



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 20, 2002

No. 65

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG BEREUTER 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. 3167. An act to endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the designation of the week beginning May 19, 2002, as "National Emergency Medical Services Week".

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the Second Session of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, to be held in Newport, Rhode Island, May 16-20, 2002:

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), Chairman.

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE).

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) as a member of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) as a member of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 103-227, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the following individuals to the National Skill Standards Board:

Upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader—

Tim C. Flynn, of South Dakota, Representative of Human Resource Professionals.

Jerald A. Tunheim, of South Dakota, Representative of Human Resource Professionals.

The message also announced that pursuant to the authority of the Majority Leader under Public Law 107-106, the Chair announces the appointment of the following individuals as members of the National Museum of African American History and Cultural Plan for Action Presidential Commission—

Henry L. Aaron, of Georgia;
Howard Dodson, of New York;
Cicely Tyson, of New York;
Robert L. Wilkins, of Washington, D.C.;

the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) (non-voting member); and announces, pursuant to the authority of the Majority Leader and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, the appointment of the following additional individuals as members of the above Commission—

Robert Bogle, of Pennsylvania;
Beverly Thompson, of Kansas;
the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWBACK) (non-voting member).

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, 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 not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 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. LATOURETTE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, this weekend both Jews and Christians have celebrated great

□ 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.

H2609

feasts by which Your people are freed and purified, renewed and given a sense of direction. Be with the 107th Congress in this same spirit.

We see the medallion of Moses high above this Chamber and thank You, Lord God, for the Torah given to Moses on Mount Sinai. May the guidance of this law and the spirit of the Upper Room be fulfilled in all the actions of the House of Representatives.

Your word revealed to Your chosen ones long ago accompanies us on our journey now and directs us in making decisions for our day. May Your Spirit empower us always so that with loving trust we may turn to You in all our troubles and give You thanks in all our accomplishments and in all our joys.

To You be the glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair 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.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6:30 p.m. today.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND BIOTERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3253) to amend

title 38, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of emergency medical preparedness centers in the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3253

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 "Department of Veterans Affairs Emergency Preparedness Research, Education, and Bio-Terrorism Prevention Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL PREPAREDNESS CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 7325. Medical emergency preparedness centers

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTERS.—(1) The Secretary shall establish at least four medical emergency preparedness centers in accordance with this section. Each such center shall be established at a Department medical center and shall be staffed by Department employees.

"(2) The Under Secretary for Health shall be responsible for supervising the operation of the centers established pursuant to this section. The Under Secretary shall provide for ongoing evaluation of the centers and their compliance with the requirements of this section.

"(3) The Under Secretary shall carry out the Under Secretary's functions under paragraph (2) in consultation with the Assistant Secretary for Veterans Affairs with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security.

"(b) MISSION.—The mission of the centers shall be—

"(1) to carry out research on and develop methods of detection, diagnosis, vaccination, protection, and treatment for chemical, biological, and radiological threats to the public health and safety;

"(2) to provide education, training, and advice to health-care professionals, including health-care professionals outside the Veterans Health Administration; and

"(3) to provide contingent rapid response laboratory assistance and other assistance to local health care authorities in the event of a national emergency.

"(c) CENTER DIRECTORS.—Each center shall have a Director with (1) expertise in managing organizations that deal with threats referred to in subsection (b), (2) expertise in providing care to populations exposed to toxic substances, or (3) significant research experience in those fields.

"(d) SELECTION OF CENTERS.—(1) The Secretary shall select the sites for the centers on the basis of a competitive selection process and a finding under paragraph (2). The centers selected shall be located in different regions of the Nation, and any such center may be a consortium of efforts of more than one medical center. At least one of the centers shall be established to concentrate on chemical threats, at least one shall be established to concentrate on biological threats, and at least one shall be established to concentrate on radiological threats.

"(2) The finding referred to in paragraph (1) with respect to a proposal for designation of a site as a location of a center under this section is a finding by the Secretary, upon the recommendations of the Under Secretary for Health and the Assistant Secretary with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security, that the facility or facilities

submitting the proposal have developed (or may reasonably be anticipated to develop) each of the following:

"(A) An arrangement with a qualifying medical school and a qualifying school of public health (or a consortium of such schools) under which physicians and other persons in the health field receive education and training through the participating Department medical centers so as to provide those persons with training in the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses induced by exposures to toxins, including chemical and biological substances and nuclear ionizing radiation.

"(B) An arrangement with an accredited graduate program of epidemiology under which students receive education and training in epidemiology through the participating Department facilities so as to provide such students with training in the epidemiology of contagious and infectious diseases and chemical and radiation poisoning in an exposed population.

"(C) An arrangement under which nursing, social work, counseling, or allied health personnel and students receive training and education in recognizing and caring for conditions associated with exposures to toxins through the participating Department facilities.

"(D) The ability to attract scientists who have made significant contributions to the development of innovative approaches to the detection, diagnosis, vaccination, protection, or treatment of persons exposed to chemical, biological, or radiological substances.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2)(A)—

"(A) a qualifying medical school is an accredited medical school that provides education and training in toxicology and environmental health hazards and with which one or more of the participating Department medical centers is affiliated; and

"(B) a qualifying school of public health is an accredited school of public health that provides education and training in toxicology and environmental health hazards and with which one or more of the participating Department medical centers is affiliated.

"(e) FUNDING.—(1) Amounts appropriated for the activities of the centers shall be appropriated separately from amounts appropriated for the Department for medical care.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated for the centers under this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

"(3) In addition to funds appropriated for a fiscal year pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in paragraph (2), the Under Secretary for Health shall allocate to such centers from other funds appropriated for that fiscal year generally for the Department of Veterans Affairs medical care account and the Department of Veterans Affairs medical and prosthetics research account such amounts as the Under Secretary for Health determines appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section. Any determination by the Under Secretary under the preceding sentence shall be made in consultation with the Assistant Secretary with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security.

"(f) RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Each center shall conduct research on improved medical preparedness to protect the Nation from threats in the area of that center's expertise. Each center may seek research funds from public and private sources for such purpose.

"(g) PEER REVIEW PANEL.—(1) In order to provide advice to assist the Secretary and the Under Secretary for Health to carry out their responsibilities under this section, the Under Secretary shall establish a peer review panel to assess the scientific and clinical

merit of proposals that are submitted to the Secretary for the designation of centers under this section. The peer review shall be established in consultation with the Assistant Secretary with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security.

“(2) The peer review panel shall include experts in the fields of toxicological research, bio-hazards management education and training, radiology, clinical care of patients exposed to such hazards, and other persons as determined appropriate by the Secretary. Members of the panel shall serve as consultants to the Department.

“(3) The panel shall review each proposal submitted to the panel by the officials referred to in paragraph (1) and shall submit to the Under Secretary for Health its views on the relative scientific and clinical merit of each such proposal. The panel shall specifically determine with respect to each such proposal whether that proposal is among those proposals which have met the highest competitive standards of scientific and clinical merit.

“(4) The panel shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(h) RESEARCH PRODUCTS.—(1) The Under Secretary for Health and the Assistant Secretary with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security shall ensure that information produced by the research, education and training, and clinical activities of centers established under this section is made available, as appropriate, to health-care providers in the United States. Dissemination of such information shall be made through publications, through programs of continuing medical and related education provided through regional medical education centers under subchapter VI of chapter 74 of this title, and through other means. Such programs of continuing medical education shall receive priority in the award of funding.

“(2) The Secretary shall ensure that the work of the centers is conducted in close coordination with other Federal departments and agencies and that research products or other information of the centers shall be coordinated and shared with other Federal departments and agencies.

“(i) ASSISTANCE TO OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary may provide assistance requested by appropriate Federal, State, and local civil and criminal authorities in investigations, inquiries, and data analyses as necessary to protect the public safety and prevent or obviate biological, chemical, or radiological threats.

“(j) DETAIL OF EMPLOYEES FROM OTHER AGENCIES.—Upon approval by the Secretary, the Director of a center may request the temporary assignment or detail to the center, on a nonreimbursable basis, of employees from other Departments and agencies of the United States who have expertise that would further the mission of the center. Any such employee may be so assigned or detailed on a nonreimbursable basis pursuant to such a request. The duration of any such assignment or detail shall be subject to approval by the Office of Personnel Management.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7324 the following new item:

“7325. Medical emergency preparedness centers.”

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 7325, as added by section 2(a), the following new section:

“§ 7326. Emergency health and medical education

“(a) EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out a program to develop and disseminate a series of model education and training programs on the medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities.

“(b) IMPLEMENTING ENTITY.—The program shall be carried out through the Under Secretary for Health, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs with responsibility for operations, preparedness, and security.

“(c) CONTENT OF PROGRAMS.—The education and training programs developed under the program shall be modelled after programs established at the F. Edward Hébert School of Medicine of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and shall include, at a minimum, training for health care professionals in the following:

“(1) Recognition of chemical, biological, and radiological agents that may be used in terrorist activities.

“(2) Identification of the potential symptoms of those agents.

“(3) Understanding of the potential long-term health consequences, including psychological effects, resulting from exposure to those agents.

“(4) Emergency treatment for exposure to those agents.

“(5) An appropriate course of followup treatment, supportive care, and referral.

“(6) Actions that can be taken while providing care for exposure to those agents to protect against contamination.

“(7) Information on how to seek consultative support and to report suspected or actual use of those agents.

“(d) POTENTIAL TRAINEES.—In designing the education and training programs under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that different programs are designed for health-care professionals at various levels. The programs shall be designed to be disseminated to health professions students, graduate health and medical education trainees, and health practitioners in a variety of fields.

“(e) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the education and training program under this section, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate representatives of accrediting, certifying, and coordinating organizations in the field of health professions education.”

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7325, as added by section 2(b), the following new item:

“7326. Emergency health and medical education.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall implement section 7326 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) INCREASE.—Subsection (a) of section 308 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “six” in the first sentence and inserting “seven”.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—subsection (b) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) Operations, preparedness, security, and law enforcement functions.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “(6)” after “Assistant Secretaries, Department of Veterans Affairs” and inserting “(7)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the prime sponsor of H.R. 3253, as amended, I rise to urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital legislation that will expand the role of the Department of Veterans Affairs in homeland security.

It may come as a surprise to many that the Department of Veterans Affairs operates the world's largest integrated health care network, with over 200,000 health care professionals, 163 medical centers, more than 800 outpatient clinics, 115 medical research programs, affiliations with over 100 schools of medicine, and a \$25 billion budget annually.

Dedicated to providing health care to America's military veterans, the VA is now the Federal Government's leading provider of direct medical services, with over 4.5 million patients treated last year. From providing top-quality medical care to veterans to performing comprehensive cutting-edge research, such as for prosthetics and Alzheimer's disease, the VA health care system has become a unique national resource and a unique national treasure.

That is why we fought so hard to increase its health care budget for next year. With bipartisan support from our committee and with the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE); the conference Chair, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS); the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY); and our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), I am pleased to say that the budget that passed the House increased the VA discretionary health care funding by a record \$2.8 billion for next year.

However, there are still too many people who do not understand the capabilities of the VA health care system. I know from extensive research and from personal experience during the anthrax crisis that the VA is ready, willing, and able to play a significant role in homeland security; but it is often overlooked.

When my post office in Hamilton Township, New Jersey, was attacked with anthrax, and is still closed, and many of the postal employees, in excess of 1,400 postal employees, were at risk of contracting that horrible disease, they were advised to take Cipro. The VA was there as a backup, ready to provide that life saving antibiotic. When I brought the VA's capabilities to the attention of the health commissioner. In New Jersey he was unaware of this important resource. I say with all respect to him, that this was a resource he could count on. And it should

not be that way. The VA should be much more integrated, and the knowledge of what the VA can do must be more widely utilized.

The Cipro was finally made available. Thankfully, at the last minute, the CDC came through and we were able to provide Cipro, which was lifesaving to so many. But, Mr. Speaker, the VA health care system must be an integral component of any homeland security strategy, especially on matters of biological, chemical, and radiological threats and terrorism.

