. I think all of us in this body and all Americans agree that it is absolutely unconscionable to discriminate against survivors of fallen officers simply because their husband, wife, or parent officer died before 1997.

The bill before us today is based on an amendment I offered 2 years ago in the Committee on Ways and Means, which was unanimously adopted in the Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act of 1999. That provision passed both the House and Senate, but unfortunately the President at the time vetoed the larger bill.

I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for expediting H.R. 1727 in the Committee on Ways and Means. I want to also thank the 13 bipartisan members of the committee who joined me in sponsoring this bill and to the other sponsors, especially the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), who have worked on this issue over the years.

I am also grateful to the more than 20 State and national law enforcement organizations who sent letters in support of this important legislation. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, I am eternally grateful to the fallen heroes and their families we honor today.

As cochair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand the risks and sacrifices made by our officers every time they put on their badge. Over the past 15 years, I have spent over 1,600 hours riding with Minneapolis and suburban police back home. I have accompanied high-risk entry teams on 65 search warrants. So I have seen, firsthand, officers in harm's way simply because they are doing their job to keep our streets and communities safe.

Each year, an average of 62,000 assaults are committed against peace officers, resulting in more than 21,000 injured officers. On the average, it was just said by the previous speakers, an officer is killed every 57 hours in America. Just last year, 150 peace and police officers gave their lives, which represents, by the way, a 12 percent increase in police fatalities over the previous year.

The average age of slain peace officers is only 38 years. Seventy-two percent of these officers were married, and the largest percentage had young children.

Of course the financial hardship on these families can be devastating on top of dealing with an unbearably painful loss.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying this legislation, H.R. 1727, is long overdue. Just a few short hours ago, a memorial service for fallen police officers was held here at the Capitol. Flags on all Federal buildings are currently flying at half-staff. It is time to honor our fallen heroes with deeds as well as words.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which will ensure that all families, all families of slain police officers receive survivor benefits tax free, regardless of when the officers were killed. It is the very least we can do for families of our fallen heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today H.R. 1727 comes to the House with strong bipartisan support. This bill was approved by the Committee on Ways and Means by unanimous vote. I strongly support this legislation.

H.R. 1727 would bring fairness to our Tax Code for a small but very special group of taxpayers. The bill would extend uniform tax treatment to certain payments received by the surviving spouse or children of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty. This legislation would extend current-law treatment to amounts paid under a survivor annuity with respect to a public safety officer killed in the line of duty before December 31, 1996 with respect to payments received after December 31 in the year 2001.

The Tax Relief Act of 1997 provided that amounts paid pursuant to a survivor annuity with respect to public safety officers who were killed in the line of duty are excluded from the income of the officer's surviving spouse or children if the officer's death occurred on or after December 31, 1996. The annuity must be provided under a government plan.

For this purpose, public safety officers include, not only law enforcement officers, but also firefighters, rescue squad members, or ambulance crews.

As demonstrated under present law, this tax treatment is provided for annuity payments received with respect to public safety officers who lose their lives due to risks inherent in their jobs. These officers risked their lives on a daily basis to protect our families and our communities. This sacrifice obviously is shared by their families.

Under H.R. 1727, we are acknowledging that, when a public safety officer is killed in the line of duty, the officer's family has paid the ultimate sacrifice. The sacrifice is no less great because the officer was killed before December 31, 1996.

This is why H.R. 1727 extends current law to families of all officers killed in the line of duty without regard to date

of death. All surviving spouses and all children of public safety officers killed in the line of duty should receive the same tax treatment.

H.R. 1727 provides that all payments received under a survivor annuity as prescribed above after December 31, 2001 would be excluded from income.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1727 in the name of all of those who put their lives on the line for us 365 days a year.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), an important cosponsor of this legislation, a strong advocate to law enforcement, and a fellow member of the Law Enforcement Caucus.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to rise in support of the Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act. I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), who is chairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus and who has worked hard and successfully to bring this important bill through the Committee on Ways and Means and to the floor.

As he and previous speakers have indicated, this legislation extends the tax-free treatment to the survivors of those law enforcement officers and public safety officers lost in the line of duty, not just for those lost after 1996. It makes good sense. It is fair. It is just.

Especially during a week when we honor law enforcement officers and those who have fallen in the line of duty, it is an important gesture, a step forward that gives them the financial security and the piece of mind they so justly deserve.

I introduced similar legislation 2 years ago with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) after sharing the stories with several families in New Hampshire that faced the consequences of having lost a loved one serving in the line of duty prior to 1996.

It is my pleasure to support the legislation, and it is a pleasure to step forward on a piece of legislation that has such a bipartisan commitment behind it. I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), a friend, a colleague, and a former police officer who himself put his life on the line for the folks in his community.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), my colleague and cochair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, for his hard work on this resolution and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) and all the members of the Committee on Ways and

Means for bringing this legislation to the point where we are today.

Public safety officers put their lives on the line every day to protect and serve the people of this country. Yet, unbelievably enough, until 1997, survivor benefits for public safety officers who died in the line of duty were subject to Federal income taxes. The families, loved ones had done so much for this country, and their spouses and children sacrifice as well, yet the Federal Government would tax the benefits they so need.

□ 1530

In 1997, as I attended the Police Officers Memorial, I was made aware of this injustice of taxing survivor benefits. Because of the quirk in the law, those law enforcement officers who were disabled, their benefits were not taxed; yet those who died, their benefits were taxed by the Federal Government. So I spoke then with the co-chair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD). We spoke with the President, got the support of the administration; we worked with members of the Committee on Ways and Means, especially the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN); and we moved legislation to try to correct this injustice. The Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus wholeheartedly supported it.

In 1997, Congress started to fix this serious problem. The Taxpayers Relief Act of 1997 provided that the survivor benefits of officers killed on or after December 31, 1996, would not be subject to taxation. However, we had budget constraints back then; and we could not extend this legislation to everyone. But we did not give up. These were not minor omissions. The bill left numerous deserving families without assistance.

I am pleased to report that through this legislation today, authored by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and my cochairman of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, who has worked so hard on this issue, we now have this bill for passage before the House of Representatives. Today, we close this unfair loophole by ensuring that the survivor benefits of all officers, regardless of the date they perished, will be exempt from taxes.

We must provide for those families that have suffered the devastating loss of losing their loved ones to the call of duty. These families deserve our support when the unthinkable happens and their loved one is struck down. We have to look out for them, just as their husbands, their wives, their mothers, and fathers look out for us every day, risking their commitments to their families for the greater commitment they have made to this country.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that in the name of basic tax fairness and on behalf of all of the

survivors of the heroes who put their lives on the line and gave their lives for our communities, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to again thank my co-chair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), and the 13 other Ways and Means colleagues who cosponsored this important legislation. I also want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) again for his hard work on this issue and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for expediting this legislation at my request.

This is the least we can do, Mr. Speaker, for our fallen law enforcement heroes and other public safety officers killed in the line of duty, to give all of the survivors of public safety officers who give their lives for our public safety the tax-free benefits regardless of when their officer relative was killed. So I urge Members to support this important legislation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, current law unfairly divides our fallen heroes into two camps. Officers who sacrificed their lives after 1997 are granted the fair and reasonable recognition of allowing their families to draw survivor benefits without paying taxes on the benefits.

Society recognizes that officers who make the supreme sacrifice deserve to be treated in a special way through this provision, which is designed to express our gratitude to the surviving family members.

Unfortunately, this distinction does not currently apply to the surviving families of officers who fell before January 1987. The law discriminates against these law enforcement officers because it denies their families the right to draw their survivor's benefits without taxes.

We need to treat all of our fallen officers equally. We should single out those brave officers who give their lives protecting society. We should demonstrate a special reverence for their demanding and dangerous work as law enforcement officers. Easing the burden on surviving family members is a fair and appropriate gesture to convey our thanks and respect. Members should show our appreciation by supporting this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1727, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAMSTAD. 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 H.R. 1727.

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

There was no objection.

#### FAIRNESS FOR FOSTER CARE FAMILIES ACT OF 2001

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 586) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion from gross income for foster care payments shall also apply to payments by qualified placement agencies, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 586

*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 "Fairness for Foster Care Families Act of 2001".*

#### SEC. 2. EXCLUSION FOR FOSTER CARE PAYMENTS TO APPLY TO PAYMENTS BY QUALIFIED PLACEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The matter preceding subparagraph (B) of section 131(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining qualified foster care payment) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘qualified foster care payment’ means any payment made pursuant to a foster care program of a State or political subdivision thereof—

“(A) which is paid by—

“(i) a State or political subdivision thereof, or

“(ii) a qualified foster care placement agency, and”.

(b) *QUALIFIED FOSTER INDIVIDUALS TO INCLUDE INDIVIDUALS PLACED BY QUALIFIED PLACEMENT AGENCIES.*—Subparagraph (B) of section 131(b)(2) of such Code (defining qualified foster individual) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) a qualified foster care placement agency.”

(c) *QUALIFIED FOSTER CARE PLACEMENT AGENCY DEFINED.*—Subsection (b) of section 131 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) *QUALIFIED FOSTER CARE PLACEMENT AGENCY.*—The term ‘qualified foster care placement agency’ means any placement agency which is licensed or certified by—

“(A) a State or political subdivision thereof, or

“(B) an entity designated by a State or political subdivision thereof,

for the foster care program of such State or political subdivision to make foster care payments to providers of foster care.”

(d) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward bill which updates and simplifies the Tax Code as it relates to foster care families. Under current law, foster care families are given a tax exemption on the payments they receive through a state-run foster care program. The current law was enacted in 1986. The law recognizes that if you are willing to open your heart and home by participating in foster care, you should receive this exemption. It is that simple.

Over the years, however, States have changed the way foster care services are delivered and many are privatizing or contracting out some or all of their services. When this happens, and a private organization participates in the State program, the tax exemption for families becomes confusing and, in some cases, unfair. Specifically, the exclusion is dependent on a complicated analysis of three factors: the age of the foster individual, the type of entity that places the individual, and the source of payment.

If the payments are found not excludable because a private entity is participating in one or all of these factors, the foster care provider is then required to keep extensive records of every expense made on behalf of the foster individual in order to qualify for the exclusion. As my colleagues can imagine, these rules are extremely confusing. In fact, many accountants have difficulty interpreting these rules for families; and as a result, families are discouraged from participating in foster care. This problem is created simply because current law is outdated and no longer reflects the changes States are making in their business practices.

Mr. Speaker, States should be encouraged to be innovative and responsible in their business practices; but more important, foster care families should not be penalized as a result. My bill, H.R. 586, simplifies current law to ensure that the exemption is there for all foster care families regardless of how their State foster care practices change and regardless of the age of the individual.

My bill recognizes the increasing role of private agencies in State foster care plans and also requires these agencies to be licensed and certified by the State in order to participate in a State foster care program.

Again, Mr. Speaker, my bill simplifies and provides fairness for the Tax Code for all foster care families, and I urge my colleagues' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), in supporting H.R. 586, the Fairness to Foster Care Families Act. H.R. 586 would expand the types of foster care payments that are excludable from a foster family's taxable income. The bill recognizes that payments received by foster families, regardless of the type of agency providing those payments, are needed to care for the foster child and, therefore, should not be taxed.

We have over 560,000 abused, abandoned, and neglected children in our Nation's foster care system who need caring homes as they wait to return to their birth parents or to be adopted. H.R. 586 removes one barrier to at least some families taking a foster child into their homes. Under current law, foster care payments are excluded from taxable income only if the placement and payment is made by a State agency or, in the case of an individual under the age of 19, by a nonprofit agency.

This bill would extend this favorable tax treatment to any foster care payment made by an agency licensed or certified by the State. This would remove restrictions currently imposed on foster families whose payments are made by for-profit agencies or, in the case of foster individuals older than the age of 18, by non-profit agencies.

The impact of for-profit agencies in the child welfare system is uncertain. We need more information on how these for-profit agencies affect child well-being and on how common it is for States to contract with them to undertake certain functions, including the placement and oversight of children in foster care. However, it does seem appropriate that we not penalize foster families when they receive foster care payments from private agencies with which a State has entered into a contract to administer parts of their foster care system. Furthermore, H.R. 586 recognizes that States also may contract with private agencies to place older, often disabled individuals with foster families.

This bill is not a single simple answer to the problems faced by our foster care system, but it does take a small step to help some foster families. I strongly support H.R. 586, and I urge support from all my colleagues.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), a good friend and colleague.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of House bill 586 and to remind ourselves that it would be easy, considering the system of gov-

ernment, to think of this bill as a tax bill; but it is really a bill about children and families.