In fact, the VA today does have some defined roles in both the National Disaster Medical System and the Federal Response Plan in the event of national emergencies. Among the VA's current specialized duties are conducting and evaluating disaster and terrorist attack simulation exercises; managing the Nation's stockpile for pharmaceuticals of biological and chemical toxins; maintaining a rapid response team for radiological releases; and training public and private EMS medical center personnel around the country and properly responding to biological, chemical, and radiological disasters.

Yet despite the VA's capacity and unique capabilities, their experience and their expertise in public health matters, it is almost routinely overlooked when it comes to discussions of homeland security, even those concerning bioterrorism, which is, I believe, just plain foolish and counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, in the administration's budget submission, almost \$6 billion was requested to address bioterrorism, including \$2.4 billion for additional research; yet not \$1 was earmarked for the Veterans Administration. A month ago, I would just say parenthetically, we asked Tom Ridge to come and appear before our committee. He used to be a member. And like he has with all the other committees, he declined to come. But he too needs to be more aware of the VA's unique capabilities in this terrorism war.

In fact, when we look at the administration's latest strategy document on homeland security, which can be found on their Web page, the VA is not even mentioned once. The VA can and must be asked to do more. That is why I introduced H.R. 3253, the legislation pending before the House.

H.R. 3253 will create four national medical preparedness centers to be operated by the VA, with at least one concentrating on biological threats, at least one on chemical, and one on radiological threats. In coordination with DOD, Health and Human Services, FEMA, CDC, the NIH, and other agencies or organizations with appropriate expertise, these centers would research and develop new methods to detect, diagnose, vaccinate, and treat potential victims of chemical, biological, and radiological terrorism.

The centers would serve both as direct research centers and as coordi-

nating centers for ongoing and promising new research at other government agencies and research universities. Furthermore, these centers would serve as training resources for thousands of community hospitals that would be first responders to future bioterrorism attacks.

Let me also point out that when anthrax hit my area, I was amazed, I was deeply dismayed that there was no protocol that could be taken off the shelf to prescribe what the course that ought to be followed in the event this happened. CDC was flying by the seat of their collective pants. Some very good scientists from CDC and other government agencies were deployed to New Jersey, and I sat in on some of those meetings. At first, they said no cross-contamination can occur. And I said, have you ever seen an envelope go through the processing machines? It is almost a violent procedure as it makes its way through. If you put a highly refined powder, in this case a weapons grade anthrax powder, surely a cloud of dust containing those harmful contaminants are likely to escape.

Turns out, they did. A couple of weeks later, we found that other post offices were contaminated as well. Four of our area post offices were "hot" with Anthrax. My point? The experts need to move effectively work this issue, and we need to do it well in advance of any future contamination.

Again, when we look at the threats that are possible—perhaps probable, and how do we deal with them, how do the first responders deal with them, the question arise as to whether we have worked with the kind of focus that will protect first responders, employees and then the public at large.

Finally, let me just say that the centers would be charged with establishing state-of-the-art labs to help local health care authorities quickly determine the presence of dangerous biological and chemical toxins such as anthrax.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that H.R. 3253 calls for the cost of these new centers to be taken from additional funds provided to combat terrorism and not from already hard-pressed VA health care dollars. Mr. Speaker, there is ample precedent and experience within the VA for undertaking this expanded mission. The VA's extensive medical research programs are renowned for expertise in diagnosing and treating viral diseases with devastating health consequences, such as groundbreaking work on HIV and hepatitis C.

Just a couple months ago, Dr. Karl Hostetler and his VA colleagues in San Diego announced significant progress has been made on a new oral treatment for smallpox, one of the most deadly bio-terror threats confronting the world today.

Furthermore, the VA already operates two war-related illness centers tasked with developing specialized treatments for illnesses and injuries re-

lated to combat. In essence, these new national medical preparedness centers would work similarly to study illnesses and injuries most likely to come from a terrorist attack and develop new treatments and protocols to mitigate their dangers.

H.R. 3253 also contains important provisions from H.R. 3254, legislation authored by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), to require the VA to work with military physicians to develop and disseminate education and training programs on the medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities. Under this provision, the VA would also disseminate training programs to health professions, students, graduate medical education trainees, and active health practitioners.

H.R. 3253 also contains an internal organizational provision proposed by the VA to add an additional Assistant Secretary for preparedness, security and law enforcement functions.

Mr. Speaker, in the ongoing war on terrorism, America must take every precaution to protect our citizens from all dangers and especially from biological, chemical, and radiological threats. H.R. 3253 is just one way, I think it is an important way, to use the existing strength of the VA in homeland security while continuing to meet its primary mission of providing care to our veterans.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3253, the Department of Veterans Affairs Emergency Preparedness Research, Education, and Bioterrorism Prevention Act of 2002. Many Members have contributed to the development of this important legislation. In particular, I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH); the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health; and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

H.R. 3253, as amended, would establish at least four medical emergency preparedness centers in VA facilities. These centers would conduct research and develop methods to detect, diagnose, vaccinate, protect, and treat chemical, biological, and radiological threats to our public health and safety.

Under H.R. 3253, the VA will also provide education, training and advice to health care professionals, including health care professionals outside the Veterans Health Administration on these matters. The VA will also provide rapid response laboratory assistance to local health care authorities.

The VA is authorized to develop a series of model education and training programs on medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities.

□ 1415

H.R. 3253 also increases the number of Assistant Secretaries within the VA from six to seven. The responsibilities of the new Assistant Secretary will include operations, preparedness, security, and law enforcement functions.

This is sound legislation. This is sensible legislation. This is needed legislation. I urge my colleagues to strongly support this measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his enthusiastic and incredible farsightedness in sponsoring this legislation which will set up, as we have heard, four new emergency medical preparedness centers within the Department of Veterans Affairs. These centers obviously expand what is already a leadership role in the areas of emergency preparedness, research, education and prevention of bioterrorism and is consistent with the challenges that VA is already meeting at both the local and national level.

In the immediate aftermath of the events of September 11, the VA, of course, was front and center, contributing its expertise wherever possible, especially in the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder in New York City and right here in our own backyard. VA research has long been recognized as ground breaking, with benefits that extend beyond our reach and improve the lives of veterans and countless others. As we have heard from our chairman at the VA medical center in my hometown of San Diego, they have found a promising treatment for smallpox. This kind of effort will save potentially thousands of lives and highlights the kind of contributions that the VA is already making to our public health and safety.

We should take VA's existing infrastructure and strengths to even greater heights. That is what H.R. 3253 does. At earlier meetings of our subcommittee and committee, concerns were expressed whether the funding for these new centers would impinge on the funding of our already-strapped funds for our veterans and their medical and benefit needs now. I was glad to hear that the chairman has said that the cost of these centers will come from antiterrorist funds already appropriated.

With that concern met, I think we should all vote for H.R. 3253. It will help us prepare for the future. Let us support this measure.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas

(Mr. MORAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, since September 11, our Nation has been made to reevaluate every action we undertake on a daily basis. What we once considered a safe Nation has become a people concerned about security, and they look to Congress and the President for answers.

With the bill we will pass today, H.R. 3253, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is challenging the Veterans Administration with the task to address some of our new concerns: to use a fraction of the assets of the Department of Veterans Affairs to help protect the people of the United States from terrorists.

We will charge the administration with this task because we believe it is one that they can readily handle. We must be proactive in preparing the United States for a future terrorist attack. As our Vice President said just yesterday, "The prospects of a future attack against the United States are almost certain. Not a matter of if but when. It could happen tomorrow, it could happen next week, it could happen next year, but they will keep trying." Those are sobering thoughts.

We must respond in a timely, effective, and comprehensive manner to protect the American people if and when an attack occurs. This bill would do just that.

Under this bill at least four geographically separated national medical emergency preparedness centers would be established. Each center would independently study and work toward solutions to health consequences that arise from exposure to chemical, biological, and nuclear substances used as weapons. What makes the VA a good host for such a new and important mission? In addition to meeting its medical care mission to millions of veterans, the VA health care system is the Nation's largest provider of graduate medical education and a major contributor to biomedical and other scientific research. Because of this widely dispersed, integrated health care system, the VA can be an essential asset in responding to national emergencies.

Not only would the four special centers conduct research and develop methods of detection, diagnosis, vaccination, and treatment for chemical, biological, and radiological threats but they would also be charged with dissemination of the latest information to other public and private health care providers to improve the quality of care for patients who may be exposed to these deadly elements.

This bill would also require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to develop and disseminate model education and training programs on the medical responses to terrorist activities. VA's infrastructure, which includes affiliations with over 107 medical schools and other schools of health professions, would enable current and future medical professionals in this

country to be knowledgeable and medically competent in the treatment of casualties from terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a definite win-win proposition. The people who need to be trained in saving lives will be properly armed with current information and education. Mechanisms will be put in place to study the likely avenues and methods of chemical, biological, and radiological poisoning; and the VA will be a part of a firm foundation for rapid response by local and Federal officials in types of emergency that only 18 months ago we could have scarcely imagined.

H.R. 3253 is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his efforts in this regard. I urge all my colleagues to support this effort and hope that it will pay a large dividend in our war on terrorism.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3253, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me conclude and thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) for managing the bill on the floor; I thank my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health for his leadership; I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for his leadership; and I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) who is our ranking member. We have worked hand in glove on these veterans issues. It has been a delight to work with him on this important legislation.

I also want to thank our staff. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, without the staff, committees would not function. They are hard working and very, very competent. They are professionals in every sense of that word. I want to thank Pat Ryan, our chief counsel and chief of staff; Kingston Smith; Jeannie McNally, who is our coordinator for legislation—by the way, it is her birthday, and I want to extend her a happy birthday—I also want to thank Summer Larson; John Bradley, who is the staff director for the subcommittee; Kimberly Cowins; Stacy Zelenski; Mike Durishin; Kathleen Grove; Art Wu; Veronica Crowe; Johnathan McKay; Bernadine Dotson; Andy Napoli; and Peter Dickinson; and others, all of whom played a vital role in this legislation. I hope I did not leave anyone out.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3253, the "Department of Veterans Affairs Emergency

Preparedness Research, Education, and Bio-Terrorism Prevention Act of 2002," introduced by Chairman CHRIS SMITH. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I want to thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership in moving this legislation forward.

H.R. 3253 will establish at least four medical emergency preparedness centers at designated VA medical centers. These centers will be charged with carrying out research related to bio-terrorist activities such as the detection, diagnosis, and treatment of chemical, biological, and radiological threats posed by these agents.

Section 3 incorporates legislation that I introduced—H.R. 3254, the "Medical Education for National Defense (MEND) Act in the 21st Century." I want to thank Chairman Smith for incorporating this language into H.R. 3253. I also want to thank the members who cosponsored my original piece of legislation, Chairman SMITH, and Representatives MICHAEL BILIRAKIS, JOHN MCHUGH, VIC SNYDER, CLIFF STEARNS, DAVE WELDON, ROBERT UNDERWOOD, MARK KIRK, and ELLEN TAUSCHER.

This provision would establish an education program to be carried out through the Department of Veterans Affairs. The education and training curriculum developed under the program shall be modeled after the F. Edward Herbert School of Medicine of the Department of Defense's Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS) core curriculum, which includes a program that teaches its students how to diagnose and treat casualties that have been exposed to chemical, biological, or radiological agents.

As a nation, we must be prepared for the new face of terror as we confront the aftermath of the September 11th attacks. What has become all too clear is that our health care providers are neither resourced nor trained with the proper tools to diagnose and treat casualties in the face of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

It is imperative that a program be disseminated to the nation's medical professionals and current medical students. This bill takes advantage of the nexus that already exists between the medical education community and the VA. Currently, 107 medical universities are affiliated with a VA medical center. This nexus is already in place and that is what we plan to tap into.

The VA's extensive infrastructure of 163 medical centers, 800 clinics, and satellite broadcast capabilities, will enable the current and future medical professionals in this country to become knowledgeable and medically competent in the treatment of casualties that we all hope they will never materialize.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to assume that our country will never again experience a biological, chemical, or radiological attack on the American people. We must, as elected Members, sent by our constituents to Washington to represent their interests, act to ensure that if the worst of fears are realized, our medical professionals will be ready and able to deal with these situations.

It is not the intent of this legislation to create new community standards of practice. We must recognize that diseases such as smallpox, botulism, and the plague are not normally seen around the country. I think it is extremely important that we disseminate the expertise that we have, so that doctors, in their diagnostic analysis, begin to think about other

things from what they normally see in their family practices.

The American Medical Association endorsed H.R. 3254, and the American Association of Medical Colleges has thrown its full weight behind this plan. These two organizations know how vital it is to receive an educational curriculum, and they have recognized that the VA is in a unique position to be able to disseminate this information to the Nation's medical community.

It is often said that knowledge is power, and in this instance nothing could be truer. The knowledge resulting from the implementation of this act is critical. Our medical professionals need to be exposed to training methods that would enable them to save lives . . . and I can think of no greater power than that.

Please, join with me and support this important piece of legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lend my voice to the National Medical Emergency Preparedness Act.

This bill directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish up to four medical emergency preparedness centers within VA medical centers. These preparedness centers are established to research diagnosis and treatment for any chemical, biological, and radiological threats to public health and safety. In addition, these centers will train and advise as well as educate health-care professionals about chemical, biological, and radiological threats to public health and safety.

This bill would authorize \$20 million a year over the 2003–2007 period to operate these centers. As part of the requirement to provide education and training, this bill would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to carry out a joint program with the Department of Defense (DoD) to develop and disseminate a series of training programs on the medical responses to terrorist activities. This bill would increase the number of Assistant Secretaries within the Department of Veteran Affairs from six to seven with the new assistant secretary being responsible for operations, preparedness, security, and law enforcement functions. As a member of the Democratic Caucus Homeland Security Task Force, I believe our focus should continue to promote effective homeland preparedness and security.

The CBO estimates that implementing this bill would cost \$12 million in this FY2003 and \$87 million over the period 2003–2007. This bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the nation's largest integrated health care network with over 200,000 health care professionals, 163 medical centers, 800 outpatient clinics, 115 medical research centers, affiliations with more than 100 medical schools and has a \$25 billion annual budget.

The VA medical centers are dedicated to providing health care to U.S. military veterans. VA is the federal government's leading provider of direct medical services. The VA medical centers has treated more than 3.4 million patients in 2001.

The VA also operates two War-Related Illness Centers responsible for developing specialized treatments for illnesses and injuries resulting from veterans' wartime exposures, and through its extensive medical and prosthetic research and clinical care programs the department has expertise in diagnosing and

treating dangerous viral or bacterial illnesses, such as hepatitis C, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and in earlier generations, tuberculosis.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3253.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3253, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

VETERANS' MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4514) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out construction projects for the purpose of improving, renovating, and updating patient care facilities at Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4514

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 "Veterans' Major Medical Facilities Construction Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects, with each project to be carried out in an amount not to exceed the amount specified for that project:

(1) Seismic corrections at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Palo Alto, California, as follows:

- (A) Building Number 2, \$14,020,000.
- (B) Building Number 4, \$21,750,000.

(2) Seismic correction at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Francisco, California, \$31,000,000.

(3) Seismic correction at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, West Los Angeles, California, \$27,200,000.

(4) Seismic correction and clinical improvement at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Long Beach, California, \$24,600,000.

(5) Seismic correction for Building Number 1 at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, San Diego, California, \$47,100,000.

(6) Ambulatory Surgery and Clinical Consolidation at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio, \$32,500,000.

(7) Consolidation of Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense health and benefits offices, Anchorage Alaska, \$59,000,000.

(8) Ward Renovation at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, West Haven, Connecticut, \$15,300,000.

(9) Ambulatory Care Expansion at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Tampa, Florida, \$18,230,000.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF A MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY LEASE.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into a lease for a Satellite Outpatient Clinic, Charlotte, North Carolina, in an amount not to exceed \$2,626,000.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2003—

(1) for the Construction, Major Projects, account \$285,000,000 for the projects authorized in section 2; and

(2) for the Medical Care account, \$2,626,000 for the lease authorized in section 3.

(b) *LIMITATION.*—The projects authorized in section 2 may only be carried out using—

(1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 2003 pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a);

(2) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2003 that remain available for obligation; and

(3) funds appropriated for Construction, Major Projects, for fiscal year 2003 for a category of activity not specific to a project.

SEC. [4.] 5. INCREASE IN THRESHOLD FOR MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) *INCREASE IN THRESHOLD.*—Section 8104(a)(3)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$4,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

(b) *APPLICABILITY TO PROJECTS ALREADY FUNDED.*—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any facility project of the Department of Veterans Affairs, except for a project for which the Secretary obligated funds before October 1, 2002.

SEC. [5.] 6. CRITERIA FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 8103 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) *PURPOSE OF MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.*—In selecting medical facilities (including research facilities) for projects under subsection (a) other than major medical facility projects subject to section 8104 of this title, the Secretary [shall] shall, to the extent practicable, select projects to improve, replace, renovate, or update facilities to achieve one or more of the following:

“(1) Seismic protection improvements related to patient safety (or, in the case of a research facility, patient or employee safety).

“(2) Fire safety improvements.

“(3) Improvements to utility systems and ancillary patient care facilities (including such systems and facilities that may be exclusively associated with research facilities).

“(4) Improved accommodation for persons with disabilities, including barrier-free access.

“(5) Improvements at patient care facilities to specialized programs of the Department, including the following:

“(A) Blind rehabilitation centers.

“(B) Inpatient and residential programs for seriously mentally ill veterans, including mental illness research, education, and clinical centers.

“(C) Residential and rehabilitation programs for veterans with substance-use disorders.

“(D) Physical medicine and rehabilitation activities.

“(E) Long-term care, including geriatric research, education, and clinical centers, adult day care centers, and nursing home care facilities.

“(F) Amputation care, including facilities for prosthetics, orthotics programs, and sensory aids.

“(G) Spinal cord injury centers.

“(H) Traumatic brain injury programs.

“(I) Women veterans’ health programs (including particularly programs involving privacy and accommodation for female patients).

“(J) Facilities for hospice and palliative care programs.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4514, as amended, the Veterans’ Major Medical Facilities Construction Act of 2002. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee for authoring this very important piece of legislation.

H.R. 4514, as amended, Mr. Speaker, would authorize \$285 million in major medical appropriations for 10 construction projects at VA health care facilities, and would also authorize a capital lease at the VA outpatient clinic in Charlotte, North Carolina. At the outset, let me remind my colleagues that we included funding in the budget resolution that was approved in March to cover the costs of this much-needed construction.

Mr. Speaker, last year this body passed H.R. 811, the Veterans Hospital Emergency Repair Act, to provide emergency funding to VA health care and research facilities for repairs and renovations. H.R. 811 would have provided \$550 million over 2 years to make needed repairs at the VA hospitals where patient safety could be compromised, such as for seismic dangers. Under that legislation, the decision of which projects would be funded was left to the Secretary with the advice of an expert panel. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has not acted on this measure and as a consequence, VA’s health care infrastructure continues to deteriorate, which is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, a recent PriceWaterhouse study estimated that the physical assets of the VA were worth more than \$35 billion and that normal replacement, repair and non-recurring expenses of such a large infrastructure should normally be between 2 and 4 percent annually, for a total of between \$700 million and \$1.4 billion per year. We are nowhere near

that. As a matter of fact, we have not been doing any of that for the last several years, or at least not much of it. It would be irresponsible to allow such a massive and valuable national asset as the VA health care system to decline for want of care. Since the Senate has not moved on our 2-year authorization, I am so glad and pleased that our chairman has decided to step up to the plate and offer this important legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced H.R. 4514, the Veterans’ Major Medical Facilities Construction Act of 2002, a bill to improve, renovate and update 10 VA medical facility construction projects with \$285 million in authorizations to fund them in fiscal year 2003. This bill will help provide safe, accessible VA medical centers for veterans to receive their health care.

Some of these VA medical centers have been around for more than 100 years. The Veterans Administration cares for millions of veterans. These aging facilities are deteriorating and must be maintained. As Chairman Smith indicated, the VA is not moving fast enough with the CARES system to meet their infrastructure needs. The facility improvement projects we would authorize with this bill are VA’s highest construction priorities: corrections to fire safety and seismic risks in Palo Alto; replacement of mechanical and electrical equipment in Cleveland; seismic bracing in San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego; asbestos abatement and various in-patient facility improvements in Tampa; patient privacy improvements in West Haven.

These are but a few of the VA’s most pressing capital investment needs. Many projects involve seismic correction or systemic improvements, and all of them focus on patient safety, more efficient delivery of health care services and a better VA health care system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to favorably consider this measure and to approve these projects for these 10 hospitals and clinics in which veterans receive their health care. This bill is paid for, Mr. Speaker, because the concurrent resolution on the budget includes sufficient funding to support this level of construction and maintenance activity in fiscal year 2003.

This bill is a reasonable and responsible measure to improve the VA’s health care infrastructure at these 10 sites. America’s veterans deserve and need quality health care in modern facilities. This will help us attain those modern facilities.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4514, as amended, the Veterans' Major Medical Facilities Construction Act of 2002. This measure authorizes funding required for 10 of the most important major construction projects identified by the Department of Veterans Affairs. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his strong leadership in support of major VA construction projects. Improving the infrastructure of VA medical centers has been a high priority of our chairman; and his concern and commitment to veterans is recognized and appreciated. I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member; the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN); and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for their important contributions to this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, veterans should not be forced to obtain the medical care they need in unsafe and potentially dangerous facilities. While this is a good measure deserving the support of all Members, it only begins to address the need for major construction in our VA medical care facilities.

□ 1430

Veterans are not second-class citizens and their health care facilities should not be second class or worse. I am hopeful that construction projects authorized by this legislation will proceed without undue delay and that the administration will request and provide more funding in its next budget so other serious building deficiencies can also be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4514, as amended.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to thank our professional staff again for the hard work that they have done on all of these bills before us. I especially want to call the attention of the House to, and thank, Mrs. Kimberly Cowins, who will be leaving the committee's majority staff at the end of this month for a new opportunity in Southern California.

Mrs. Cowins has been the consummate professional as a staff member of our Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. She was instrumental in our work last year that led to passage of the Homeless Assistance and Health Care Benefits Acts, and she has been a major contributor this year to the health legislation that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Cowins devoted 10 years in serving as a medic in the United States Navy, including duty at facilities in Great Lakes, Jacksonville, Corpus Christi, my own facility of Lakehurst, New Jersey, and Orlando Navy hospitals.

After leaving active duty, she worked in the health care systems of the VA and in the private sector prior to joining our staff. She holds a bachelor's degree in biology from Ryder University, which used to be in my district, and a master's in public administration from Texas A&M University.

Mrs. Cowins is returning to the Navy in San Diego as the business manager of pediatrics at the Balboa Navy Hospital. Mr. Speaker, Balboa's gain is a significant loss for our committee, because of her intelligence, positive attitude, experience and good humor.

We wish Mrs. Cowins and her family every blessing under heaven, and good fortune in her future endeavors. We know with confidence she will achieve the same level of excellence in her work at Balboa Navy Hospital as she did in her congressional service to America's veterans.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. 4514, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, I thank the chairman for bringing us this bill, and I thank especially the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), for making sure that we had this bill passed in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the chairman for his kind words about Ms. Cowins. We are looking forward to seeing her in San Diego. I am sorry the Navy got her. I wanted to hire her for a job here. But we will see if they can keep her there.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about how necessary this construction is for the VA and how critical the construction needs are for our health facilities. There has been a gross underfunding of VA facilities for the past decade, and this is meant to start to catch up.

The average age of our VA facilities is over a half century old. An aging infrastructure, like aging bodies, needs more than a band-aid and an aspirin. So this would allow the VA to carry out 10 major construction projects.

I was pleased to know that 3 of these are in California, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs said, in San Francisco and Los Angeles and

in my hometown of San Diego, and I am pleased and relieved that we are able to do this for the San Diego Medical Center in San Diego County. In fact, this is one of the 6 health care facilities that will be authorized to meet safety codes in the event of an earthquake. The projects would improve the structural integrity of a building that serves a growing metropolitan veteran population each year and houses almost 2,500 VA employees.