So often youngsters in the classroom ask me where I got the best insight to serve as a Member of Congress. They expect me to talk about my economics classes or different classes I had in school. And I always answer that it is being the mother of six children. What I have learned is that families are the most enduring, important part of a child's life. It is the security that they begin life with and that they carry throughout life.

Some of our children in this country have not been blessed with a consistent family life. To our good fortune, we have agencies that are becoming partners with our States to provide more children with better services and an even better chance of growing up in a foster family. Some of these children come from the most difficult circumstances, and it is not surprising that sometimes support systems have to be in place for these families. It is to our good fortune and to this country's good fortune and to our children's good fortune that we have so many of these agencies that are able to provide the comprehensive support services that families need. It is only reasonable that we make sure that our tax laws support these new evolving, important systems that allow children to have what is the most important thing in their life: a family.

And so this bill is not about taxes. It is about families, specifically foster families, and expanding the number and the opportunity and the differing looks that foster families often have as they serve each one of our unique children. God bless our children. How lucky we are to have the services of our foster services, and this bill will help make sure that those services exist and expand for every child.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and in support of all of the foster children across this country and the families who care for them, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 586, the Foster Care Promotion Act. As the son of parents who welcomed 25 foster children into their family, I know firsthand the worth of the foster care system.

This bill would allow foster parents to exclude payments for foster children of any age placed by a non-governmental foster care agency from their taxable income. By subsidizing the cost of foster children, regardless of their age or the method in which they were placed, we will properly value the incredible work of foster parents everywhere.

Foster parenting is an act of true selflessness, as each child requires a significant financial and emotional investment. Many foster children have been abused or neglected. Such treatment leaves indelible scars, which foster parents lovingly attempt to heal. We should not ask such generous individuals to give of their pocketbooks as well as their hearts.

All children need love and support. This bill takes an important step toward ensuring that

some of the most needy children will received it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 586, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1545

#### CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 428) concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO).

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Good health is important to every citizen of the world and access to the highest standards of health information and services is necessary to improve the public health.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in international health cooperation forums and programs is beneficial for all parts of the world, especially with today's greater potential for the cross-border spread of various infectious diseases such as the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), tuberculosis, and malaria.

(3) Taiwan's population of 23,500,000 people is larger than that of ¾ of the member states already in the World Health Organization (WHO).

(4) Taiwan's achievements in the field of health are substantial, including one of the highest life expectancy levels in Asia, maternal and infant mortality rates comparable to those of western countries, the eradication of such infectious diseases as cholera, smallpox, and the plague, and the first to eradicate polio and provide children with hepatitis B vaccinations.

(5) The United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and its Taiwan counterpart agencies have enjoyed close collaboration on a wide range of public health issues.

(6) In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO.

(7) On January 14, 2001, an earthquake, registering between 7.6 and 7.9 on the Richter scale, struck El Salvador. In response, the Taiwanese government sent 2 rescue teams, consisting of 90 individuals specializing in firefighting, medi-

cine, and civil engineering. The Taiwanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs also donated \$200,000 in relief aid to the Salvadoran Government.

(8) The World Health Assembly has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1974, the Order of Malta, and the Holy See in the early 1950's.

(9) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations.

(10) Public Law 106-137 required the Secretary of State to submit a report to the Congress on efforts by the executive branch to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations, in particular the WHO.

(11) In light of all benefits that Taiwan's participation in the WHO can bring to the state of health not only in Taiwan, but also regionally and globally, Taiwan and its 23,500,000 people should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the WHO.

(b) PLAN.—The Secretary of State is authorized—

(1) to initiate a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual week-long summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2001 in Geneva, Switzerland; and

(2) to instruct the United States delegation to Geneva to implement that plan.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a written report to the Congress in unclassified form containing the plan authorized under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. 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 material on H.R. 428.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation which would authorize the administration to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization during the May 2001 World Health Assembly in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for sponsoring this resolution. It should be stressed that nothing in this bill implies a change in this country's one China policy, which has been based for over 30 years on three communiques and the Taiwan Relations Act. At the same time, however, care should be taken not to arbitrarily exclude the 23 million people of Taiwan from appropriate economic and humanitarian venues.

Mr. Speaker, the House previously passed this bill 407-0 on April 24. Today we are considering the legislation as amended by the Senate. We should support it for at least two reasons:

First, Taiwan's participation in the WHO will advance the cause of public

health worldwide. In January, Taiwan played an important role in providing relief to earthquake victims in El Salvador. By gaining observer status at the WHO, Taiwan will be able to participate more meaningfully in meeting its, and our, global health challenges in the future. Disease and national disasters know no borders.

Secondly, where sovereignty is not at issue, Taiwan's participation in international organizations makes common sense. Taiwan thrives economically and politically. Economically, Taiwan has raised the standard of living on a more equalitarian basis than any developing country over the past half century.

Politically, reminiscent of Sun Yat-Sen's call for staged democratic development, Taiwan has moved, particularly over the past two decades, to expand and refine representative democracy. Today it is a model for the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has modified this bill to reflect the concerns of the senior Senator from the State of Utah, Mr. HATCH. The bill now authorizes rather than requires the Secretary of State to formulate and pursue a plan to win observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization. The administration supports this change, and I urge that the House do so as well.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for his good work on this issue. On May 20 of last year, Chen Shui-bian was sworn in as President of Taiwan. This was an historic event, the first major transfer of power between rival political parties in that nation's history.

Mature democracies like the United States take such political transitions for granted, but the peaceful exchange of power is a rare democratic legacy. Taiwan now shares this privilege. Taiwan has evolved into a stable, prosperous nation governed by the rule of law. Taiwan's 40-year journey toward democracy is a success story. We should acknowledge and reward that progress and celebrate it.

Mr. Speaker, to this end, I introduced H.R. 428, which would authorize our U.S. Department of State to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in this year's World Health Assembly. Ninety-two of my colleagues have cosponsored this bill fostering Taiwan's participation in the World Health Assembly. This is a modest step, but a meaningful one. Observer status in the WHA does not require statehood, in fact the PLO, the Order of Malta, the Vatican, and Rotary International all have observer status in Geneva at the WHA, but passing this bill will be a significant victory for every Taiwanese citizen and for every American who cares about human rights.

Children and families suffer from the effects of inadequate health care,

whether they live in Washington, Geneva, Beijing, or Taipei. In 1998, Taiwan suffered an outbreak of enterovirus 71, a potentially fatal disease that causes severe inflammation of muscle surrounding the brain, spinal cord, and heart. Infants and children are particularly vulnerable to this highly contagious virus. Unfortunately, the Taiwanese doctors treating enterovirus 71 did not have access to the medical resources of the WHO. By the time the outbreak was under control, 70 Taiwanese children had died. Had Taiwan been permitted to draw on WHO expertise, these children could very well still be alive.

But as Taiwan benefits from participation in the WHO, so does the rest of the world. Taiwan, with a highly developed health care system, has made great advances in science and technology. Inclusion in WHO would allow American health officials better access to Taiwanese information, as much as the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, our government's tacit support for the status quo, our unwillingness to fight for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization, is not only short-sighted, it is unjustifiable. Infectious diseases do not respect politically driven distinctions or national borders. Infectious diseases travel. If there is TB in Taiwan, there will inevitably be TB in the U.S. If there is HIV/AIDS in South Africa, there will inevitably be HIV/AIDS in Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, global illnesses are just that, global. No country is immune when one country faces a public health crisis. Recently, the administration decided to sell four Kidd-class destroyers to Taiwan, despite threats from the People's Republic of China. If our commitment as a Nation is strong enough to justify supporting Taiwan's military defense with arms sales, it certainly is strong enough to justify supporting access to global health resources for Taiwan's 23.5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strong support H.R. 428 has received from Members on both sides of the aisle, and look forward to the bill's passage today. I call on President Bush to do the right thing, to go to Geneva and fight for observer status for Taiwan at the World Health Assembly.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 428. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for their excellent work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this measure before the House will mark yet another triumph for the United States and Taiwan. For too long Taiwan has been denied the benefit of participation in the World Health Organization and a dialogue with its member nations concerning public health policy.

Unfortunately, this absence has prevented the people of Taiwan and the members of the World Health Organization from the experiences of an emerging leader in East Asia. I am pleased that we will correct this oversight today.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral duty to ensure that our neighbors have access to the same lifesaving information and technology that we enjoy in the United States. As one of the world's most densely populated regions, Taiwan has been successful at controlling infectious diseases and matching the infant mortality rates of developed nations. Yet work remains in areas such as food safety and the control of illegal drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization can help Taiwan in those efforts. I am encouraged by the prospects for all the World Health Organization's members, and I look forward to increased participation by Taiwan in world health events. Ultimately, the real benefit of Taiwan's entry in the WHO will be the children of Taiwan who will have better access to immunizations and preventive care.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this bipartisan effort in supporting this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me stress that arguably the greatest issue in the world today may well be disease control. What the WHO symbolizes is a people-oriented concern for control of disease. Taiwan should not be precluded from expanding its capacity to meet its people's needs, nor precluded from assisting others in less sophisticated health care centers from receiving the support of Taiwanese doctors and health care delivery specialists.

Mr. Speaker, this is a common-sense bill. I urge support of it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the House Resolution 428 to approve Taiwan participation in the World Health Organization.

Historically the United States and Taiwan have maintained good relationship. Ever since its establishment in 1912 we have had substantive diplomatic and commercial ties. On April 10, 1979, the House of Representatives have enacted Public Law 96-8, known as the Taiwan Relations Act. This Act played a very important role in shaping our policies toward Taiwan. It is considered as a representation of our best ideals to safeguard security and commercial interests in the area.

Taiwan with its population of approximately 20 million has solidly embraced the principles of a democratic society.

Its medical infrastructure is considered to be among the best in the world. According to a recent report, at the end of 1999, there were 152,385 medical personnel in Taiwan. There are currently 11 medical schools, 13 paramedical junior colleges, and 14 paramedical vocational schools.

Virtually all medical specialties known in the Western World are being practiced in Taiwan.

In view of our close diplomatic ties and excellent health care program in Taiwan, I support House Resolution 428 to allow Taiwan to participate in the World Health Organization.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 428 which authorizes the United States Secretary of State to initiate and implement a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health assembly (of the World Health Organization) this month in Geneva, Switzerland. Taiwan and its 23 million people should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the World Health Organization (WHO).

The WHO Constitution states that the "enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition." Yet today, Taiwan is excluded from participation in the WHO because of political pressure from the People's Republic of China.

This means that the people of Taiwan cannot share in the WHO's vital resources and expertise. Taiwanese physicians and health experts are not allowed to take part in WHO-organized forums and workshops regarding the latest techniques in the diagnosis, monitoring and control of diseases. Taiwanese doctors do not have access to WHO medical protocols and health standards.

This is simply not right. Diseases do not stop at national boundaries, and with today's high frequency of international travel, the possibility of transmitting infectious diseases is greater than ever. Good health is a basic right for every citizen of the world, and Taiwan should be granted membership in the WHO.

Despite its exclusion from the WHO, Taiwan has made some remarkable achievements in the field of health, including one of the highest life expectancy levels in Asia, maternal and infant mortality rates comparable to those of western countries, and the eradication of infectious diseases such as smallpox and the plague. Taiwan is the first Asian nation to be rid of polio and the first country in the world to provide children with free hepatitis B vaccinations.

Prior to 1972 and its loss of membership in the WHO, Taiwan sent specialists to serve on health projects in other members countries, and its experts held key positions in the WHO. In recent years, the Taiwanese government has expressed a willingness to assist financially or technically in WHO-supported international aid and health activities, but it has been unable to render such assistance because it is unable to participate in the international health organization.

Taiwan's population of 23 million people is larger than three-quarters of the member states already in the WHO. Clearly, Taiwan and the world community could benefit by its participation in the WHO. I believe the United States should actively support Taiwan's membership in the World Health Organization.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 428.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the initiative by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, concerning Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization. I commend our committee's distinguished chairman, Mr. HYDE and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS and the subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members of the International Operations and Human Rights

and East Asia and the Pacific for crafting and bringing this resolution expeditiously to the floor.

Secretary Powell noted before our committee that there should be ways for Taiwan to enjoy full benefits of participation in international organizations without being a member. H.R. 428 only calls for the Secretary of State to initiate a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status at the WHO for Taiwan.