This bill would also raise the threshold for what are called major construction projects to those that cost more than \$6 million, thus allowing the Secretary more flexibility for approving minor construction projects and keeping pace with the rising cost of construction across the country. I believe that we have an obligation to help the VA maintain a safe and decent health care system.

I would also urge our committee to consider legislation down the line to meet new needs in our National Cemetery System. While the VA does not have enough funds to meet the needs around the country, I would urge upon our committee to examine new ways of looking at this. For example, in San Diego, 2 private cemeteries have agreed to cede over to the Veterans Administration land on which veterans from San Diego could be buried. We have called these satellite cemeteries, and we will be introducing legislation to try to get these authorized in the coming year.

While the VA administration has tentatively said that that gives them new bureaucratic problems, I believe that veterans around this Nation deserve an honorable burial right in their hometowns. If we have to find new ways to do that, then this House ought to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are here to approve H.R. 4514. Our veterans deserve no less, and I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4514, the Veterans Major Medical Facilities Act.

This bill authorizes ten projects to improve, renovate and update patient care facilities at Veterans' Affairs (VA) medical centers.

H.R. 4514 establishes criteria for selection of minor construction projects. These criteria would provide a higher priority for seismic protection and fire safety, as well as improvements to VA utility systems and ancillary patient care facilities.

Moreover, I am especially supportive of the provisions that provide additional accommodations for persons with disabilities; blind rehabilitation centers; programs for the seriously mentally ill patients; rehabilitation programs for substance abuse; physical medicine and rehabilitation activities; amputee care; spinal cord injury centers; traumatic brain injury programs; women's health programs; and facilities for hospice and palliative care.

These medical problems plague many in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and many around the nation. Let us support this legislation to improve healthcare for our veterans.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill on the floor today will significantly improve the lives of the veterans who have served us so honorably.

H.R. 4514, Veterans Major Medical Facilities Construction Act, provides an increase to the Veterans Administration to improve patient care facilities. This bill is targeted at specified medical facility projects in California, Ohio, Alaska, Connecticut and Florida. It authorizes ten projects to improve, renovate and update patient care facilities at VA medical centers in these five states. The measure sets specific authorizations for each project in FY 2003 and an overall authorization of \$285 million in FY 2003 for all ten projects. The much needed improvements in patient care at these facilities will include accommodations for veterans with disabilities, blind rehabilitation centers, programs for seriously mentally ill patients, rehabilitation programs for substance abuse, and facilities for hospice care.

My colleagues may recall that when we were debating the rule for the Defense Authorization Act earlier this month, I expressed concerns about the projected rise in the number of veterans and retirees over the next few years, especially those over the age of 65.

Caring for these Americans in the coming years will be one of the greatest challenges facing the military health care system and the Veterans Administration.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4514, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4015) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4015

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Jobs for Veterans Act".

(b) **REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is

expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; references to title 38, United States Code.

Sec. 2. Priority of service for veterans in Department of Labor job training programs.

Sec. 3. Performance incentive awards for quality veterans employment, training, and placement services.

Sec. 4. Refinement of job training and placement functions of the Department.

Sec. 5. Additional improvements in veterans employment and training services.

Sec. 6. Committee to raise employer awareness of skills of veterans and benefits of hiring veterans.

Sec. 7. Sense of Congress commending veterans and military service organizations.

Sec. 8. Study on economic benefits to the United States of long-term sustained employment of veterans.

SEC. 2. PRIORITY OF SERVICE FOR VETERANS IN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS.

(a) **VETERANS' JOB TRAINING ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 42 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§4215. Priority of service for veterans in Department of Labor job training programs

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) The term 'covered person' means any of the following individuals:

"(A) A veteran.

"(B) The spouse of any of the following individuals:

"(i) Any veteran who died of a service-connected disability.

"(ii) Any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty who, at the time of application for assistance under this section, is listed, pursuant to section 556 of title 37 and regulations issued thereunder, by the Secretary concerned in one or more of the following categories and has been so listed for a total of more than 90 days: (I) missing in action, (II) captured in line of duty by a hostile force, or (III) forcibly detained or interned in line of duty by a foreign government or power.

"(iii) Any veteran who has a total disability resulting from a service-connected disability.

"(iv) Any veteran who died while a disability so evaluated was in existence.

"(2) The term 'qualified job training program' means any workforce preparation, development, or delivery program or service that is directly funded, in whole or in part, by the Department of Labor and includes the following:

"(A) Any such program or service that uses technology to assist individuals to access workforce development programs (such as job and training opportunities, labor market information, career assessment tools, and related support services).

"(B) Any such program or service under the public employment service system, one-stop career centers, the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, a demonstration or other temporary program, and those programs implemented by States or local service providers based on Federal block grants administered by the Department of Labor.

"(C) Any such program or service that is a workforce development program targeted to specific groups.

"(3) The term 'priority of service' means, with respect to any qualified job training program, that a covered person shall be given priority over nonveterans for the receipt of employment, training, and placement services provided under that program, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"(b) ENTITLEMENT TO PRIORITY OF SERVICE.—
(1) A covered person is entitled to priority of service under any qualified job training program if the person otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for participation in such program.

"(2) The Secretary of Labor may establish priorities among covered persons for purposes of this section to take into account the needs of disabled veterans and special disabled veterans, and such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS AT STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS.—An entity of a State or a political subdivision of the State that administers or delivers services under a qualified job training program shall—

"(1) provide information and priority of service to covered persons regarding benefits and services that may be obtained through other entities or service providers; and

"(2) ensure that each covered person who applies to or who is assisted by such a program is informed of the employment-related rights and benefits to which the person is entitled under this section.

"(d) ADDITION TO ANNUAL REPORT.—In the annual report required under section 4107(c) of this title for the program year beginning in 2002 and each subsequent program year, the Secretary of Labor shall evaluate whether covered persons are receiving priority of service and are being fully served by qualified job training programs, and whether the levels of service of such programs are in proportion to the incidence of representation of veterans in the labor market, including within groups that the Secretary may designate for priority under such programs, if any."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 42 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4214 the following new item:

"4215. Priority of service for veterans in Department of Labor job training programs."

(b) EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4212(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Any contract in the amount of \$100,000 or more entered into by any department or agency of the United States for the procurement of personal property and nonpersonal services (including construction) for the United States, shall contain a provision requiring that the party contracting with the United States take affirmative action to employ and advance in employment qualified covered veterans. This section applies to any subcontract entered into by a prime contractor in carrying out any such contract.

"(2) In addition to requiring affirmative action to employ such qualified covered veterans under such contracts and subcontracts and in order to promote the implementation of such requirement, the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe regulations requiring that—

"(A) each such contractor for each such contract shall immediately list all of its employment openings with the appropriate employment service delivery system (as defined in section 4101(7) of this title), and may also list such openings with one-stop career centers under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, other appropriate service delivery points, or America's Job Bank (or any additional or subsequent national electronic job bank established by the Department of Labor), except that the contractor may exclude openings for executive and senior management positions and positions which are to be filled from within the contractor's organization and positions lasting three days or less;

"(B) each such employment service delivery system shall give such qualified covered veterans priority in referral to such employment openings; and

"(C) each such employment service delivery system shall provide a list of such employment

openings to States, political subdivisions of States, or any private entities or organizations under contract to carry out employment, training, and placement services under chapter 41 of this title.

“(3) In this section:

“(A) The term ‘covered veteran’ means any of the following veterans:

“(i) Disabled veterans.

“(ii) Veterans who served on active duty in the Armed Forces during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized.

“(iii) Veterans who, while serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, participated in a United States military operation for which an Armed Forces service medal was awarded pursuant to Executive Order 12985 (61 Fed. Reg. 1209).

“(iv) Recently separated veterans.

“(B) The term ‘qualified’, with respect to an employment position, means having the ability to perform the essential functions of the position with or without reasonable accommodation for an individual with a disability.”

(2) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 4212(c) is amended—

(i) by striking “suitable”; and

(ii) by striking “subsection (a)(2) of this section” and inserting “subsection (a)(2)(B)”.

(B) Section 4212(d)(1) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of this section” after “subsection (a)”; and

(ii) by amending subparagraphs (A) and (B) to read as follows:

“(A) the number of employees in the workforce of such contractor, by job category and hiring location, and the number of such employees, by job category and hiring location, who are qualified covered veterans;

“(B) the total number of new employees hired by the contractor during the period covered by the report and the number of such employees who are qualified covered veterans; and”.

(C) Section 4212(d)(2) is amended by striking “of this subsection” after “paragraph (1)”.

(D) Section 4211(6) is amended by striking “one-year period” and inserting “three-year period”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to contracts entered into on or after the first day of the first month that begins 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) EMPLOYMENT WITHIN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The second sentence of section 4214(a)(1) is amended—

(A) by inserting “, competent” after “effective”; and

(B) by striking “major” and inserting “uniquely qualified”.

(2) APPOINTMENTS.—Section 4214(b) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “readjustment” and inserting “recruitment”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “to—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “to qualified covered veterans.”;

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively,

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking “The limitations of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph” and inserting “The limitation of subparagraph (A)”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking “clause (i) of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”;

(v) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, the following new subparagraph:

“(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a qualified covered veteran may receive such an appointment only within the 10-year period that begins on the date of the veteran’s last discharge or release from active duty.”

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 4214(a) is amended—

(i) in the third sentence of paragraph (1), by striking “disabled veterans and certain veterans of the Vietnam era and of the post-Vietnam era” and inserting “qualified covered veterans (as defined in paragraph (2)(B))”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(2) In this section:

“(A) The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘department or agency’ in section 4211(5) of this title.

“(B) The term ‘qualified covered veteran’ means a veteran described in section 4212(a)(3) of this title.”

(B) Clause (i) of section 4214(e)(2)(B) is amended by striking “of the Vietnam era”.

(C) Section 4214(g) is amended by striking “qualified” the first place it occurs and all that follows through “era” the first place it occurs and inserting “qualified covered veterans”.

SEC. 3. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE AWARDS FOR QUALITY VETERANS EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, AND PLACEMENT SERVICES.

(a) PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE AWARDS FOR QUALITY EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING, AND PLACEMENT SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 41 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§4112. Performance incentive awards for quality employment, training, and placement services

“(a) PROGRAM OF PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE AWARDS.—(1) The Secretary shall carry out a program, consistent with the provisions of this section, of performance incentive awards to States to encourage the improvement and modernization of employment, training, and placement services provided under this chapter. The Secretary shall carry out the program through the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training.

“(2) The Secretary shall make performance incentive awards for each program year, beginning with the program year that begins in fiscal year 2004, with respect to services provided under this chapter during the preceding program year.

“(b) CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for eligibility for performance incentive awards for purposes of this section in consultation with representatives of States, political subdivisions of States, and other providers of employment, training, and placement services under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 consistent with the performance measures established under section 4102A(b)(7) of this title.

“(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF AWARD.—(1) The Secretary shall determine the amount of performance incentive awards in a State under this section by measuring the performance of the State in providing employment, training, and placement services furnished veterans and eligible persons in each State through employment service delivery systems, through disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists, and through local veterans’ employment representatives during the previous program year based on the measures of performance established under section 4102A(b)(7) of this title.

“(2) In determining the amount of awards under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide greater amounts to those States which the Secretary determines furnished, during the preceding fiscal year, the highest quality employment, training, and placement services based on measures of performance;

“(B) provide awards to those States that have made significant improvements in the delivery of such services, as determined by the Secretary, but do not meet the criteria under subparagraph (A); and

“(C) consider the applicable annual unemployment data for the State and other factors, such as prevailing economic conditions, that af-

fect performance of individuals providing employment, training, and placement services in the State.

“(d) USE OF AWARD.—Amounts received by a State under this section may be used—

“(1) to hire additional State veterans employment and training staff; or

“(2) for such other purposes related to the provision of employment, placement, and training services as the Secretary may approve for such services furnished under this chapter to veterans and eligible persons.

“(e) RELATIONSHIP OF AWARD TO GRANT AMOUNTS OR OTHER COMPENSATION.—A performance incentive award under this section is in addition to amounts made available to a State under section 4102A(b)(5) of this title.

“(f) AVAILABILITY FOR OBLIGATION.—Amounts received in a performance incentive award under this section may be obligated by the State during the program year in which the award was received and the subsequent program year.

“(g) APPROPRIATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the program under this section from amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization under section 4106(b)(2) of this title. Such amounts shall only be available to carry out the program under this section.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“4112. Performance incentive awards for quality employment, training, and placement services.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 4106(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(b)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out the program of performance incentive awards under section 4112 of this title the following:

“(A) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2004, \$10,000,000.

“(B) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2005, \$25,000,000.

“(C) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2006, \$50,000,000.

“(D) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2007, \$75,000,000.

“(E) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2008, \$100,000,000.

“(F) For the program year beginning during fiscal year 2009 and each subsequent fiscal year, such sums as are necessary.”

SEC. 4. REFINEMENT OF JOB TRAINING AND PLACEMENT FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT.

(a) REVISION OF DEPARTMENT LEVEL SENIOR OFFICIALS AND FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 4102A and 4103 are amended to read as follows:

“§4102A. Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training; program functions; Regional Administrators

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR FOR VETERANS’ EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—(1) There is established within the Department of Labor an Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall formulate and implement all departmental policies and procedures to carry out (A) the purposes of this chapter, chapter 42, and chapter 43 of this title, and (B) all other Department of Labor employment, unemployment, and training programs to the extent they affect veterans. The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training shall be a veteran.

“(2) The employees of the Department of Labor administering chapter 43 of this title shall

be administratively and functionally responsible to the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

“(3)(A) There shall be within the Department of Labor a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training. The Deputy Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training prescribes. The Deputy Assistant Secretary shall be a veteran.

“(B) No individual may be appointed as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training unless the individual has at least five years of continuous service in the Federal civil service in the executive branch immediately preceding appointment as the Deputy Assistant Secretary. For purposes of determining such continuous service of an individual, there shall be excluded any service by the individual in a position—

“(i) of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character;

“(ii) in which the individual served as a non-career appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as such term is defined in section 3132(a)(7) of title 5; or

“(iii) to which the individual was appointed by the President.

“(b) PROGRAM FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the following functions:

“(1) Except as expressly provided otherwise, carry out all provisions of this chapter and chapter 43 of this title through the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training and administer through such Assistant Secretary all programs under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for the provision of employment and training services designed to meet the needs of all veterans and persons eligible for services furnished under this chapter.

“(2) In order to make maximum use of available resources in meeting such needs, encourage all such programs, and all grantees and contractors under such programs to enter into cooperative arrangements with private industry and business concerns (including small business concerns owned by veterans or disabled veterans), educational institutions, trade associations, and labor unions.

“(3) Ensure that maximum effectiveness and efficiency are achieved in providing services and assistance to eligible veterans under all such programs by coordinating and consulting with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to (A) programs conducted under other provisions of this title, with particular emphasis on coordination of such programs with readjustment counseling activities carried out under section 1712A of this title, apprenticeship or other on-the-job training programs carried out under section 3687 of this title, and rehabilitation and training activities carried out under chapter 31 of this title and (B) determinations covering veteran population in a State.

“(4) Ensure that employment, training, and placement activities are carried out in coordination and cooperation with appropriate State public employment service officials.

“(5) Subject to subsection (c), make available for use in each State by grant or contract such funds as may be necessary to support—

“(A) disabled veterans' outreach program specialists appointed under section 4103A(a)(1) of this title,

“(B) local veterans' employment representatives assigned under section 4104(b) of this title, and

“(C) the reasonable expenses of such specialists and representatives described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, for training, travel, supplies, and other business expenses, including travel expenses and per diem for attendance at the National Veterans' Employment and Training Services Institute established under section 4109 of this title.

“(6) Monitor and supervise on a continuing basis the distribution and use of funds provided for use in the States under paragraph (5).

“(7) Establish, and update as appropriate, a comprehensive performance accountability system (as described in subsection (f)) and carry out annual performance reviews of veterans employment, training, and placement services provided through employment service delivery systems, through disabled veterans' outreach program specialists, and through local veterans' employment representatives in States receiving grants, contracts, or awards under this chapter.

“(c) CONDITIONS FOR RECEIPT OF FUNDS.—(1) The distribution and use of funds under subsection (b)(5) in order to carry out sections 4103A(a) and 4104(a) of this title shall be subject to the continuing supervision and monitoring of the Secretary and shall not be governed by the provisions of any other law, or any regulations prescribed thereunder, that are inconsistent with this section or section 4103A or 4104 of this title.

“(2)(A) A State shall submit to the Secretary an application for a grant or contract under subsection (b)(5). The application shall contain the following information:

“(i) A plan that describes the manner in which the State shall furnish employment, training, and placement services required under this chapter for the program year, including a description of—

“(I) duties assigned by the State to disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives consistent with the requirements of sections 4103A and 4104 of this title; and

“(II) the manner in which such specialists and representatives are integrated in the employment service delivery systems in the State.

“(ii) The veteran population to be served.

“(iii) Such additional information as the Secretary may require to make a determination with respect to awarding a grant or contract to the State.

“(B)(i) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subparagraph, of the amount available under subsection (b)(5) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available to each State with an application approved by the Secretary an amount of funding in proportion to the number of veterans seeking employment using such criteria as the Secretary may establish in regulation, including civilian labor force and unemployment data, for the State on an annual basis. The proportion of funding shall reflect the ratio of—

“(I) the total number of veterans residing in the State that are seeking employment; to

“(II) the total number of veterans seeking employment in all States.

“(ii) The Secretary shall phase in over the three fiscal-year period that begins on October 1, 2002, the manner in which amounts are made available to States under subsection (b)(5) and this subsection, as amended by the Jobs for Veterans Act.

“(iii) In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary may establish minimum funding levels and hold-harmless criteria for States.

“(3)(A) As a condition of a grant or contract under this section for a program year, in the case of a State that the Secretary determines has an entered-employment rate for veterans that is deficient for the preceding program year, the State shall develop and implement a corrective action plan to improve that rate for veterans in the State. The State shall submit the corrective action plan to the Secretary.

“(B) To carry out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall establish in regulations a uniform national threshold entered-employment rate for veterans for a program year by which determinations of deficiency may be made under subparagraph (A).

“(C) In making a determination with respect to a deficiency under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into account the applicable annual unemployment data for the State and consider other factors, such as prevailing economic conditions, that affect performance of in-

dividuals providing employment, training, and placement services in the State.

“(4) In determining the terms and conditions of a grant or contract under which funds are made available to a State in order to carry out section 4103A or 4104 of this title, the Secretary shall take into account—

“(A) the results of reviews, carried out pursuant to subsection (b)(7), of the performance of the employment, training, and placement service delivery system in the State, and

“(B) the monitoring carried out under this section.

“(5) Each grant or contract by which funds are made available to a State shall contain a provision requiring the recipient of the funds—

“(A) to comply with the provisions of this chapter; and

“(B) on an annual basis, to notify to Secretary of, and provide supporting rationale for, each nonveteran who is employed as a disabled veterans' outreach program specialist and local veterans' employment representative for a period in excess of 6 months.

“(6) Each State shall coordinate employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans and eligible persons under this chapter with such services furnished with respect to such veterans and persons under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the Wagner-Peyser Act.

“(d) PARTICIPATION IN OTHER FEDERALLY FUNDED JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS.—The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training shall promote and monitor participation of qualified veterans and eligible persons in employment and training opportunities under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and other federally funded employment and training programs.

“(e) REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS.—(1) The Secretary shall assign to each region for which the Secretary operates a regional office a representative of the Veterans' Employment and Training Service to serve as the Regional Administrator for Veterans' Employment and Training in such region. A person may not be assigned after October 9, 1996, as such a Regional Administrator unless the person is a veteran.

“(2) Each such Regional Administrator shall carry out such duties as the Secretary may require to promote veterans employment and reemployment within the region that the Administrator serves.

“(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND OUTCOMES MEASURES.—(1) By not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training shall establish and implement a comprehensive performance accountability system to measure the performance of employment service delivery systems, disabled veterans' outreach program specialists, and local veterans' employment representatives providing employment, training, and placement services under this chapter in a State to provide accountability of that State to the Secretary for purposes of subsection (c).

“(2) Such standards and measures shall—

“(A) be consistent with State performance measures applicable under section 136(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998; and

“(B) be appropriately weighted to provide special consideration for placement of (i) veterans requiring intensive services (as defined in section 4101(9) of this title), such as special disabled veterans and disabled veterans, and (ii) veterans who enroll in readjustment counseling under section 1712A of this title.

“§4103. Directors and Assistant Directors for Veterans' Employment and Training; additional Federal personnel

“(a) DIRECTORS AND ASSISTANT DIRECTORS.—(1) The Secretary shall assign to each State a representative of the Veterans' Employment and Training Service to serve as the Director for Veterans' Employment and Training, and shall assign full-time Federal clerical or other support personnel to each such Director.

“(2) Full-time Federal clerical or other support personnel assigned to Directors for Veterans’ Employment and Training shall be appointed in accordance with the provisions of title 5 governing appointments in the competitive service and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5.

“(b) ADDITIONAL FEDERAL PERSONNEL.—The Secretary may also assign as supervisory personnel such representatives of the Veterans’ Employment and Training Service as the Secretary determines appropriate to carry out the employment, training, and placement services required under this chapter, including Assistant Directors for Veterans’ Employment and Training.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The items relating to sections 4102A and 4103, respectively, in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 are amended to read as follows:

“4102A. Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training; program functions; Regional Administrators.

“4103. Directors and Assistant Directors for Veterans’ Employment and Training; additional Federal personnel.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—(A)(i) Section 4104A is repealed.

(ii) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 is amended by striking the item relating to section 4104A.

(B) Section 4107(b) is amended by striking “The Secretary shall establish definitive performance standards” and inserting “The Secretary shall apply performance standards established under section 4102A(f) of this title”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on December 1, 2002, and shall apply to appointments made on or after that date.

(b) REVISION OF STATUTORILY DEFINED DUTIES OF DISABLED VETERANS’ OUTREACH PROGRAM SPECIALISTS AND LOCAL VETERANS’ EMPLOYMENT REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) DISABLED VETERANS’ OUTREACH PROGRAM SPECIALISTS.—Section 4103A is amended by striking all after the heading and inserting the following:

“(a) REQUIREMENT FOR EMPLOYMENT BY STATES OF A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF SPECIALISTS.—(1) Subject to approval by the Secretary, a State shall employ such full- or part-time disabled veterans’ outreach program specialists as the State determines appropriate and efficient to carry out intensive services under this chapter to meet the employment needs of eligible veterans with the following priority in the provision of services:

“(A) Special disabled veterans.

“(B) Other disabled veterans.

“(C) Other eligible veterans in accordance with priorities determined by the Secretary taking into account applicable rates of unemployment and the employment emphases set forth in chapter 42 of this title.

“(2) In the provision of services in accordance with this subsection, maximum emphasis in meeting the employment needs of veterans shall be placed on assisting economically or educationally disadvantaged veterans.

“(b) REQUIREMENT FOR QUALIFIED VETERANS.—A State shall, to the maximum extent practicable, employ qualified veterans to carry out the services referred to in subsection (a). Preference shall be given in the appointment of such specialists to qualified disabled veterans.”.

(2) LOCAL VETERANS’ EMPLOYMENT REPRESENTATIVES.—Section 4104 is amended by striking all after the heading and inserting the following:

“(a) REQUIREMENT FOR EMPLOYMENT BY STATES OF A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Subject to approval by the Secretary, a State shall employ such full- and part-time local veterans’ employment representatives as the State determines appropriate and effi-

cient to carry out employment, training, and placement services under this chapter.