In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO, but has been unable to render such assistance because Taiwan is not a member of the WHO.

The WHO has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organizations, including the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Knights of Malta, and the Vatican.

Along with many of my colleagues, we are very disappointed that Taiwan is not a full member of the U.N. and all international organizations that its democratically led government wishes to join. Although this resolution does not anywhere near enough address this concern, it is a first step in addressing the problem that Taiwan faces.

Accordingly, I strongly support H.R. 428.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 428.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1696, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 116, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1727, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 586, by the yeas and nays; concurring in Senate amendment to H.R. 428, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

#### EXPEDITING CONSTRUCTION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1696.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1696, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 15, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Andrews  
Armed  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berkley  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)

Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)

Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
Camp  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen

Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kerns  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette

Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrary  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer

Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solis  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancred  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Oliver  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Traffant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vislosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)

NAYS—15

Bereuter  
Berman  
Clay

Gilchrest  
Harman  
Hinchev

LaFalce  
Lee  
Miller, George

Oberstar Stark Taylor (NC)  
Snyder Stupak Waxman

NOT VOTING—16

Allen Mollohan Slaughter  
Brady (PA) Obey Souder  
Fattah Platts Whitfield  
Hall (OH) Portman Young (FL)  
McInnis Ros-Lehtinen  
McIntyre Sanchez

□ 1825

Ms. SOLIS and Mr. LIPINSKI changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and 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. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Coble Hoekstra Moran (KS) Stark Thune Watkins  
Collins Holden Moran (VA) Stearns Thurman Watt (NC)  
Combest Holt Morella Stenholm Tiahrt Watts (OK)  
Condit Honda Murtha Strickland Tiberi Waxman  
Conyers Hooley Myrick Stump Tierney Weiner  
Cooksey Hostettler Nadler Stupak Toomey Weldon (FL)  
Costello Houghton Napolitano Sununu Towns Weldon (PA)  
Cox Hoyer Neal Sweeney Traficant Weller  
Coyne Hulshof Nethercutt Tancredo Turner Wexler  
Cramer Hunter Ney Tanner Udall (CO) Whitfield  
Crane Hutchinson Northrup Tauscher Udall (NM) Wicker  
Crenshaw Hyde Norwood Tauzin Wilson  
Crowley Inslee Nussle Taylor (MS) Velazquez Wolf  
Cubin Isakson Oberstar Taylor (NC) Vitter Woolsey  
Culberson Israel Obey Terry Walsh Wu  
Cummings Issa Olver Thomas Walden Wynn  
Cunningham Jackson (IL) Ortiz Thompson (CA) Walsh Young (AK)  
Davis (CA) Jackson-Lee Osborne Osborn Wamp  
Davis (FL) (TX) Ose  
Davis (IL) Jefferson Otter  
Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins Owens  
Davis, Tom John Oxley  
Deal Johnson (CT) Pallone  
DeFazio Johnson (IL) Pascrell  
DeGette Johnson, E. B. Pastor  
Delahunt Johnson, Sam Paul  
DeLauro Jones (NC) Payne  
DeLay Jones (OH) Pelosi  
DeMint Kanjorski Pence  
Deutsch Kaptur Peterson (MN)  
Diaz-Balart Keller Peterson (PA)  
Dicks Kelly Petri  
Dingell Kennedy (MN) Phelps  
Doggett Kennedy (RI) Pickering  
Dooley Kerns Pitts  
Doolittle Kildee Platts  
Doyle Kilpatrick Pombo  
Dreier Kind (WI) Pomeroy  
Duncan King (NY) Portman  
Dunn Kingston Price (NC)  
Edwards Kirk Pryce (OH)  
Ehlers Kleczka Putnam  
Ehrlich Knollenberg Quinn  
Emerson Kolbe Radanovich  
Engel Kucinich Rahall  
English LaFalce Ramstad  
Eshoo LaHood Rangel  
Etheridge Lampson Regula  
Evans Langevin Rehberg  
Everett Lantos Reyes  
Farr Largent Reynolds  
Ferguson Larsen (WA) Riley  
Filner Larson (CT) Rivers  
Flake Latham Rodriguez  
Fletcher LaTourette Roemer  
Foley Leach Rogers (KY)  
Ford Lee Rogers (MI)  
Fossella Levin Rohrabacher  
Frank Lewis (CA) Ross  
Frelinghuysen Lewis (GA) Rothman  
Frost Lewis (KY) Roukema  
Gallegly Linder Roybal-Allard  
Ganske Lipinski Royce  
Gekas LoBiondo Rush  
Gephardt Lofgren Ryan (WI)  
Gibbons Lowey Ryan (KS)  
Gilchrest Lucas (KY) Sabo  
Gillmor Lucas (OK) Sanders  
Gilman Luther Sandlin  
Gonzalez Maloney (CT) Sawyer  
Goode Maloney (NY) Saxton  
Goodlatte Manzullo Scarborough  
Goss Markey Schaffer  
Graham Mascara Schakowsky  
Granger Matheson Schiff  
Graves Matsui Schrock  
Green (TX) McCarthy (MO) Scott  
Green (WI) McCarthy (NY) Sensenbrenner  
Greenwood McCollum Serrano  
Grucci McCrery Sessions  
Gutierrez McDermott Shadegg  
Gutknecht McGovern Shaw  
Hall (TX) McHugh Shays  
Hansen McKeon Sherman  
Harman McKinney Sherwood  
Hart McNulty Shimkus  
Hastings (FL) Meehan Shows  
Hastings (WA) Meek (FL) Simmons  
Hayes Meeks (NY) Simpson  
Hayworth Menendez Skeen  
Hefley Mica Skelton  
Herger Millender-Smith (MI)  
Hill McDonald Smith (NJ)  
Hilleary Miller (FL) Smith (TX)  
Hilliard Hilliard, Gary Smith (WA)  
Hinchey Miller, George Snyder  
Hinojosa Mink Solis  
Hobson Moakley Spence  
Hoeffel Moore Spratt

Allen Horn Ros-Lehtinen  
Brady (PA) Istook Sanchez  
Fattah McInnis Sanchez  
Gordon McInnis Slaughter  
Hall (OH) McIntyre Souder  
Mollohan Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1834

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Concurrent resolution acknowledging the dedication and sacrifices of the men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement officers.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

COMMEMORATING DEDICATION AND SACRIFICES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 116, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 116, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie Berkley Bryant  
Ackerman Berman Burr  
Aderholt Berry Burton  
Akin Biggert Buyer  
Andrews Bilirakis Callahan  
Army Bishop Calvert  
Baca Blagojevich Camp  
Bachus Blumenauer Cannon  
Baird Blunt Cantor  
Baker Boehlert Capito  
Baldacci Boehner Capps  
Baldwin Bonilla Capuano  
Ballenger Bonior Carlin  
Barcia Bono Carson (IN)  
Barr Borski Carson (OK)  
Barrett Boswell Castle  
Bartlett Boucher Chabot  
Barton Boyd Chambliss  
Bass Brady (TX) Clay  
Becerra Brown (FL) Clayton  
Bentsen Brown (OH) Clement  
Bereuter Brown (SC) Clyburn

Green (TX) Green (WI) Greenwood Grucci Gutierrez Gutknecht Hall (TX) Hansen Harman Hart Hastings (FL) Hastings (WA) Hayes Hayworth Hefley Herger Hill Hilliard Hilliard, Gary Hinchey Hinojosa Hobson Hoeffel  
McCarthy (MO) McCarthy (NY) McCollum McCrery McDermott McGovern McHugh McKeon McKinney McNulty Meehan Meek (FL) Meeks (NY) Menendez Mica Millender-McDonald Miller (FL) Miller, Gary Miller, George Mink Moakley Moore  
Scott Sensenbrenner Serrano Sessions Shadegg Shaw Shays Sherman Sherwood Shimkus Shows Simmons Simpson Skeen Skelton Smith (MI) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smith (WA) Snyder Solis Spence Spratt

FALLEN HERO SURVIVOR BENEFIT FAIRNESS ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1727, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1727, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie Berman Buyer  
Ackerman Berry Callahan  
Aderholt Bilirakis Calvert  
Akin Bishop Camp  
Andrews Blagojevich Cannon  
Army Blumenauer Cantor  
Baca Blunt Capito  
Bachus Boehlert Capps  
Baird Boehner Capuano  
Baker Bonilla Cardin  
Baldacci Bonior Carson (IN)  
Baldwin Bono Carson (OK)  
Ballenger Borski Castle  
Barcia Boswell Chabot  
Barr Boucher Chambliss  
Barrett Boyd Clay  
Bartlett Brady (TX) Clayton  
Barton Brown (FL) Clement  
Bass Brown (OH) Clyburn  
Becerra Brown (SC) Coble  
Bentsen Bryant Collins  
Bereuter Burr Combust  
Berkley Burton Condit