“(b) PRINCIPAL DUTIES.—As principal duties, local veterans’ employment representatives shall—

“(1) conduct outreach to employers in the area to assist veterans in gaining employment, including conducting seminars for employers and, in conjunction with employers, conducting job search workshops and establishing job search groups; and

“(2) facilitate employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans in a State under the applicable State employment service delivery systems.

“(c) PREFERENCE FOR QUALIFIED VETERANS.—A State shall, to the maximum extent practicable, employ qualified veterans to carry out the services referred to in subsection (a).

“(d) REPORTING.—Each local veterans’ employment representative shall be administratively responsible to the manager of the employment service delivery system and shall provide reports, not less frequently than quarterly, to the manager of such office and to the Director for Veterans’ Employment and Training for the State regarding compliance with Federal law and regulations with respect to special services and priorities for eligible veterans and eligible persons.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on December 1, 2002, and shall apply to appointments made on or after that date.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO PROMPTLY ESTABLISH ONE-STOP EMPLOYMENT SERVICES.—By not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall provide one-stop services and assistance to covered persons electronically by means of the Internet, as defined in section 231(e)(3) of the Communications Act of 1934, and such other electronic means to enhance the delivery of such services and assistance.

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR BUDGET LINE ITEM FOR TRAINING SERVICES INSTITUTE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The last sentence of section 4106(a) is amended to read as follows: “Each budget submission with respect to such funds shall include a separate listing of the amount for the National Veterans’ Employment and Training Services Institute together with information demonstrating the compliance of such budget submission with the funding requirements specified in the preceding sentence.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and apply to budget submissions for fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 4107(c)(5) is amended by striking “(including the need” and all that follows through “representatives)”.

(2) Section 3117(a)(2)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) utilization of employment, training, and placement services under chapter 41 of this title; and”.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS IN VETERANS’ EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES.

(a) INCLUSION OF INTENSIVE SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Section 4101 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) The term ‘intensive services’ means local employment and training services of the type described in section 134(d)(3) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.”.

(B) Section 4102 is amended by striking “job and job training counseling service program,” and inserting “job and job training intensive services program.”.

(C) Section 4106(a) is amended by striking “proper counseling” and inserting “proper intensive services”.

(D) Section 4107(a) is amended by striking “employment counseling services” and inserting “intensive services”.

(E) Section 4107(c)(1) is amended by striking “the number counseled” and inserting “the number who received intensive services”.

(F) Section 4109(a) is amended by striking “counseling,” each place it appears and inserting “intensive services.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ADDITIONAL VETS DUTY TO IMPLEMENT TRANSITIONS TO CIVILIAN CAREERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Section 4102 is amended by striking the period and inserting “, including programs carried out by the Veterans’ Employment and Training Service to implement all efforts to ease the transition of servicemembers to civilian careers that are consistent with, or an outgrowth of, the military experience of the servicemembers.”.

(B) Such section is further amended by striking “and veterans of the Vietnam era” and inserting “and veterans who served on active duty during a war or in a campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) MODERNIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE DELIVERY POINTS TO INCLUDE TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4101(7) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) The term ‘employment service delivery system’ means a service delivery system at which or through which labor exchange services, including employment, training, and placement services, are offered in accordance with the Wagner-Peyser Act.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) INCREASE IN ACCURACY OF REPORTING SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Section 4107(c)(1) is amended—

(i) by striking “veterans of the Vietnam era,”; and

(ii) by striking “and eligible persons who registered for assistance with” and inserting “eligible persons, recently separated veterans (as defined in section 4211(6) of this title), and servicemembers transitioning to civilian careers who registered for assistance with, or who are identified as veterans by,”.

(B) Section 4107(c)(2) is amended—

(i) by striking “the job placement rate” the first place it appears and inserting “the rate of entered employment (as determined in a manner consistent with State performance measures applicable under section 136(b) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998)”;

(ii) by striking “the job placement rate” the second place it appears and inserting “such rate of entered employment (as so determined)”.

(C) Section 4107(c)(4) is amended by striking “sections 4103A and 4104” and inserting “section 4212(d)”.

(D) Section 4107(c) is amended—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) a report on the operation during the preceding program year of the program of performance incentive awards for quality employment services under section 4112 of this title, including an analysis of the amount of incentives distributed to each State and the rationale for such distribution.”.

(E) Section 4107(b), as amended by section 4(a)(3)(B), is further amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “Not later than February 1 of each year, the Secretary shall report to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the performance of States

and organizations and entities carrying out employment, training, and placement services under this chapter, as measured under subsection (b)(7) of section 4102A of this title. In the case of a State that the Secretary determines has not met the minimum standard of performance (established by the Secretary under subsection (f) of such section), the Secretary shall include an analysis of the extent and reasons for the State's failure to meet that minimum standard, together with the State's plan for corrective action during the succeeding year."

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply to reports for program years beginning on or after July 1, 2002.

(e) **CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF NVETS/IT TO PROVIDE TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.**—Section 4109 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing the Institute to enter into contracts or agreements with departments or agencies of the United States or of a State, or with other organizations, to carry out training of personnel of such departments, agencies, or organizations in the provision of services referred to in subsection (a).

"(2) All proceeds collected by the Institute under a contract or agreement referred to in paragraph (1) shall be applied to the applicable appropriation."

SEC. 6. COMMITTEE TO RAISE EMPLOYER AWARENESS OF SKILLS OF VETERANS AND BENEFITS OF HIRING VETERANS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.**—There is established within the Department of Labor a committee to be known as the President's National Hire Veterans Committee (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Committee").

(b) **DUTIES.**—The Committee shall establish and carry out a national program to do the following:

(1) To furnish information to employers with respect to the training and skills of veterans and disabled veterans, and the advantages afforded employers by hiring veterans with such training and skills.

(2) To facilitate employment of veterans and disabled veterans through participation in America's Career Kit national labor exchange, and other means.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—(1) The Secretary of Labor shall appoint 15 individuals to serve as members of the Committee, of whom one shall be appointed from among representatives nominated by each organization described in subparagraph (A) and of whom eight shall be appointed from among representatives nominated by organizations described in subparagraph (B).

(A) Organizations described in this subparagraph are the following:

- (i) The Ad Council.
- (ii) The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve.
- (iii) Veterans' service organizations that have a national employment program.
- (iv) State employment security agencies.
- (v) One-stop career centers.
- (vi) State departments of veterans affairs.
- (vii) Military service organizations.

(B) Organizations described in this subparagraph are such businesses, small businesses, industries, companies in the private sector that furnish placement services, civic groups, workforce investment boards, and labor unions as the Secretary of Labor determines appropriate.

(2) The following shall be *ex officio*, nonvoting members of the Committee:

- (A) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.
- (B) The Secretary of Defense.
- (C) The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.
- (D) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
- (E) The Postmaster General.
- (F) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(3) A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.**—(1) The Committee shall meet not less frequently than once each calendar quarter.

(2) The Secretary of Labor shall appoint the chairman of the Committee.

(3)(A) Members of the Committee shall serve without compensation.

(B) Members of the Committee shall be allowed reasonable and necessary travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for persons serving intermittently in the Government service in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5 while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of the responsibilities of the Committee.

(4) The Secretary of Labor shall provide staff and administrative support to the Committee to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section. The Secretary shall assure positions on the staff of the Committee include positions that are filled by individuals that are now, or have ever been, employed as one of the following:

(A) Staff of the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training under section 4102A of title 38, United States Code as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Directors for Veterans' Employment and Training under section 4103 of such title as in effect on such date.

(C) Assistant Director for Veterans' Employment and Training under such section as in effect on such date.

(D) Disabled veterans' outreach program specialists under section 4103A of such title as in effect on such date.

(E) Local veterans' employment representatives under section 4104 of such title as in effect on such date.

(5) Upon request of the Committee, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Committee to assist it in carrying out its duties.

(6) The Committee may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons to furnish information to employers under subsection (b)(1) without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5).

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than December 31, 2003, 2004, and 2005, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Committee under this section during the previous fiscal year, and shall include in such report data with respect to placement and retention of veterans in jobs attributable to the activities of the Committee.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The Committee shall terminate 60 days after submitting the report that is due on December 31, 2005.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor from the employment security administration account (established in section 901 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1101)) in the Unemployment Trust Fund \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2005 to carry out this section.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS COMMENDING VETERANS AND MILITARY SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) veterans and military service organizations are to be commended for the continued assistance the organizations provide veterans; and

(2) veterans and military service organizations are encouraged to provide job placement assistance to veterans who are job-ready by making personal computers with access to electronic job placement services and programs available to veterans at local posts and through other means.

SEC. 8. STUDY ON ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO THE UNITED STATES OF LONG-TERM SUSTAINED EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Labor shall enter into a contract with an appropriate organization or entity to conduct a study to quantify the economic benefit to the United States attributable to the provision of employment and training services under chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code, in assisting veterans to attain long-term, sustained employment. Such study shall include analyses on the impact of such employment on Federal, State, and local tax generated by reason of such employment, the contributions of such employment on the domestic gross national product, and such other indicators of the effect of such employment on the economy of the United States.

(b) **REPORT.**—A condition of the contract under subsection (a) shall be that the organization submit to the Secretary of Labor a report on the study conducted by the organization not later than 18 months after the date on which that Secretary enters into such contract.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor \$1,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section, such sums to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, we all agree our veterans are a unique national resource. H.R. 4015 provides us the opportunity to approve legislation that helps them get jobs. That is the bottom line of this legislation.

The Jobs for Veterans Act essentially creates a new Department of Labor delivery system for veterans' employment and training services in light of the Government Performance and Results Act, the new One-Stop Career Centers under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 and the availability of self-service job assistance by way of the Internet.

H.R. 4015 can be described in four words: Incentives, results, flexibility and accountability in the delivery of employment and training services for veterans through individual States and counties.

The bill we are considering will (1) give the States more program delivery flexibility and a new performance incentive program, (2) create a 3-year phase in period for the new funding formula, (3) create a "hold harmless" provision for small States with respect to the funding formula, (4) clarify intent regarding the hiring of veterans for Disabled Veteran Outreach Specialists and Local Veterans Representatives, (5) create the President's National Hire Veterans Committee, and (6) create a one-stop, full-service job service office on the Internet for service members and veterans.

The Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been working on this veterans' employment legislation for 2 years now, and I applaud the hard work of the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), the gentleman from California (Mr. FILLNER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) on earlier versions of this bill. I also want to recognize the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), for his leadership on this issue, as well as the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) for their support.

Mr. Speaker, with about 215,000 service members estimated to separate from the armed forces in fiscal year 2003, this bill is a win-win situation for both our veterans and the economy. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4015.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4015, I rise in strong support of this measure, the Jobs for Veterans Act. This important legislation will improve the delivery of job services to veterans and the percentage of veterans who are placed in meaningful employment.

H.R. 4015 is a product of dedicated work by many people. In particular, I want to recognize and thank our chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the ranking Democrat member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) for their many contributions.

For years, outdated provisions of law hampered the delivery of employment services to veterans. H.R. 4015, as amended, provides needed flexibility in providing job services to members. This new flexibility, combined with performance incentives and improved measures of performance provided by this legislation, will result in improved employment opportunities for our Nation's veterans.

We have a national responsibility to assist our veterans in their efforts to find and maintain stable, permanent employment. I know firsthand that there are a lot of hard-working, caring people providing employment services to veterans. Every day, these dedicated people strive to fulfill our national commitment. They are the Disabled Veterans Outreach Program Specialists, the Local Veterans Employment Representatives, community-based nonprofits and veterans' service organizations. Many, in fact, are veterans themselves.

I applaud the cooperative effort that has transpired among my colleagues, the veterans' community and the Secretary of Labor to evaluate the roles

and functions of veterans' employment specialists. Changes in the number and responsibilities of these important positions must always be made very carefully and with consensus among the veterans and employment service communities.

In this regard, I am pleased that the new funding formula contemplated in H.R. 4015 focuses on the number of job-seeking veterans in each State and each State's unemployment rate. This seems to be a good way to factor in the unique economic and labor conditions that might otherwise be overlooked.

I believe it is important to provide incentives to States to improve employment services to veterans. This bill provides for financial incentives to both States which have high quality programs and those who show marked improvement. We have heard complaints that the current system does not recognize the achievements of States who work hard to place severely disadvantaged veterans, including disabled veterans, in quality employment. I hope these incentives will encourage such efforts.

I want to stress that although the committee has introduced some flexibility in hiring non-veterans as Disabled Veterans Outreach Program Specialists and Local Employment Veterans Representatives, the committee expects those positions will ordinarily be held by veterans, including disabled veterans. In order to monitor the flexibility granted, States are required to report and provide supporting rationale to the Department of Labor whenever a non-veteran is employed as a DVOP or LVER for a period of more than 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in some cases veterans have gone without services because no qualified veteran was available to serve as a DVOP on even a temporary basis while efforts were under way to recruit and train a qualified veteran. The flexibility in this bill is intended to assure that the needs of the veterans do not get unmet in such situations.

The provision also provides some ability to utilize the services of non-veterans. For example, due to a geographically dispersed veterans' population in a large State, it may not be feasible to hire veterans for limited hours of service.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4015 will result in improved service to our Nation's unemployed and underemployed veterans. I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished chairman for his leadership in authoring this bill and working it through the committee hearings and markup, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) as well, the ranking member, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member of the full committee.

It has been, again, an effort made by so many. I want to thank a few other people on the staff again. Pat Ryan and Kingston Smith, Jeannie McNally, Summer Larson, Darryl Kehrer, who has done yeoman's work on this, Paige McManus, Devon Siebert, Jerry Tan, Mary McDermott, Mary Ellen McCarthy and Beth Kilker.

Again, so much has gone into this. The distinguished chairman talked about the 2-year effort, and that the previous chairman of the subcommittee worked on this as well. This bill, we hope, will be very seriously and quickly considered by the Senate side. This has to be enacted into law as soon as humanly possible. Again, I thank him for his leadership.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. 4015, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.)

□ 1445

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we embark upon this Memorial Day weekend and pay homage to our veterans, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4015, the Jobs for Veterans Act.

I appreciate the commitment and diligent work of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and all others who have partaken of this piece of legislation on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

It is a familiar principle among veterans in our armed services that we do not leave our wounded behind. Jobless and homeless veterans are our Nation's wounded, and we cannot afford to leave them without support. H.R. 4015 reflects the debt of gratitude we owe to those who have served our country with honor. It also signals our enduring commitment to the men and women in uniform who today defend our freedom throughout the world.

Veterans represent a unique and invaluable human resource for American society and the economy. Service personnel leave the military knowing that they have made a vital contribution to our country. Veterans want to continue making meaningful contributions as they return to civilian life. However, in 21 States, fewer than 10 percent of veterans between the ages of 22 and 44 were placed in employment after seeking job search assistance from State service providers. During

2001, there was an average of 519 unemployed veterans; and in the same time period, 32 percent of unemployed veterans experienced 15 or more consecutive weeks of unemployment. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do better. I urge everyone to support this legislation.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking member REYES of the Benefits Subcommittee for their hard work to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

This bill will allow the State of Indiana to tailor our veterans programs to provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of veterans. These include eligible veterans who have served since the Vietnam War, including; Lebanon, Bosnia, Desert Storm, and Enduring Freedom.

All 567,000 Indiana veterans and spouses of certain veterans will be eligible for priority of service for employment, training, and placement services in any job training program directly funded by the Department of Labor.

It will also make eligible for federal contracts: disabled veterans; veterans who served on active duty during a war or in a campaign or expedition in which a campaign badge has been authorized; veterans who participated in military operation for which an Armed Services medal was awarded; or veterans discharged or released from military service within the past three years.

It is important that those veterans who served their country and settled around the country, like my home state of Indiana, should not be penalized for their military service. In fact, it should be celebrated.

This will allow the experience of these veterans to enrich Indiana and add to the quality of life for all Hoosiers

All states would now have an incentive to make that extra for their veterans, like the effort these veterans have made for our country.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation can only help the veterans in Indiana and around the country and urge all my colleagues to join in my support.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill on the floor today will significantly improve the lives of the veterans who have served us so honorably.

H.R. 4015, the Jobs for Veterans Act, grants priority placement in certain job training programs for veterans and their spouses. Beginning with \$10 million in FY 2004, this bill authorizes increasing amounts through FY 2008, and such sums as may be necessary in FY 2009 and succeeding years, for a new performance incentive awards program to encourage states to improve their employment, training, and placement programs for veterans. This incentive program will award the states that have the best record in helping veterans find work. The awards will take the form of new contracts for veterans employment programs.

This bill also establishes the President's National Hire Veterans Committee to take actions to facilitate the employment of veterans and disabled veterans.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH, Democratic Ranking Member EVANS, and the Chairman of our Subcommittee, MIKE SIMPSON, for their work on H.R. 4015. This bill is the product of a lot of hard work by our

present Benefits Subcommittee as well as its former Chairman, JACK QUINN, and Ranking Member BOB FILNER.

When enacted, this measure will result in increased and improved job placements for veterans who use the public labor exchange and receive assistance from Disabled Veterans Program Outreach and Local Veterans Employment Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, during our hearing on this bill, I was particularly disturbed that March 2002, data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) indicated a very high rate of unemployment for young male veterans, especially minority veterans. In March 2002, male veterans aged 20 to 24 had an unemployment rate of 26 percent compared to 12 percent of all males. For African Americans, the rate was 54 percent and for Hispanic veterans, 30 percent. At this point in time, it is not clear if the data from March 2002, which is considerably worse than that reported during all of Fiscal Year 2001, is an anomaly or a trend. I expect the Department of Labor, under the provisions of this bill, to pay special attention to areas where minority veterans are disproportionately represented in the unemployed labor force. I hope that by providing more flexibility to the States, intensive services will be directed to such veterans.

During the hearing on the bill, some concerns were raised concerning increased flexibility to the states in permitting nonveterans to be employed as Disabled Veterans Outreach Program Specialists (DVOP) and Local Veterans Employment Representatives (LVER). I requested that certain changes be made in the bill and I appreciate Chairman Simpson's cooperation in strengthening this section of the bill.

In order to emphasize the Committee's expectation that these positions ordinarily be filled by veterans, the language in the bill now indicates that to "the maximum extent practicable", veterans be employed in these positions. Since the bill allows for part time as well as full time employees in these positions, the States may find circumstances under which a qualified veteran may not be available to provide services most effectively or efficiently. In order to assure compliance with the Committee's intention that permanent positions ordinarily be filled by veterans, the States are required to submit information and supporting rationale to the Secretary whenever non-veterans are employed in these positions for more than six months. I intend to monitor this provision closely.

I believe that H.R. 4015 will provide the states with the flexibility that they need in order to effectively meet the needs of veterans in the 21st century. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4015, the Jobs for Veterans Act, and I commend the distinguished Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH.

This legislation provides priority of service to veterans and spouses of certain veterans for the receipt of employment, training, and placement services in any job training program directly funded, in whole or in part by the Department of Labor. This bill also provides, with respect to Federal contracts and subcontracts in the amount of \$100,000 or more, the contractor to take affirmative action to employ and advance in employment qualified veterans, including listing employment openings imme-

diately through the appropriate employment delivery system.

This measure also changes "Veterans Re-adjustment Authority (VRA)" to "Veterans Recruitment Authority" and changes eligibility for such appointment from Vietnam ERA and post-Vietnam ERA veterans to qualified covered veterans within the 10-year period that begins on the date of the veterans' last discharge; the 10-year period will not apply to a veteran with a service-connected disability of 30 percent or more.

Additionally, the bill requires the Secretary to carry out a program of performance incentive cash awards to States to encourage the improvement and modernization of employment, training and placement services to veterans; such program begins with the program year that begins in FY 2004, with respect to services provided during the preceding program year.

Funding for this incentive program is authorized to be appropriated for the Secretary to carry out a program of performance incentive awards of \$10 million for the program year beginning in FY 2004 (for performance in FY 2003); \$25 million for the program year beginning in FY 2005; \$50 million for the program year beginning in FY 2006; \$75 million for the program year beginning in FY 2007; and \$100 million for the program year beginning in FY 2008.

This bill also makes a number of adjustments to the manner in which the Secretary of the VA furnishes veterans job training funds to the States. The primary goal of the change is to fund States in proportion to the level of veterans who are seeking employment with it. This change will be phased in over a three year period beginning in October 2002.

Finally, this measure directs the VA to develop and implement comprehensive accountability system to measure the performance of training programs within the States.

Mr. Speaker, like the other veterans measures being considered by the House today, this bill is appropriately paying tribute to the service and sacrifice for our Nation's veterans, by offering improvements to existing job training programs. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give H.R. 4015 their unqualified support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4015, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

VETERANS' AND SURVIVORS' BENEFITS EXPANSION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4085) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2002, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4085

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' and Survivors' Benefits Expansion Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, effective on December 1, 2002, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary, as specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under sections 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1162 of such title.

(4) NEW DIC RATES.—The dollar amounts in effect under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1311(a) of such title.

(5) OLD DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(a)(3) of such title.

(6) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH MINOR CHILDREN.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1311(b) of such title.

(7) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR DISABILITY.—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1311(c) and 1311(d) of such title.

(8) DIC FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—The dollar amounts in effect under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—(1) The increase under subsection (a) shall be made in the dollar amounts specified in subsection (b) as in effect on November 30, 2002.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), each such amount shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2002, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(3) Each dollar amount increased pursuant to paragraph (2) shall, if not a whole dollar amount, be rounded down to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(e) PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.—At the same time as the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2003, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in subsection (b), as increased pursuant to that section.

SEC. 3. RETENTION OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES REMARRYING AFTER AGE 65.

(a) EXCEPTION TO TERMINATION OF BENEFITS UPON REMARRIAGE.—Paragraph (2) of section 103(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "if the remarriage" and all that follows and inserting "if—

"(A) the remarriage occurs after the surviving spouse attains age 65 ;

"(B) the remarriage has been terminated by death; or

"(C) the remarriage has been terminated by divorce, unless the Secretary determines that the divorce was secured through fraud or collusion."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (4) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking "The first month" and all that follows through "shall be" and inserting the following "When eligibility for benefits for a surviving spouse is restored by reason of this subsection, the first month of eligibility for such benefits shall be"; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking "described in" and inserting "with a remarriage described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of".

(c) INCLUSION OF DEATH COMPENSATION AMONG RESTORED BENEFITS.—Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (5) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Sections 1121 and 1311, relating to death compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation, respectively."

(d) APPLICATION FOR BENEFITS.—In the case of an individual who but for having remarried would be eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation under section 1311 of title 38, United States Code, or death compensation under section 1121 of such title, and whose remarriage was before the date of the enactment of this Act and after the individual had attained age 65, the individual shall be eligible for such compensation by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) only if the individual submits an application for such compensation to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs not later than the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) COORDINATION OF BENEFITS.—Section 1311 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) In the case of an individual who is eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation under this section by reason of section 103(d)(2)(A) of this title who is also eligible for benefits under another provision of law by reason of such individual's status as the surviving spouse of a veteran, then, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no reduction in benefits under such other provision of law shall be made by reason of such individual's eligibility for benefits under this section."