Conyers	Honda	Moran (KS)	Stark	Thune	Watkins	Dooley	Kelly	Peterson (MN)
Cooksey	Hooley	Moran (VA)	Stearns	Thurman	Watt (NC)	Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (PA)
Costello	Horn	Morella	Stenholm	Tiahrt	Watts (OK)	Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Petri
Cox	Hostettler	Murtha	Strickland	Tiberi	Waxman	Dreier	Kerns	Phelps
Coyne	Houghton	Myrick	Tanner	Tierney	Weiner	Duncan	Kildee	Pickering
Cramer	Hoyer	Nadler	Stupak	Toomey	Weldon (FL)	Dunn	Kilpatrick	Pitts
Crane	Hulshof	Napolitano	Sununu	Toomey	Weldon (PA)	Edwards	Kind (WI)	Platts
Crenshaw	Hunter	Neal	Sweeney	Traficant	Weller	Ehlers	King (NY)	Pombo
Crowley	Hutchinson	Nethercutt	Tancredo	Turner	Wexler	Ehrlich	Kingston	Pomeroy
Cubin	Hyde	Ney	Udall (CO)	Udall (CO)	Whitfield	Emerson	Kirk	Portman
Culberson	Inlee	Northup	Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Wicker	Engel	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Cummings	Isakson	Norwood	Tauzin	Upton	Wilson	English	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Israel	Nussle	Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Wolf	Eshoo	Kolbe	Putnam
Davis (CA)	Issa	Oberstar	Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Woolsey	Etheridge	Kucinich	Quinn
Davis (FL)	Istook	Obey	Terry	Vitter	Wu	Evans	LaFalce	Radanovich
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Olver	Thomas	Walden	Wynn	Everett	LaHood	Rahall
Davis, Jo Ann	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)	Walsh	Young (AK)	Farr	Lampson	Ramstad
Davis, Tom	(TX)	Osborne	Thompson (MS)	Wamp		Ferguson	Langevin	Rangel
Deal	Jefferson	Ose	Thornberry	Waters		Filner	Lantos	Regula
DeFazio	Jenkins	Otter				Flake	Largent	Rehberg
DeGette	John	Owens				Fletcher	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
Delahunt	Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Allen	Hall (OH)	Sanchez	Foley	Larson (CT)	Reynolds
DeLauro	Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Biggart	McInnis	Slaughter	Ford	Latham	Riley
DeLay	Johnson, E.B.	Pascrell	Brady (PA)	McIntyre	Souder	Fossella	LaTourette	Rivers
DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Pastor	Fattah	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)	Frank	Leach	Rodriguez
Deutsch	Jones (NC)	Paul				Frelinghuysen	Lee	Roemer
Diaz-Balart	Jones (OH)	Payne				Frost	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Dicks	Kanjorski	Pelosi				Galleghy	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (MI)
Dingell	Kaptur	Pence				Ganske	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Doggett	Keller	Peterson (MN)				Gekas	Lewis (KY)	Ross
Dooley	Kelly	Peterson (PA)				Gephardt	Linder	Rothman
Doolittle	Kennedy (MN)	Petri				Gibbons	Lipinski	Roukema
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Phelps				Gilchrest	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Dreier	Kerns	Pickering				Gillmor	Lofgren	Royce
Duncan	Kildee	Pitts				Gilman	Lowey	Rush
Dunn	Kilpatrick	Platts				Gonzalez	Lucas (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Edwards	Kind (WI)	Pombo				Goode	Lucas (OK)	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	King (NY)	Pomeroy				Goodlatte	Luther	Sabo
Ehrlich	Kingston	Portman				Gordon	Maloney (CT)	Sanders
Emerson	Kirk	Price (NC)				Goss	Maloney (NY)	Sandlin
Engel	Kleczka	Pryce (OH)				Graham	Manzullo	Sawyer
English	Knollenberg	Putnam				Granger	Markey	Saxton
Eshoo	Kolbe	Quinn				Graves	Mascara	Scarborough
Etheridge	Kucinich	Radanovich				Green (TX)	Matheson	Schaffer
Evans	LaFalce	Rahall				Green (WI)	Matsui	Schakowsky
Everett	LaHood	Ramstad				Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Schiff
Farr	Lampson	Rangel				Grucci	McCarthy (NY)	Schrock
Ferguson	Langevin	Regula				Gutierrez	McCollum	Scott
Filner	Lantos	Rehberg				Gutknecht	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Flake	Largent	Reyes				Hall (TX)	McDermott	Serrano
Fletcher	Larsen (WA)	Reynolds				Hansen	McGovern	Sessions
Foley	Larson (CT)	Riley				Harman	McHugh	Shadegg
Ford	Latham	Rivers				Hart	McInnis	Shaw
Fossella	LaTourette	Rodriguez				Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Shays
Frank	Leach	Roemer				Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Sherman
Frelinghuysen	Lee	Rogers (KY)				Hayes	McNulty	Sherwood
Frost	Levin	Rogers (MI)				Hayworth	Meehan	Shimkus
Galleghy	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher				Hefley	Meek (FL)	Shows
Ganske	Lewis (GA)	Ross				Herger	Meeks (NY)	Simmons
Gekas	Lewis (KY)	Rothman				Hill	Menendez	Simpson
Gephardt	Linder	Roukema				Hilleary	Mica	Skeen
Gibbons	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard				Hilliard	Millender	Skelton
Gilchrest	LoBiondo	Royce				Hinchev	McDonald	Smith (MI)
Gillmor	Lofgren	Rush				Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Gilman	Lowey	Ryan (WI)				Hobson	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Gonzalez	Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)				Hoeffel	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Goode	Lucas (OK)	Sabo				Hoekstra	Mink	Snyder
Goodlatte	Luther	Sanders	Abercrombie	Bonior	Collins	Holden	Moakley	Solis
Gordon	Maloney (CT)	Sandlin	Ackerman	Bono	Combest	Holt	Mollohan	Spence
Goss	Maloney (NY)	Sawyer	Aderholt	Borski	Condit	Honda	Moore	Spratt
Graham	Manzullo	Saxton	Akin	Boswell	Coyne	Hooley	Moran (KS)	Stark
Granger	Markey	Scarborough	Andrews	Boucher	Cooksey	Horn	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Graves	Mascara	Schaffer	Armedy	Boyd	Costello	Hostettler	Morella	Stenholm
Green (TX)	Matheson	Schakowsky	Baca	Brady (TX)	Cox	Houghton	Murtha	Strickland
Green (WI)	Matsui	Schiff	Bachus	Brown (FL)	Coyne	Hoyer	Myrick	Stump
Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Schrock	Baird	Brown (OH)	Cramer	Hulshof	Nadler	Stupak
Grucci	McCarthy (NY)	Scott	Baker	Brown (SC)	Crane	Hunter	Napolitano	Sununu
Gutierrez	McCollum	Sensenbrenner	Baldacci	Burr	Crenshaw	Hutchinson	Neal	Sweeney
Gutknecht	McCrery	Serrano	Baldwin	Burton	Crowley	Hyde	Nethercutt	Tancredo
Hall (TX)	McDermott	Sessions	Ballenger	Buyer	Cubin	Inlee	Ney	Tauscher
Hansen	McGovern	Shadegg	Barcia	Callahan	Culberson	Isakson	Northup	Tauscher
Harman	McHugh	Shaw	Barr	Calvert	Cunningham	Israel	Norwood	Tauzin
Hart	McKeon	Shays	Barrett	Camp	Davis (CA)	Issa	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Sherman	Bartlett	Cannon	Davis (FL)	Istook	Oberstar	Taylor (NC)
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Sherwood	Barton	Cantor	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Obey	Terry
Hayes	Meehan	Shimkus	Bass	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann	Jackson-Lee	Olver	Thomas
Hayworth	Meek (FL)	Shows	Becerra	Capps	Davis, Tom	(TX)	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Hefley	Meeks (NY)	Simmons	Bentsen	Capuano	Deal	Jefferson	Osborne	Thompson (MS)
Herger	Menendez	Simpson	Bereuter	Cardin	DeFazio	Jenkins	Ose	Thornberry
Hill	Mica	Skeen	Berkley	Carson (IN)	DeGette	John	Otter	Thune
Hilleary	Millender	Skelton	Berman	Carson (OK)	Delahunt	Johnson (CT)	Owens	Thurman
Hilliard	McDonald	Smith (MI)	Berry	Castle	DeLauro	Johnson (IL)	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hinchev	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Biggart	Chabot	DeLay	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Tiberi
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Bilirakis	Chambliss	DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Pascrell	Tierney
Hobson	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Bishop	Clay	Deutsch	Jones (NC)	Pastor	Toomey
Hoeffel	Mink	Snyder	Blagojevich	Clayton	Diaz-Balart	Jones (OH)	Paul	Towns
Hoekstra	Moakley	Solis	Blumentauer	Clement	Dicks	Kanjorski	Payne	Traficant
Holden	Mollohan	Spence	Blunt	Clyburn	Dingell	Kaptur	Pelosi	Turner
Holt	Moore	Spratt	Boehert	Coble	Doggett	Keller	Pence	Udall (CO)

## NOT VOTING—12

□ 1844

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAIRNESS FOR FOSTER CARE  
FAMILIES ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 586, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 586, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—420

Udall (NM)      Watkins  
 Upton            Watt (NC)  
 Velazquez      Watts (OK)  
 Visclosky      Waxman  
 Vitter           Weiner  
 Walden          Weldon (FL)  
 Walsh           Weldon (PA)  
 Wamp            Weller  
 Waters          Wexler

Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)

Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Goss

Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Lowey  
 Lucas (KY)  
 Lucas (OK)  
 Luther

Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)

NOT VOTING—16

Allen  
 Bishop  
 Brady (PA)  
 Capuano  
 Fattah  
 Frank  
 Hall (OH)  
 Johnson (CT)  
 McIntyre  
 Quinn  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Sanchez  
 Slaughter  
 Souder  
 Weller  
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Allen  
 Boehner  
 Brady (PA)  
 Fattah  
 Hall (OH)  
 McIntyre  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Sanchez  
 Slaughter  
 Souder  
 Young (FL)

□ 1853

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 428.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 428, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Andrews  
 Arney  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baker  
 Baldacci  
 Baldwin  
 Ballenger  
 Barcia  
 Barr  
 Barrett  
 Bartlett  
 Barton  
 Bass  
 Becerra  
 Bentsen  
 Bereuter  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Blagojevich  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boehlert  
 Boehner  
 Bonilla  
 Bonior  
 Bono  
 Borski  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyd  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Bryant  
 Burr  
 Burton  
 Buyer  
 Callahan  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Cardin  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carson (OK)  
 Barrett  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Barton  
 Bass  
 Clayton  
 Clement  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Collins  
 Combust  
 Condit  
 Conyers  
 Cooksey  
 Costello  
 Cox  
 Coyne  
 Cramer  
 Crane  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cubin  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Cunningham  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (FL)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 DeMint  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 English  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Farr  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Fletcher  
 Foley  
 Ford  
 Fossella  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frost  
 Gallegly  
 Ganske  
 Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Green (TX)  
 Green (WI)  
 Greenwood  
 Grucci  
 Gutierrez  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hansen  
 Harman  
 Hart  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Heger  
 Hill  
 Hilleary  
 Hilliard  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hobson  
 Hoeffel  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Horn  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Hutchinson  
 Hyde  
 Inslee  
 Isakson  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Istook  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 Jefferson  
 Jenkins  
 John  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E.B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kapur  
 Keller  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy (MN)  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kerns  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind (WI)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Kleczka  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 Kucinich  
 LaFalce  
 LaHood  
 Lampson  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Largent  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Leach  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)

Maloney (CT)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Manzullo  
 Markey  
 Mascara  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (MO)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum  
 McCrery  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McHugh  
 McInnis  
 McKeon  
 McKinney  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Menendez  
 Mica  
 Millender-  
     McDonald  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Mollohan  
 Moore  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nethercutt  
 Ney  
 Northup  
 Norwood  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Oliver  
 Ortiz  
 Osborne  
 Ose  
 Otter  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Phelps  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Riley  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rogers (KY)

Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaffer  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shows  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Visclosky  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watkins  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)

□ 1900

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 701

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 701.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE CONGRESS IS OPPOSED TO FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to Congress his International Trade Agenda for 2001. Members who were expecting a detailed and responsible approach were sorely disappointed.

First, the President is trying to play the name game. He knows that Congress has repeatedly rejected Fast Track, most recently in 1998. He also knows that he does not have the support or votes in this Congress to pass this misguided approach. So instead of pushing an initiative that is bound to fail, he is trying to confuse the public and lead the press to believe that this is some kind of novel idea.

By any other name, Fast Track is Fast Track. Let us get real. Trade promotion authority, or TPA as it is being now referred to, is really nothing new. Congress rejected it before, and we will do so again. Let us remember why we rejected it in the first place.

Without congressional oversight and input, trade agreements will be negotiated by unrepresentative delegates, who were never elected, standing up for the rights of international corporations, instead of our hardworking constituents, not to mention that a thing called the Constitution of the United States grants to Congress the right to

regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Our Founding Fathers granted Congress this responsibility as a check on the executive branch. It is critical that we do not trade away the right to represent our constituents.

They have sent us here to represent their wishes, not those of only international corporations looking to their bottom line. The second round of the name game came when President Bush referred to labor and environment as core standards.

If these are core standards, why are they not being included in the core text of trade agreements? That would make sense, would it not? Instead, the President wants labor rights, get ready for this, to be enforced by the U.S. Agency for International Development and environmental standards by the World Health Organization. Who is he kidding? Not Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do exactly what they have done numerous times before. Reject this name game. Reject Fast Track. Stand up for the American people, their standard of living, their right to work for a living wage, their right to live in an environment which is not polluting, and to use the power of this marketplace to raise living standards in other parts of the world, not pull us down to their standards. Reject Fast Track. Reject the name game. Reject trade promotion authority.

#### INSTANT RECALL ON ANY VACCINE GOING INTO OUR CHILDREN THAT HAS MERCURY IN IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 had a prepared statement that I was going to use, but it has not arrived, so I will speak extemporaneously tonight.

Mr. Speaker, vaccinations have been a real plus for this country. We had a lot of diseases that used to be so feared, like polio and diphtheria that we do not have to worry about anymore, and it is because we have vaccinations that really help protect our young people.

But along with the positives, unfortunately there are some negatives, and parents across this country ought to be aware of the negatives as well as the positives. That is why my committee has been holding a number of hearings and has had the health agencies of this country before the committee numerous times.

We have had what is called an explosion of autism in America. Autism, that is a disease most people are not familiar with unless it has hit their family, and that is where one day your child is apparently normal or appears to be normal, and the next day he is running around flapping his arms, cannot speak clearly anymore, bangs his

head against the wall, has severe bowel disorders and other related things.

We have had an explosion, an absolute explosion. Twenty years ago, 1 in 10,000 children in America were considered autistic. Today it is 1 in 500. In some parts of the country, it is as many as 1 in 150. Now think about that; 1 in 150 children in some parts of this country is autistic. We need to find out why.

Our committee has held hearings, and we think we have some things that need to be thoroughly investigated, and one of those is why do we have vaccines going into children's arms and into adults arms that contain mercury. Mercury.

Mercury is a toxic substance that we have taken out of our topical dressings. It used to be that you could buy creams that had mercury in them because it was a preservative. They said because it could leach into the bloodstream through the skin, they thought it was safer to take it out of all topical dressings. They still use it as a preservative in many of the vaccinations given to our children.

Mercury is being injected, as I speak tonight, into children across this country along with the vaccinations they are getting.

Other substances being injected into our children are formaldehyde and aluminum, metals that could be and substances that could be toxic. We need to find out why.

I, for one, believe that my grandson became autistic at least in part because he received vaccinations. He received 9 in 1 day, and 6 of those contained mercury. Mercury has a cumulative effect in the body. It gets in the brain. So I believe that 1 week after he received these vaccinations, he became autistic.

He spoke normally. He acted like any other normal child. Yet within 1 week he was running around flapping his arms, walking on his toes, because he had severe bowel disorder, banging his head against the wall, and he could not speak clearly anymore, and he still has those problems.

Mr. Speaker, if what we are putting into our children's bodies along with the vaccinations is causing that, something has to be done.

I asked the Food and Drug Administration when they were before our committee, do we have vaccines that do not contain mercury or these substances? They said, yes, we do, in single-vial doses. Now, what does that mean? It means that if we have single-vial doses that do not contain the mercury, the child is not going to get the mercury.

But what happens is, the pharmaceutical companies are putting out many shots into one vial, and because of that they have to have these preservatives in there, and in many cases they put several vaccines together. And so they have these preservatives in there to make sure that the vaccine does not become contaminated.

If we went to single-vial vaccines and shots, we would eliminate, in my opinion, a large part of the problem. But that is why this country needs to have continued oversight over our health agencies, because our health agencies have not really been following up on these vaccines to find out if there are any side effects that are really going to hurt our kids for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I will say tonight that mercury should be taken out of every vaccine in the country, and it should be taken out today. There should be an instant recall on any vaccine that is going into our children that has mercury in it.

We have enough vaccines that do not contain these toxic chemicals and substances, so our children can be inoculated in a safe and effective way, and yet our health agencies continue to let these companies use mercury in these vaccines.

Today as I speak, as I said, children are being vaccinated with these toxic chemicals in them. It is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, we have what is called AIDS deaths, and they have said it is because children go to bed and they sleep on the wrong side, and there is no explanation why they do not. My granddaughter received a Hepatitis B shot, and within an hour she quit breathing. We had to rush her to the hospital, and she was blue in the face.

Had she been in bed, the next morning she would have been dead; but my daughter saw her and saw her turning blue and rushed her to the hospital. It was a reaction to the Hepatitis B shot.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say in conclusion, we will have more of these 5-minute special orders, every parent in the country ought to start reading the inserts on those vaccines. Vaccinations are important, but we want to make sure we know what is going into our children's bodies.

#### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM'S OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF VACCINE SAFETY

During the 106th Congress the Full Government Reform Committee and two of its Subcommittees initiated investigations looking at several vaccine issues. There are increasing concerns that the risks related to vaccines are not widely known or acknowledged. Vaccines have been hailed as the greatest public health advance in the twentieth century. I have said from the outset of our investigation that I am not anti-vaccine. Rather I support the appropriate use of safe vaccines that have been thoroughly tested. I support improved information sharing with parents and patients regarding the benefits and risks of immunization and respect the concerns that have been raised by thousands of families across the United States about vaccine adverse events. I also support increased clinical research looking at the long-term safety of vaccines, including their potential link to chronic conditions such as autism, diabetes, attention-deficit disorder, and asthma.

Vaccines are the only drugs Americans are mandated to receive as a condition of attendance at day care and schools and in some

cases as a condition of employment. Because each state bases its mandatory immunizations on Federal recommendations, it is very important that adequate oversight be provided by Congress to insure the integrity of the vaccine programs.

At this time, there is a paucity of research looking at long-term safety of any vaccine. This was acknowledged last year in a report to Congress from the Institute of Medicine, "Few vaccines for any disease have been actively monitored for adverse effects over long periods of time.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST ON VACCINE-RELATED ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Committee investigated two vaccine-related advisory committees. We were concerned that the pharmaceutical industry has too much influence over these committees. From the evidence we found, I think they do. The first committee was the FDA's Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC). This Committee makes recommendations on whether new vaccines should be licensed. The second committee is the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunizations Practices (ACIP). This committee recommends which vaccines should be included on the Childhood Immunization Schedule. We focused on the handling of the rotavirus vaccine. The FDA approved it for use in August 1998. The CDC recommended it for universal use in March 1999. Serious problems cropped up shortly after it was introduced. Children started developing serious bowel obstructions. The vaccine was pulled from the U.S. market in October 1999. We learned that during the FDA's committee meetings there was concern raised about adverse events. They were aware of potential problems. Five children out of 10,000 developed bowel obstructions. There were also concerns about children failing to thrive and developing high fevers, which as we know from other vaccine hearings, can lead to brain injury. Even with all of these concerns, the committee voted unanimously to approve it.

At the CDC's committee, there was a lot of discussion about whether the benefits of the vaccine really justified the costs. Even though the cost-benefit ratio was questioned, the Committee voted unanimously to approve it.

We learned that waivers had been granted to individuals who had financial ties to the industry. This is troubling. At the time the Rotashield vaccine was approved and recommended for universal use, the following conditions existed: (1) That members, including the chair, of the FDA and CDC advisory committees who make these decisions own stock in drug companies that make vaccines. (2) That individuals on both advisory committees own patents for vaccines under consideration or affected by the decisions of the committee. (3) That three out of five of the members of the FDA's advisory committee who voted for the rotavirus vaccine had conflicts of interest that were waived. (4) That seven individuals of the 15 member FDA advisory committee were not present at the meeting, two

others were excluded from the vote, and the remaining five were joined by five temporary voting members who all voted to license the product. (5) That the CDC grants conflict-of-interest waivers to every member of their advisory committee a year at a time, and allows full participation in the discussions leading up to a vote by every member, whether they have a financial stake in the decision or not. (6) That the CDC's advisory committee has no public members—no parents have a vote in whether or not a vaccine belongs on the childhood immunization schedule. The FDA's committee only has one public member.

Families need to have confidence that the vaccines that their children take are safe, effective, and truly necessary. Doctors need to feel confident that when the FDA licenses a drug, that it is really safe, and that the pharmaceutical industry has not influenced the decision-making process. Doctors place trust in the FDA and assume that if the FDA has licensed a drug, it's safe to use. I am concerned that this trust has been violated.

We will be continuing this investigation in the 107th Congress to see if the problems have been resolved. Last week, every member of Congress received a well-meaning letter with an attachment addressing some of the "anti-vaccine" messages. The letter states the information was prepared by the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. What the letter fails to inform members of Congress is that the document was prepared by a Center at Children's lead by someone with direct financial ties to the vaccine industry. I am concerned about this subterfuge. It is important that individuals who are promoting vaccine safety declare their conflicts of interest. To not do so, in my opinion is unfair to those who receive the information. This omission of corporate sponsorship calls into question the accuracy and balance of the information provided.

#### INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE'S MEASLES-MUMPS RUBELLA VACCINE AND AUTISM REPORT

The Institute of Medicine's (IOM) Committee on Immunization Safety Review released the "Measles-Mumps-Rebella Vaccine and Autism Report" in April. I was troubled by the headlines and news reports which all stated that the IOM Committee found no connection between the MMR vaccine and autism. The IOM Committee also noted in its conclusions that it could not exclude the possibility that MMR vaccine could contribute to Autism Spectrum Disorder. I would urge all of you to read the entire report, which is available on the National Academy of Sciences website.

#### THE REALITY IS THAT THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE TO CONCLUSIVELY PROVE OR DISPROVE A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MMR VACCINE AND ACQUIRED AUTISM

We have substantial parental observation, which should never be discounted. And we have several case studies and laboratory evidence showing measles virus in the guts of autistic children who have bowel dysfunction. And we also have several population-level epidemiological studies. While the IOM Committee noted that the epidemiological studies

do not support an association at a population level, their report stated, "it is important to recognize the inherent methodological limitations of such studies in establishing causality."

In essence, the studies that have been published and held up by the public health community as "proof" against Dr. Wakefield's hypothesis can never answer the question of whether or not MMR vaccine is linked to autism in some children. That is why we need to insist that the National Institutes of Health fund independent research to replicate Dr. Wakefield's research.

At this time, we do not have enough research to make an evidence-based final conclusion. What we have is a clear indication that a problem exists for some children. We need to do the research to get our arms around that problem, so that we can prevent any further escalation of this epidemic of acquired autism.

When the Institute of Medicine formed their Committee, we were assured that there were be no one on the Committee who had ties to the vaccine industry. I was disturbed to learn that the Committee sent this report out for review and comment prior to becoming final to numerous individuals who have ties to the vaccine industry including individuals with financial ties to the manufacturer of the MMR vaccine.

#### THE AUTISM EPIDEMIC

Two weeks ago, I stood in support of House Resolution 91, which recognizes the importance of increasing the awareness of autism spectrum disorders and supporting programs for greater research and improved treatment of autism and improved training.

Autism rates have skyrocketed. Conservative estimates suggest 1 in 500 children in the United States is autistic. However, those rates are dramatically higher in some places such as Brick Township, New Jersey, where the rates are 1 in 150.

In the first quarter of this year a child was diagnosed with autism every three hours in California. Last year, that rate was every six hours.

Indiana is seeking a similar trend in increased rates. One in 400 children in Indiana is autistic. Between December 1999 and December 2000, requests for special education services for children with autism went up twenty-five percent. That is a twenty-five percent increase in requests for taxpayer provided services in one year.

We have a national and potentially worldwide epidemic on our hands. It cannot simply be better reporting or an expanded definition of autism.

#### MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Autism or Autism Spectrum Disorder is devastating to families. I know this from personal experience. My grandson, Christian, was born healthy and developed normally. His story is not much different than that of the thousands of families we have heard from

over the last year. He met his developmental milestones. He was talkative. He enjoyed being with people. He interacted socially.

Then Christian received his routine immunizations as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. His life changed dramatically and rapidly. He received five different shots and one oral vaccine all in the same day. We now know that many of these shots contained the mercury containing preservative, thimerosal. He may have been exposed to forty-one times the level of mercury than is considered safe by Federal guidelines for a child his size. This was on top of other mercury exposure from earlier vaccinations. This issue of having mercury in children's vaccine is a very troubling issue and I intend to continue this discussion in Special Orders every week.

Within ten days of receiving his vaccines, Christian was locked inside the world of autism. Is it related to the MMR vaccine? Is it related to the mercury toxicity? Is it the environment, including food allergies? Or is autism purely genetic?

As with any epidemic, we need to focus significant energy and research on containing it. We need to locate the cause or causes. We need to be aggressive in developing and making available treatments for both the behavioral issues and the biomedical illnesses related to this condition. Last week I chaired two days of hearings to ask experts and public health officials how they have responded to this epidemic.

#### SHOW ME THE SCIENCE

Some of the scientists and public health officials that have come before the Committee would have us believe that a child's regression into autism within a short time of vaccination is purely a coincidence. However their opinion is not based on scientific evidence, but on their own desire to protect vaccine policy. In fact, our Government has funded very little research looking at the long-term safety of vaccines and has funded no clinical research looking at the potential connection between autism and vaccines.

I don't want to leave the impression that I am an "anti-vaccine" because I am not. Vaccines against serious infectious diseases such as polio and smallpox have saved thousands of lives. I support the use of needed vaccines that have been thoroughly evaluated for safety and efficacy and have been tested extensively.

As Chairman of the Government Reform Committee, I have conducted several hearings on vaccine safety issues and the potential connection between childhood vaccines and the autism epidemic. We have heard from a lot of witnesses on both sides of the issue. One common thread in testimonies of dozens of witnesses is that to date there is a very little research in this area.

Autism and vaccine safety are both very important issues. There is a lot of research that needs to be done to get answers about the causes of autism and whether or not the MMR vaccine and thimerosal-containing vaccines are linked to the onset of acquired autism. Our health agencies can no longer hide their heads in the sand and refuse to acknowledge that we have an epidemic and that in our well-meaning desire to protect the public at large from infectious diseases, that we may have

created this epidemic of a chronic and life-long disease.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 622, HOPE FOR CHILDREN ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-67) on the resolution (H. Res. 141) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for our purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Ms. NORTON 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 Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JOHNSON 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 Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHOWS 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ENERGY PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in addressing the serious issue of rising energy costs.

Today in Rhode Island, the average price of one gallon of regular unleaded gasoline reached \$1.77, almost 5 cents above the national average and a record high in my State.

Thousands of my constituents depend on their automobiles to get to their jobs each day and simply cannot afford the drastic increase in gas prices that they are being forced to pay.

Additionally, this problem has a significant impact on Rhode Island's economy which relies heavily on summer tourism.

Increased gasoline costs threaten to discourage people from summer travel, which would have a disastrous effect on our communities.

Mr. Speaker, we need a solution to this problem now. I have contacted the administration and insisted that any energy strategy that they develop must help American consumers by lowering gas prices.

□ 1915

Both the President and the Vice President have extensive experience and contact in the oil industry. I am certain that, if properly motivated, they could find a way to lower gasoline prices and bring relief to Americans that have been hardest hit by this price spike.

Our national energy strategy must also incorporate technologies to improve vehicles' fuel efficiency standards in order to reduce our runaway consumption of oil and gasoline.

For example, by requiring SUVs to simply meet fuel efficiency standards of passenger cars would reduce U.S. oil consumption by 1 million barrels per day, approximately the daily estimated oil yield from drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Even though the technology currently exists to make our Nation's cars and SUVs more fuel efficient, Congress has blocked the establishment of higher standards since 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to work with my colleagues in Congress to increase fuel efficiency standards, not only to cut our consumption of oil and gasoline, but also to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, the greatest contributor to global warming.

I am optimistic that the United States will take advantage of our current energy debate to develop a forward-thinking plan for the future. We must establish an energy strategy that addresses short-term and long-term problems, is environmentally responsible, and truly benefits the American consumer as well as the future of this world.

#### ENERGY CRISIS AND FUEL PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in my district in New Jersey, the average price for unleaded gasoline is \$1.72 this month. The Energy Information Administration report shows that the average price in New Jersey was \$1.14 at

this time last year. This is a 50 percent increase in one year, yet I assure my colleagues that New Jersey is not seeing the worst of the gasoline price increases. Prices in many parts of California are well over \$2, and price fluctuations in the Midwest have been dramatic.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the energy crisis and the increase in gasoline prices, President Bush's answer has been, and he delivered this just last Friday, he said, "The best way to make sure that people are able to deal with high energy prices is to cut taxes, is to give people more of their own money so they can meet the bills, so they can meet the high energy prices."

Mr. Speaker, I understand that we just heard today that tomorrow President Bush's tax cut bill, the reconciliation bill, is going to come to the floor. But I assure my colleagues that that is not the answer to gasoline prices.

He is talking about a tax cut so that Americans can go out and pay the \$2 to \$3 per gallon price of gasoline. But let us look at this. The President proposes that Congress act quickly to pass the tax cut so the Federal Government can refund American families a modest tax refund so they can in turn put gasoline in their vehicle.

Well, he is not proposing a solution. He is just again displaying a lack of leadership and his alliance essentially with the oil and petroleum industry. What he is proposing with his tax cut is just another way to assist the industry, his friends.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that, if one looks at the message that President Bush is delivering today and one compares it to the one he delivered when he was a candidate last year, in January 2000, when heating oil prices were soaring in key campaign States and spot prices were \$27 per barrel, then Candidate Bush said, "What I think the President ought to do is he ought to get on the phone to OPEC, the cartel, and say we expect you to open your spigots."

Well, why is President Bush changing his position. Even today, Vice President CHENEY was out saying he does not support increases in OPEC oil production. The Secretary Abraham was quoted a couple weeks ago saying that he was not going to give into or lower himself, I think the word was, to talk to OPEC about oil production because that would somehow lower his quality, his status as Energy Secretary.

President Bush has also said he will not release any oil from the SPR, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Both the Clinton administration and the first President Bush, his father, George W.'s father, successfully released oil from the SPR, from the reserve, to calm energy markets.

In fact, President Bush's decision not to take action, I think, is essentially unilateral disarmament in talks with oil producing countries. We know last year President Clinton was very effec-

tive, I thought, in using the SPR as a tool, if you will, to try to bring prices down.

The other thing that President Bush has talked about as a long-term solution, of course, is to build more refining capacity. But I think he misses the point because it does not help the consumer today. The interesting thing about Bush's policy and CHENEY's policy is that they are not talking about the problem that Americans face today. We have blackouts. We have oil prices, gasoline prices rising dramatically. American motorists are spending too much on gasoline. They want a solution now.

The President talked refineries, but he did not talk about the effect of refinery consolidation. While the number of refineries has decreased, the refinery capacity has increased. Part of the problem that we witness today is this consolidation, is the size of the refinery has increased. Any problem in the refinery, like a fire, for example, that affects production has a greater impact on supply and price.

I just wanted to mention I have a number of speakers tonight who are joining me, my colleagues on the Democratic side. I do not want to take up much more time before I start yielding to them, but I did want to talk a little bit before I finish the introduction here to our special order that we have tonight to mention mergers in the oil industry, because I also think that that is something that needs to be investigated and looked at, and it is not being looked at by this administration.

Recent company mergers include a \$7.49 billion deal in which Tosco recently agreed to be purchased by Phillips Petroleum, and Valero will acquire Ultramar Diamond Shamrock for \$3.91 billion.

In a letter I recently sent along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), we requested that the administration, specifically the Department of Energy and the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission, carefully review these mergers to assure that they do not unfairly disadvantage independent marketers.

While mergers like BP and Amoco or Exxon and Mobile may be good for business, I am concerned about the impact on consumers. Exxon-Mobile this year reported \$5 billion in record profits over the last year. Valero alone had a 2,272 percent increase in profits from 1999.

There are real solutions, and Democrats have the real solutions. But those solutions are not found in President Bush's energy plan.

Let me just mention a couple of things that we can do. First, we need to review the effect that mergers have on the price of gasoline. Second, I strongly believe that we need to find innovative ways to reduce demand. Conservation and energy efficiency are vital components of reducing prices of gasoline at the pump, and these ideas must be part of our Nation's energy use strategy.

But, unfortunately, President Bush does not really think about this. Last week, he announced that he would abandon the 2004 goal set to develop a five-person vehicle that would get 80 miles per gallon. The Federal Government has spent \$1.4 billion on this initiative, and last year the National Academy of Scientists called the program an outstanding effort. But now this program aimed at reducing the future demand on gasoline has been put on hold.

American demand for gasoline is 8.6 million barrels per day. Sport utility vehicles, pickups and minivans account for 43 percent of the vehicles on the road today, up from 30 percent in 1990. Because of this increase, the current fuel efficiency in the U.S. has dropped to its lowest level since 1980.

Today the standard for passenger cars is 27.5 miles per gallon, and for light trucks it is 20.4 miles per gallon. This standard has not changed since 1990. We need to address fuel consumption and create 21st century solutions to meet our 21st century users.

I know that a number of my colleagues have been taking the lead on this, particularly some of the newer Members. I know that the energy crisis has been particularly bad in California.

I yield first to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), one of my colleagues.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) bringing this to our attention, and it gives me an opportunity to speak particularly about the situation in San Diego.

San Diego families and businesses have been devastated with soaring energy prices since last July, and so now we are faced with rising gasoline prices. Here, too, San Diego was first with the most, not the distinction that we would necessarily like. Prices are almost always 10 percent higher than neighboring Los Angeles. With these prices soaring across the county, San Diego is still at the head of the parade.

Much attention has been focused on issues of supply and demand, and these are important. But there are other predatory practices that crank up the price at the pump.

In August of 1998, as chair of the California Assembly Consumer Protection Committee, I held hearings on the causes of high gasoline prices and why they are so particularly affected in my community of San Diego. We learned a lot during these hearings. We learned about mini-marketing techniques that control the supply. We learned that there are practices where companies sell the same gasoline to different outlets at different prices and discriminate against some communities.

These practices now are being challenged in the Wholesale Motor Fuel Fairness and Competition Restoration Act that is being authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), and I am very happy to be a co-sponsor of that. There are several

things that this legislation will do, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in working with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) on them.

One, they require that petroleum producers reveal their pricing structure. It seems like a sensible thing to do that will be helpful to consumers to know.

Two, it would make it illegal for companies to discriminate on price regardless of who is purchasing it.

Third, it will mandate that the Federal Trade Commission study the relationships between ownership of gas stations and the high price of motor fuel. I think all of these elements of this legislation are needed and will make it more difficult for oil companies to practice what we consider price zoning, redlining, and discriminatory wholesale pricing.

It is only right that consumers know how rebates, refunds, and discounts to dealers affect the prices that they pay at the pump. I think we now have an opportunity and we now should shine the spotlight on how gas is priced so we can then return to competitive pump prices.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for bringing these issues to our attention.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), and mention, which I am sure some people already know, that certainly the Democrats today, our Democratic leadership, announced an energy policy program under the auspices of the House Democratic Caucus, our energy task force.

There are a number of provisions in there that I think are very good. But one of them specifically says with regard to price gouging that we would instruct the Justice Department to aggressively investigate energy pricing to assure that illegal price fixing does not occur and to give thorough anti-trust reviews to any proposals to further consolidate energy companies.

I know that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our leader, was out there with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) in San Diego, with some of our other colleagues from California, Southern California. We have been basically saying that we have got to look at this problem overall. Price gouging and gasoline prices are an important part of this.

We still do not have the President's or the Cheney proposal. That is supposed to come out Thursday. But so far every indication that we have got from President Bush and Vice President CHENEY is that they simply do not want to do anything about gasoline prices. It is just not their problem. I cannot imagine that, with all the problems that one faces in California with regard to blackouts and the overall energy crisis, that anybody is happy to hear that we are going to not address gas price problem.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is really adding insult to injury,

I think, out in the West. When we have seen the energy prices going up 900 percent, people want to know where that is coming from.

I think, when it comes to gasoline prices as well, I know in the San Diego community, we have looked to our neighbors. We do not have to travel that far. I took trips every Sunday when I used to visit my dad actually in Orange County, and we knew where to fill up because gasoline prices were about 35 cents less.

□ 1930

Now we are seeing high prices throughout the State, but we still have some communities that seem to be affected more than others.

Mr. PALLONE. And in New Jersey we have the phenomenon whereas after Memorial Day, and I represent the shore area, everybody is going to be paying these higher prices when they have to travel to the shore or to the beaches. I know some might say that people do not have to go on a vacation; but obviously, that is not the answer. I just cannot believe that the President and the Vice President simply do not see this as a problem and think that somehow a tax cut is going to help that.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for being here. I know she has been taking her leadership in her home State on this issue. Thanks.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now wish to yield time to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Currently, Arkansas residents pay on average \$1.69 per gallon of mid-grade gasoline. Thousands of my constituents depend on their cars to get to and from their jobs or on tractors or equipment to tend to their farms each and every day. I live in a very rural district, and they simply cannot afford the drastic increase in gas prices that they are being forced to pay.

With the summer season expected to be as hot as last year, we will probably have in Arkansas a drought for the fourth year in a row, and I anticipate that we are headed for a repeat of last year's overheated oil prices, the highest since 1990. In fact, we have already seen indications that the price is growing steadily.

A recent national survey shows that the price of gasoline has skyrocketed 17 cents in the last 4 weeks alone, bringing the national average to \$1.82 a gallon. These prices are unjustified, and our response to bring these prices down must be immediate. I call on the President and the administration to tell OPEC to increase their levels of oil production, which they cut as recently as March by a million barrels a day. It is wrong that a handful of foreign countries can get together and have a lot to do with dictating the price of

gasoline at the pumps in south Arkansas.

Our reliance on foreign oil has been steadily increasing. We must concentrate on increasing our domestic energy supplies and strengthening our energy infrastructure, and we must guard consumers against potential price gouging by the big oil companies.

Now, the President, as recent as late last week, said that we needed a tax cut to pay for gasoline. Now, Mr. President, I have a problem with my constituents paying \$2 or \$3 a gallon for gasoline. Yes, Mr. President, we need a tax cut. We need a tax cut for working families to help them make ends meet, to help them pay for child care and, yes, to help them send a child to college. We do not need a tax cut to pay for gas. We need to bring the prices of gas back down.

America's economic prosperity and national security have come to depend on the availability of reliable, affordable energy. We need a balanced, long-term energy policy, not one built for the past, as the administration is putting forth. We need a proactive energy policy for the future, one that helps consumers by increasing energy production while reducing energy demand; one that stresses the importance of conservation, building more energy-efficient products and developing more renewable and alternative fuel sources, the kind that can create new markets for our struggling farm families in south Arkansas.

The production, generation, and distribution aspects must all be done with greater efficiency. Research and development in new energy technologies that increase conservation in all areas are imperative. In addition, we need to expand other energy sources, such as wind, solar and hydroelectric. Renewable energy sources may not be an immediate answer to our energy crisis, but they are certainly important for the long term as fossil fuel sources continue to diminish. These emerging technologies will need Federal support if we are to finally achieve energy independence.

We must look at all available options to solve this complicated crisis. But whatever we do, we must guarantee that drivers in south Arkansas and all across America will pay less when they fill up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arkansas. It is really almost incredible to think that the President and the Vice President do not understand what needs to be done now to address the problem with the gasoline prices.

I was just looking at some of the statements that were made here. This is from Vice President CHENEY, May 11, I guess just a week ago, in USA Today. He said, "There's not much we can do in the short-term." And he goes on to talk about everything they are going to come out with, theoretically this

Thursday, is long term. Then it says that they apparently have been warning Republicans on Capitol Hill that the energy policy to be released will do little to help with gas prices or California blackouts this summer.

To me, it is incredible to think that they are not looking to at least talk to OPEC and say, look, do something here. These are countries where I think we have a lot of clout and the ability to influence their policy because they depend on us for so many things. The same thing with the SPR. I cannot believe there was so much discussion last session about the SPR and the ability to use that as a sort of a hammer to force prices down and to force more production of OPEC, and yet so far they are not willing to do it.

The gentleman obviously has the same problem leading up to Memorial Day and the summer in Arkansas that we have in New Jersey, and I just know that a few more weeks of these price increases, and it is already almost the number one issue on people's minds, but I do not know how we are going to be able to go back from Congress and say Washington is not doing anything about it. It is just incredible.

I want to thank the gentleman for participating and we are obviously going to be doing a lot more of this. Thanks.

Next, Mr. Speaker, we have, from my neighboring State of New York, and I imagine he has the same phenomenon with people leaving to go to Long Island for the start of Memorial Day weekend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time and his important leadership on this very vital issue.

Mr. Speaker, last week gas prices on Long Island rose 9 cents per gallon in the span of a single week, and this year alone OPEC has cut its production twice already. I think it is absolutely outrageous that the same countries that we defend time after time are gouging Americans at the pump.

Now, last summer, then Governor Bush said that when he was President, if gas prices increased, he would simply get OPEC on the phone and tell them to turn on the spigot. Well, Mr. President, it is time to make that call. We cannot wait any longer. And when OPEC reconvenes again in June, they have to know that we will no longer tolerate this price-fixing cartel behavior that is punishing Americans at the pump.

At the same time, however, while we are talking a tough line towards OPEC, we have to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I have been working with some of my colleagues to draft a Tax and Energy Cost Relief Act that will provide working families with tax credits and deductions that will help them purchase energy-efficient equipment and technologies. Now, that is going to reduce taxes, it is going to spur the economy by encouraging people to go

and purchase new energy-efficient products, it is going to improve our environment, and it is going to reduce our long-term dependence on foreign oil.

Taking a hard line with OPEC and expanding tax incentives is the smart way to reduce the price of gas while providing relief to working families and decreasing our dependence on foreign oil. It is time for a coherent, effective, comprehensive policy to get gas prices down; and I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Jersey to reach that goal.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York. I know we are both in the New York metropolitan area, so we share the same concerns and we hear the same complaints from our constituents.

I just wanted to mention, if I could, that the Democrats' energy policy paper was released today, wherein our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), who is the chairman of the caucus and also the chairman of the task force that put this together, talked about two major tax credits along the lines of what the gentleman just discussed; and I wanted to mention them briefly, if I could.

There is this best energy savings tax credit, which is basically a consumer tax credit for up to \$4,000 provided for new homes, in other words, a \$4,000 credit for purchase of a new home based on the energy efficiency of the new home. And then similarly with regard to home improvements, 20 percent of the cost up to \$2,000 based on the measures taken by the consumer. And there is a separate one for vehicles that an individual could get a credit up to \$4,000 based on fuel savings or other performance standards when they purchase a car or a light truck or SUV equipped with these new fuel saving technologies.

And then for businesses, the Democratic proposal has what they call a SAVE incentive, structure and vehicle efficiency tax incentive; and this provides up to a 30 percent investment tax credit for business investment in renewable energy generation and allows businesses to take a deduction for increasing energy efficiency.

These are the kinds of conservation measures linked to new technology that we need, and I know that is what the gentleman was talking about. And I think the great part of what the Democrats put forward today in our energy proposal is that it deals with the high price of gasoline, which is an immediate concern; it deals with conservation; it deals with efforts to use tax credits and deductions for conservation; and, at the same time, it has measures to increase energy production.

So we are looking at this universally, in a sort of a well-rounded way, whereas all we get from the Bush-Cheney administration is just pump; let us pump more oil, let us pump more, and that is

going to solve all our problems. But that is not going to solve our problems, particularly in the short term.

Mr. ISRAEL. If the gentleman will yield, about 2 weeks ago, five Federal laboratories issued a report that said if we can encourage weatherization and encourage energy-efficient technologies and energy-efficient consumer products, we will not have to build the 1,300 power plants that the administration is proposing; that we would not have to drill the Arctic reserve that the administration is proposing; we would not have to degrade our environment. And those are the kinds of technologies and efficiencies that we ought to be pursuing.

Now, these were not Democratic Federal laboratories or Republican Federal laboratories; they were Federal laboratories that have been looking at this, and we need to heed their advice.

Mr. PALLONE. The amazing thing that I find is that even my own utilities, during Earth Day myself and my other Democratic colleagues in the House did a bus tour around the State, and one of the places we went, I think it was in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), was a generating facility in Linden, which was building a new plant that would reduce carbon dioxide and other emissions by 30 percent.

Here are these utilities, and this is the business community, telling us that they can address carbon dioxide emissions effectively at the same time that the Bush administration tells us they do not want to regulate it. So the President is just not being realistic about what can be done. He is sort of living in the past, in my opinion; and it is very unfortunate.

I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, next is my colleague on the Committee on Commerce who has been involved in these energy issues for a long time, and I know that our committee has taken up some legislation, but so far the Republicans have not really been helping us very much in terms of addressing the California situation. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

□ 1945

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and I would like to take a few moments to talk about my district in southern Ohio, because as I have heard my colleagues discuss gas prices in their districts, I was thinking gas prices are so much higher in my poor, rural district.

But first, I would like to say some things about the President and his justification for this tax cut, 43 percent of which will be going to the richest 1 percent of the people in our country. Last summer during the campaign he said we needed this large tax cut simply because we had a huge surplus, and this surplus, rather than being spent on government programs, should be returned to the taxpayer. That was the justification a year or so ago.

Then just 2 or 3 months ago, he was justifying this huge tax break, most of which is going to the very wealthy, by saying our economy is entering a period of slump and perhaps moving into a recession, so we need a tax break to generate activity within our economy and keep us from going into a recession. Lo and behold a couple of days ago I was flabbergasted to hear the President say we need a tax cut so people can spend it on gasoline so that my friends in the oil industry can reap the benefits of the tax cut, basically. It is just beyond belief that we would have such shallow, superficial thinking going on when the Nation is facing a very serious problem.

My colleague said he thinks this concern about gas prices may be near the top of people's concerns. I can tell my colleagues after having gone home to southern Ohio for the last several weekends, in my district it is the primary concern. I can go nowhere in my district without meeting people who are saying to me, Congressman, what can you do about these gasoline prices?

I can tell you this weekend the cheapest gasoline I could find in southern Ohio was nearly \$1.86 per gallon. That was for the cheapest grade, and the premium was over \$2 a gallon.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that troubles me, these prices fluctuate overnight. Especially as we move toward the weekend, this happens regularly. As we are moving toward the weekend on Thursday night or Friday morning, prices may escalate 10 or 15 cents or more overnight. This happens weekend after weekend.

Now, the American people are fairly wise, and they know when they are being taken advantage of. I believe that there is a quiet but growing anger throughout this country. Those of us in political office who are supposed to be representatives of the people are going to pay a heavy price if we do not deal with this issue. The American people are being gouged. They are being charged unfair prices, and they feel hopeless and helpless; and they are looking to Washington for some relief.

Mr. Speaker, to have the President say there is nothing we can do, to have the Vice President say there is nothing we can do is not acceptable. We must do something. I have been trying to search for solutions. I think we should even consider the possibility of a windfall profit tax to be levied on these companies that are gouging the American public.

Last summer in the early summer, myself and the two Senators from Ohio, Senator VOINOVICH and Senator DEWINE, both Republican Senators, met with the Federal Trade Commission. We were concerned at that time with what was happening with escalating gasoline prices, and we asked them to look into the situation and try to determine if something illegal was happening, if collusion was occurring between the oil companies.

Finally, after several months of looking at this, they came out with a re-

port. The report stated that it was not possible for them to establish indications of collusion which would be illegal, but that there was some strong indication that some of these companies were purposefully withholding supplies in an effort to drive up prices.

Now, I want to say a word about supply. I do not like the fact that OPEC has cut back on supplies. The fact is we used our national resources, we put our sons and daughters in danger to protect Kuwait and to keep that part of the world relatively free of the threat of Saddam Hussein. We are supposed to be friendly with Mexico. It troubles me that these companies that use our support and use our protection and use our resources, when they find themselves in need would be so terribly insensitive to the situation facing this country that they would cut back on supplies.

But it troubles me even more, Mr. Speaker, that our President is unwilling to expect something out of these OPEC nations that we as a Nation have a right to suspect. It troubles me that he will not urge and insist that they increase their production. Having said that, I suspect that the problem is not a supply problem right now in the immediate future, but the problem is a pricing problem. I do not see any stations running out of gasoline or lines of people waiting to get gasoline. We can buy as much gasoline in southern Ohio as we are willing to pay for. The problem is that we are simply being charged too much.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there will be a price to pay, regardless of whether or not we are Democrats or Republicans, or from what part of the country we come. If we do not do something to give relief to the American public, the American public has every right to seek retribution against us at the polls. The American people are patient and tolerant, and I think they are wise; but they also get tired, and there is a line beyond which we must not cross. We owe them protection.

I urge the President, I urge the leadership of this House to assume the responsibility that we rightfully have as representatives of the people and think of the various ways in which we can take action to bring some immediate relief this spring, this summer to the American people.

I wanted to share those thoughts with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, because I know that the American people are paying attention to what we are doing up here, and I think they are also paying attention to what we are not doing up here. I urge all of my colleagues to address all of these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for what he said. He mentioned two things that I want to elaborate on. First, about the Bush administration's inaction on the price of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, I often find myself quoting the Vice President because he seems to be the one who speaks more often on this issue, maybe on most

issues, but certainly on this issue. Reading something from Reuters today where Vice President Mr. CHENEY said, "Record high U.S. gasoline prices cannot be blamed on the global price of crude." In an interview with Reuters, Cheney also said, "Jawboning OPEC to increase production and reduce the price of crude would have market consequences." I do not know what he means by that. He says that if the United States talked OPEC nations into increasing production, thus dropping the price of crude, the end result could be a slowing in investment by oil companies.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the oil companies are recording record profits. The oil companies are getting the profits which they ought to be using to invest in new technologies and in new resources. We ought not to feel sorry for the oil companies. They are doing very well. But I tell you who I feel sorry for. I have got residents in my district who drive one way 85 or 95 miles to work so that they can have a job to support their families. They do that day in and day out, and some of them year in and year out. They are going to the pumps, and they are paying \$1.86 up to \$2 per gallon to put gasoline in their tanks simply so they can go to work and earn a living. We have got a responsibility to do something about that. It just really, really troubles me.

When someone runs for the Presidency, they assume responsibility. The President has a responsibility to the American people to provide leadership and to protect them from being gouged by the oil industry. That is his responsibility. If he did not want to accept that responsibility, he ought not to have sought the Presidency. There is a burden that comes with an office. We share it here in this House, but the President and the Vice President share it as well. They have got a responsibility to step up to the plate to say what is happening is wrong and to take steps to make sure that the American people are protected.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can overestimate the anger of the American people on this issue, and it is going to grow as we enter into the summer months and gasoline goes from \$1.86 to \$2 and beyond. That is when we are going to see the strong feelings of the American people directed toward us. That is one of the reasons to act. The real reason we should act is because it is the right thing to do for our constituents. But even if we did not care about the well-being of our constituents, if our only unworthy motive was our political survival, we ought to care.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President and the Vice President and the leaders of this House are listening to this debate because the American people are expecting action.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with what the gentleman said. I was looking at this last statement which I read where the Vice

President said if the U.S. talked OPEC nations into increasing production, thus dropping the price of crude, the end result could be a slowing in investment by oil companies. It is almost as if he is saying that it is a good thing that the prices are going up because that gives them more money to invest, which is incredible.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I think his actions indicate that he is happy with the high prices. To say that the answer to the high prices is just for the American citizen to get a tax break so he can then take that tax break, use it to pay these high prices so that the oil companies will get their profits, that is very troubling to me.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree. It is incredible to think about the reasoning that goes behind it.

The second thing which was mentioned is the profits that the companies are getting. There is a chart here that I have that says that while consumers face spiking energy prices, many oil, gas and power companies post record profits. For example, Exxon-Mobil reaped nearly \$18 billion in profits last year, up more than 120 percent over the previous year.

This has a chart, and I will just give a few of them. It has Exxon-Mobil profits, increased from 1999 124 percent; British Petroleum-Amoco increased 54 percent; Chevron increase in profits over the year, 151 percent; Hess, which is in New Jersey, increase of 234 percent; Texaco, an increase of 116 percent. It is just incredible to see how much money they have been making.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Their profits are enormous. The supplies are there; otherwise we would not be able to go to the pump and buy the gasoline. I know of nowhere in this country where there seems to be a shortage of gasoline at this time. There is all of the gas that we want to buy if we are willing and able to pay for it. How much profit is enough? How much profit is it going to take to encourage the oil industry to innovate and to do those things that they need to do to bring more supplies to market?

Mr. Speaker, if I felt that there was a true shortage of supply, then there may be some reasonable expectation that prices would escalate. But what we have now is apparently a sufficient supply; but ever-increasing costs and ever-increasing profits; and we have got a President and a Vice President who seems to think that is okay. That is very troubling.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong what we say necessarily, but I want to mention again that the Democrats came out today with an energy policy and principles. Obviously, we did this a couple of days before we hear the final report that is going to come out from the Vice President which will express the President's position. I am very proud of what we did today because it basically addresses each of the issues that I think that the public is concerned about, both short term and long term.

If I can just review it and then we can finish our Special Order. First of all, it specifically deals with the problem of prices going up now, first of all, by asking that the President put pressure on OPEC to increase production and lower prices and to use the SPR, the strategic petroleum reserve, and to investigate the price gouging by the biggest companies.

□ 2000

Then it has with regard to energy efficiency, what I mentioned, these best tax credits for both consumers and businesses to improve energy efficiency, to use renewables; and then we also have emergency funding to help low- and fixed-income families meet the rising cost of home heating and cooling bills, basically supplemental to the LIHEAP program which helps people with their energy bills. We have the price caps imposed on wholesale electricity prices in the West, which I think is necessary. That is something that we are going to be addressing in our committee next week when we get the energy bill that comes up. We also have strong provisions to protect the environment. We are saying that you can increase production, but you have to do it in a way that protects the environment.

One of the things I would note is that during the 8 years of the Clinton administration, there actually was a significant increase in production; but they were not drilling in ANWR and other sensitive areas. What we are really doing, I think, is investing in the future. We are trying to come up with ways to encourage conservation, do things more efficiently, increase production but at the same time address this real problem that exists now both with the energy crisis where you have blackouts, electricity blackouts, as well as with the high price of gasoline. All those things have to be looked at as the gentleman pointed out. I want to thank him, and I want to thank the rest of my colleagues for joining me this evening.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). The Chair reminds all Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to others outside the Chamber.

#### 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 8 o'clock and 1 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2340

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 11 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1836, ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-68) on the resolution (H. Res. 142) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1836) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family emergency.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

#### 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:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, May 16.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, May 16 and 17.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, May 17.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 166. An act to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Committee on Government Reform 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.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 2001, 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:

1915. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sucroglycerides; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-301119; FRL-6778-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1916. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Division of General and International Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Audit Appeals; Policy and Procedure [Docket No. MARAD-2000-8284] (RIN: 2133-AB42) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1917. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer Alternate, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Conversion from Stock Form Depository Institution to Federal Stock Association [No. 2001-34] (RIN: 1550-AB46) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1918. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Commission Guidance to Broker-Dealers on the Use of Electronic Storage Media under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act of 2000 with Respect to Rule 17a-4(f) [Release No. 34-44238] received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1919. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Recordkeeping Requirements for Transfer Agents [Release No. 34-44227; File No. S7-17-99] (RIN: 3235-AH74) received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1920. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of the Redesignation of Shelby County, Tennessee, to Attainment for Lead [TN 240-1-200103a; FRL-6974-6] received May 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1921. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Ozone; Beaumont/Port Arthur Ozone Nonattainment Area [FRL-6976-1] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1922. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Identification Rule: Revisions to the Mixture and Derived from Rules [FRL-6975-2] (RIN: 2050-AE07) received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1923. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Storage, Treatment, Transportation, and Disposal of Mixed Waste [FRL-6975-1] (RIN: 2050-AE45) received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1924. A letter from the Deputy Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting the FY 2000 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1925. A letter from the Inspector General, International Trade Commission, transmitting the Semiannual report of the Inspector General of the International Trade Commission for the period of October 1, 2000, through March 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1926. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Government Performance and Results Act Annual Performance Plan for FY 2002 and the Annual Performance Report for FY 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1927. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Missouri Regulatory Program and Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [SPATS No. MO-033-FOR] received May 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1928. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oklahoma Regulatory Program [SPATS No. OK-025-FOR] received May 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1929. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—American Lobster; Interstate Fishery Management Plans; Cancellation of Moratorium [Docket No. 010125024-1089-02; I.D. 121500D] (RIN: 0648-AO88) received May 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1930. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 01012013-1013-01; I.D. 042501D] received May 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1931. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emergency Medical Equipment [Docket No. FAA-2000-7119; Amendment No. 121-280 and 135-78] (RIN: 2120-AG89) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1932. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Emergency Exits [Docket No. 28154; Amendment No. 121-283] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1933. A letter from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Temporary Reduction of Registration Fees [Docket No. RSPA-00-8439 (HM-208D)] (RIN: 2137-AD53) received May 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Com-

mittee 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. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 to provide for consistent treatment of survivor benefits for public safety officers killed in the line of duty; with an amendment (Rept. 107-65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 586. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion from gross income for foster care payments shall also apply to payments by qualified placement agencies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-67). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 142. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1836) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 (Rept. 107-68). Referred to the House Calendar.

## DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1829. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full funding for assistance for education of all children with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1830. A bill to ensure the energy self-sufficiency of the United States by 2011, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, and Government Reform, 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. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEFazio,

Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. BONO, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. WILSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BASS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HORN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. KIND, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1831. A bill to provide certain relief for small businesses from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina):

H.R. 1832. A bill to improve the Federal licensing process for hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend all motor fuel taxes for six months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 1834. A bill to require the Department of Energy to study potential regulatory improvements that may help alleviate high fuel prices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income computers and Internet access provided by an employer for the personal use of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 1836. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 104 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to withhold highways funds from any State that permits an individual to

use a hand-held mobile telephone while operating a motor vehicle; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1838. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to modify the provisions relating to drawback claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1839. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide adequate coverage for immunosuppressive drugs furnished to beneficiaries under the Medicare Program that have received an organ transplant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 1840. A bill to extend eligibility for refugee status of unmarried sons and daughters of certain Vietnamese refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1841. A bill to amend the definition of a law enforcement officer under subchapter III of chapter 83 and chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, to ensure the inclusion of certain positions; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1842. A bill to reinstate the authority of the Federal Communications Commission and local franchising authorities to regulate the rates for cable television service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 1843. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies for teacher recruitment, retention, and training, and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand the program of loan forgiveness for teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide teachers, principals, and other school professionals the tools they need to undertake reasonable actions to maintain order, discipline, and an appropriate educational environment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1845. A bill to provide that no more than 50 percent of funding made available under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 for any fiscal year be provided for home heating purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. GRUCCI:

H.R. 1846. A bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require schools and libraries receiving universal service assistance to block access to Internet services that enable users to access the World Wide Web and transfer electronic mail in an anonymous manner; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRUCCI:

H.R. 1847. A bill to require the Attorney General to identify organizations that recruit juveniles to participate in violent and illegal activities related to the environment or to animal rights; and to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide assistance to States to carry out activities to prevent the participation of juveniles in such activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1848. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide vouchers for the purchase of educational books for infants and children participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children under that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 1850. A bill to extend the Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century and to make technical corrections to the law governing the Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1851. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to limit the extent to which natural gas prices charged to end users may be increased; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1853. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend enterprise communities for the same period as empowerment zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H.R. 1854. A bill to amend the General Education Act to allow parents access to certain information about their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 1855. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize a grant program to enhance parental

involvement in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1856. A bill to provide relief from Federal tax liability arising from the settlement of claims brought by African American farmers against the Department of Agriculture for discrimination in farm credit and benefit programs and to exclude amounts received under such settlement from means-based determinations under programs funded in whole or in part with Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. BASS):

H.J. Res. 48. A joint resolution authorizing the President to issue to the late Colonel William Mitchell, United States Army, a posthumous commission in the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to remarks by the President of Syria concerning Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Book Festival; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr.

DEUTSCH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. KING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HOEFFEL):

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress welcoming President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the Joint Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to Abandon Plans to Conduct a Feasibility Study Concerning the Establishment of a National Park in Maine's North Woods; to the Committee on Resources.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. GUTIERREZ introduced a bill (H.R. 1857) for the relief of Ana Esparza and Maria Munoz; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 25: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 68: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 105: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 144: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 157: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 168: Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. THURMAN.  
H.R. 169: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 179: Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 210: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 214: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 219: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 236: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 267: Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 270: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 274: Mr. WYNN, Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 280: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 282: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 287: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 303: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 336: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 419: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 436: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 437: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 439: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 442: Mr. CLAY and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 448: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 457: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 482: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 500: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 510: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 527: Mr. CLAY and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 531: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 586: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 590: Mr. FRANK and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 598: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OTTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 602: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 606: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 609: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 626: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 627: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 638: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 664: Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 665: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 668: Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 678: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 686: Mr. FRANK, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 691: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 693: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 701: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 702: Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 716: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 730: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 737: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 742: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 744: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 796: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 797: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 798: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 804: Mr. OTTER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 826: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 827: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 844: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 854: Mr. SAWYER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. MATSUO.

H.R. 876: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 896: Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 914: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 917: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 931: Mr. TERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 953: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 954: Mr. BARRETT and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 969: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 976: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 978: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Ms. HART.

H.R. 985: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 986: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1007: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1017: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1025: Mr. SKEEN and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1035: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1073: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1110: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1127: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1129: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1140: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. McCRERY, and Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 1145: Mr. GREENWOOD and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1153: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1158: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1170: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1184: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1192: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1233: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1262: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1266: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 1272: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1273: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 1305: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1320: Mr. FRANK, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1351: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1353: Mr. UPTON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1354: Ms. NORTON, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1358: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1360: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1367: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1372: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 1377: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1398: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1413: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1433: Mr. FILNER and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1434: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1450: Mr. PUTNAM.  
 H.R. 1455: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. NEY.  
 H.R. 1458: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 1468: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 1470: Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 1471: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H.R. 1476: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SIMMONS.  
 H.R. 1477: Mr. OTTER, Mr. SANDLIN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.  
 H.R. 1483: Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.  
 H.R. 1492: Mr. COYNE.  
 H.R. 1523: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. OSBORNE.  
 H.R. 1542: Mr. RILEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SHOWS, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 1545: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1553: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 1556: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KING, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. QUINN.  
 H.R. 1575: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. PAUL, Ms. HART, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1577: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FILNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HILL, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FROST, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 1581: Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BOEHNER.  
 H.R. 1586: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 1597: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 1609: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. SANDLIN.  
 H.R. 1624: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WU, Mr. RILEY, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SHOWS.  
 H.R. 1644: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1645: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. GREENWOOD.  
 H.R. 1649: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 1650: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 H.R. 1651: Mr. ENGLISH.  
 H.R. 1657: Mr. CARDIN.  
 H.R. 1671: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, and Ms. RIVERS.  
 H.R. 1677: Mr. SCHAFFER and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 1683: Ms. LEE, Ms. HART, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CROWLEY.  
 H.R. 1687: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 1696: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1711: Mr. FOLEY.  
 H.R. 1713: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1716: Mr. REHBERG, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 1746: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KING, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. ENGLISH.  
 H.R. 1781: Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 1784: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 1786: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. RILEY.  
 H.R. 1798: Mrs. ROUKEMA.  
 H.R. 1809: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 1819: Mr. PAYNE and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.  
 H.J. Res. 12: Mr. KERNS.  
 H.J. Res. 36: Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. CLEMENT.  
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. SNYDER.  
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. TANCREDO.  
 H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. BAIRD.  
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. HAYWORTH.  
 H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. VALAZQUEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. STARK.  
 H. Con. Res. 104: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. HORN.  
 H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. TIBERI.  
 H. Res. 17: Mr. BARRETT.  
 H. Res. 120: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. REYNOLDS.  
 H. Res. 139: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FATTAH.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 701: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

---

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1

OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In section 5214(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 501 of the bill, add at the end the following: "Such a description may include how the applicant will provide release time for teachers (which may include the provision of a substitute teacher)."