SEC. 4. UNIFORM HOME LOAN GUARANTY FEES FOR QUALIFYING MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE AND ACTIVE DUTY VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 3729(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(2)";

(2) by inserting "for any loan closed after September 30, 2005" after "paragraph (1)"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) The loan fee table referred to in paragraph (1) for any loan closed during the period beginning on October 1, 2002, and ending on September 30, 2005, is as follows:

"LOAN FEE TABLE

Type of loan	Veteran	Other obligor
(A)(i) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed before October 1, 2008)	2.00	NA
(A)(ii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other initial loan described in section 3710(a) other than with 5-down or 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2008)	1.25	NA
(B)(i) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed before October 1, 2008)	3.00	NA
(B)(ii) Subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 0-down, or any other subsequent loan described in section 3710(a) (closed on or after October 1, 2008)	1.25	NA
(C)(i) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed before October 1, 2008)	1.50	NA
(C)(ii) Loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 5-down (closed on or after October 1, 2008)	0.75	NA

“LOAN FEE TABLE—Continued

Type of loan	Veteran	Other obligor
(D)(i) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed before October 1, 2008)	1.25	NA
(D)(ii) Initial loan described in section 3710(a) to purchase or construct a dwelling with 10-down (closed on or after October 1, 2008)	0.50	NA
(E) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan	0.50	NA
(F) Direct loan under section 3711	1.00	NA
(G) Manufactured home loan under section 3712 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)	1.00	NA
(H) Loan to Native American veteran under section 3762 (other than an interest rate reduction refinancing loan)	1.25	NA
(I) Loan assumption under section 3714	0.50	0.50
(J) Loan under section 3733(a)	2.25	2.25”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4)(A) of such section is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and the term ‘veteran’ means any veteran eligible for the benefits of this chapter”.

SEC. 5. LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) INCREASE OF VETERANS’ MORTGAGE LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE TO \$150,000.—(1) Section 2106(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$90,000” and inserting “\$150,000”.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to insurance payable under section 2106 of title 38, United States Code, in the case of a veteran insured under that section who dies on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR VETERANS’ MORTGAGE LIFE INSURANCE TO BE CARRIED BEYOND AGE 70.—Section 2106 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “age 69 or younger” after “any eligible veteran”; and

(2) in subsection (i), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

SEC. 6. INCREASE IN AGGREGATE ANNUAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR STATE IMPROVING AGENCIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2003, 2004, AND 2005.

Section 3674(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “, and for each of fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005, \$18,000,000”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4085, the Veterans’ and Survivors’ Benefits Expansion Act of 2002 will expand and increase a number of important benefits for veterans and their surviving spouses. With more than 2.3 million veterans relying on disability compensation payments, H.R. 4085 provides a much-needed cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), the same as that which is given to Social Security recipients, currently estimated to be about 2.3 percent next year. Sur-

viving spouses and children of veterans who qualify for dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) would also see their payments increased by the same COLA amount.

For a 100 percent service-connected disabled veteran, this increase would take effect December 1 and will total about \$600 next year in increase. In total, H.R. 4085 will increase disability compensation payments by about \$300 million next year and by more than \$1.5 billion over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4085 would also make a historic change in current law to allow surviving spouses who remarry after the age of 65 to retain their dependency and indemnity compensation as well as health insurance, home loan, and education benefits. Under current law, a surviving spouse of a veteran who is currently eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation, and who remarries, loses his or her eligibility for this and other VA benefits. Sadly, this economic penalty has prevented thousands of older women from enjoying the comforts that come from marriage later in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, when a man and woman serve our Nation in the Armed Forces, we not only benefit from their service, but also from that of their spouse, who make their own sacrifices supporting their family on the home front. We should stop penalizing these brave women and men who have already lost so much, and are now looking for companionship in their twilight years.

This provision has been championed in the House by the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs vice chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS). I want to commend him for his continuing work, and his commitment on behalf of veterans and their spouses.

Let me say to my colleagues that we had hoped to bring forward legislation that contained a lower age limit; we wanted to get to 55 years, but budgetary constraints and questionable CBO scoring have prevented us from

doing that. Instead, our legislation in essence would make a down payment to these Gold Star wives who have given our Nation so much. We will be monitoring the actual implementation costs of this provision so that we can revisit it in the future. While today’s action is historic, let me assure these brave women that it is just the beginning of the process and not the end of the process. H.R. 4085 also contains several other provisions which the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits will be outlining in a moment.

Finally, I just want to say that I am grateful to the chairman, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the ranking member, and again my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), for working with us on this legislation and for helping to bring it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time and for his unwavering support of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, many veterans and their survivors will be served as a result of the enhancements included in H.R. 4085, the Veterans’ and Survivors’ Benefits Expansion Act of 2002.

Section 2 provides an annual cost-of-living adjustment effective December 1, 2002, to service-connected veterans as well as those survivors receiving dependency and indemnity compensation. The Congress has approved a COLA every fiscal year since 1976; and as in the past, the percentage increase will mirror the COLA the Social Security recipients receive.

Section 3 would allow surviving spouses who remarry after age 65 to retain their dependency and indemnity compensation, death compensation, VA health insurance, and education and home loan benefits. Additionally, those spouses who remarry after age 65, but prior to enactment of this bill, will

have 1 year to reapply for their benefits. DIC is the only Federal survivor annuity that terminates when the spouse remarries.

It is important, as the chairman stated, that I reiterate that this is the first step in enhancing the benefits for these spouses. The Subcommittee on Benefits considered a number of ways to enhance these benefits, including lowering the age at which spouses could remarry and retain benefits; but with the budget constraints we are working under, we just could not do more at this time. I want to thank the vice chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), for his leadership on this provision.

Section 4 would lower the home loan fees that members of the Selected Reserve pay to equal the fees paid by the active duty veterans. Again, because of budget constraints, we have had to sunset this provision in fiscal year 2005. We will reexamine the policy at that time.

Section 5 would increase coverage from \$90,000 to \$150,000 under the Veterans' Mortgage Life Insurance program, as well as permit coverage of this insurance to veterans beyond age 70. Currently, the coverage is terminated after the veteran's 69th birthday.

Lastly, section 6 would increase the funding for State approving agencies from \$14 million to \$18 million for the next 3 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the subcommittee's ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), for the opportunity to work with him in writing this bill. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for their input on the home loan insurance provisions and, again, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for his support for the Gold Star Wives. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4085.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our committee chairman; and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), our Subcommittee on Benefits chairman; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), ranking member, for their important bipartisan work on this important measure. This is a bill strongly supported by Members of both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4085, the Veterans' and Survivors' Benefits Expansion Act of 2002, provides a cost-of-living adjustment to veterans receiving service-connected disability compensation and the survivors in receipt of DIC. This ensures the value of their hard-earned benefits will not be reduced because of cost-of-living increases.

The bill contains provisions derived from measures introduced by my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida

(Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), two outstanding advocates for our Nation's veterans.

The bill also includes a provision of H.R. 2095, which I introduced. For the next 3 years, the additional funding fee now imposed upon members of the Selected Reserve for the use of the home loan guarantee program will be eliminated. In addition, the bill increases the maximum amount of VMLI to \$150,000. This will enable about 90 percent of veterans' families to have their mortgage paid off in the event of a veteran's death.

I am pleased to support additional funding for State approving agencies provided in this measure so that they can fulfill their responsibilities to ensure the quality of education and training provided by the Montgomery GI Bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), our chairman; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), our vice chairman; and our chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON); and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for their contributions to this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here today is the best of bipartisanship under the leadership that we have come together on to help our veterans. It not only is a reflection of this committee and its leadership, but also I think an example for the other committees; and I salute again our chairman and I thank him for his hard work.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for his comments and for working so well with us on these important bills, the whole package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I thank him and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) for their kind remarks.

I rise in strong support, Mr. Speaker, of all of the veterans bills we are considering today; however, I do want to focus my remarks, as so many others already have done, on H.R. 4085, the bill at hand.

In addition to providing an annual cost-of-living adjustment to disabled veterans and their survivors, this bill addresses an issue that I have been working on for a number of years. Dependency and indemnity compensation, DIC, is the benefit accorded to the surviving dependents of those members of the Armed Forces who died while on active duty or a service-connected cause. DIC is the only Federal annuity

program that does not allow a widow who is receiving compensation to remarry at an older age and retain her annuity. Last year, I reintroduced legislation which provides that the remarriage of the surviving spouse of a veteran after age 55 should not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation.

I have heard, and I am sure we all have, Mr. Speaker, from military widows from across the country who have found someone they would like to spend the rest of their lives with, but cannot afford to do so because of the current law. They have expressed deep frustrations about not being able to remarry. Mr. Speaker, these are people who have sacrificed, who have suffered. I have always said that it is the families who really sacrifice even more and have even more of a burden than the actual person in the military. Many of these women lost their husbands at a very young age and have been alone for a long, long time. They have finally found someone to share their lives with, but they are afraid to remarry because they will lose their DIC benefits.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking member; the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the ranking member of the subcommittee; and primarily the majority and minority staffs for working with me to include a DIC remarriage provision in H.R. 4085. Due to funding constraints, my original provision had to be modified. The legislation we are considering today provides that remarriage of a surviving spouse of a veteran after age 65 should not result in termination of DIC or eligibility for CHAMPVA medical care, education and housing loan benefits.

Those surviving spouses that remarried after age 65, prior to the enactment of this legislation, will have 1 year, and I hope that we will continue to get this word to them, will have 1 year from the date of enactment to reapply for benefits.

While we all would have preferred to be able to allow for remarriage at an earlier age, I do believe that the bill before us will provide a significant benefit to the surviving spouses of veterans. As I understand it, there will be report language requiring the VA to track the number of spouses applying for reinstatement of benefits, which should provide our committee with more accurate data than is currently available.

□ 1500

It is my hope that we will be able to readdress this issue in the future, and adjust the remarriage age from 65 to 55 to bring the DIC program in line with other Federal annuity programs.

I also urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4085 and other veterans' bills before us today.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4085, the Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2002. I commend our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), for their strong support of this measure.

This measure authorizes a cost-of-living adjustment to the veterans who receive disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation to the surviving spouses of our prisoners of war who received complete disability at time of death due to service-related injuries. This will be effective as of December 1 of this year.

Congress has approved an annual cost-of-living adjustment to these veterans and survivors since 1976.

This legislation also provides that remarriage of the surviving spouse of a veteran after age 65 will not result in any termination of any dependency and indemnity compensation eligibility for CHAMPVA medical care, education, and housing loan benefits.

Those surviving spouses who remarried after age 65 prior to enactment of the bill will have 1 year from the date of enactment to reapply for these benefits.

This measure also provides that, through fiscal year 2006, the home loan fees charged qualifying members of the selected reserve be equal to those fees charged to active duty veterans.

Finally, the measure increases veterans' mortgage life insurance coverage from \$90,000 to \$150,000, allowing veterans over the age of 70 to continue coverage under veterans' mortgage life insurance, a very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is meritorious legislation, and an appropriate and deserving response by this legislative body to the sacrifices made by our Nation's veterans and their families, especially those recently engaged in our war on terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for his comments. Although not a member of the committee, he is

ever faithful on veterans' legislation, always here, and we thank him for his contribution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4085.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill on the floor today will significantly improve the lives of the veterans who have served us so honorably. H.R. 4085, the Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, provides an annual cost-of-living increase for veterans, and increases compensation for disabled veterans and their dependents and survivors. The committee estimates that the increase will be 2.3%. This bill also increases indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans. Of significance in this legislation is the measure providing that the surviving spouse of a veteran who remarries after the age 65 would not lose his or her dependency and indemnity compensation payments, eligibility for medical care, or education and housing loan benefits. Also, that veterans over age 70 could maintain coverage under this program, which currently is canceled at age 70.

This bill before us supports our veterans and I believe this legislation will significantly improve their lives. I urge my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this legislation.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member EVANS for their hard work in corraling all these important and diverse provisions and including them into one bill that covers all aspects of veterans and their survivors life.

Increasing the funding for the state approving agencies by \$4 million a year will help the Indiana State Department of Veterans Affairs determine if the beneficiaries of the Montgomery GI Bill are getting the education promised to them when they entered service for our nation. The 5,216 Hoosier veterans who used GI Bill payments for their education deserve the best education we can give.

Reservists would be offered VA home loans at the same cost that active duty military receive. Today's military is more dependent on our nation's citizen soldiers serving in the Reserves than ever. They could be called up to serve overseas or across the country, away from their families and their homes for extended periods of time. It is only right that all men and women who put their lives on the line for this country be eligible for these home loans. The men and women from Indiana, who live and work there, whose kids go to school and they pay taxes deserve the same rights as active duty military.

The spouse of a veteran suffered and served for our country almost as much as the veteran. They took care of the family and moving the house from base to base across the country so the servicemember could focus on his or her job for this nation. If widowed, and they find someone special with whom to

spend the rest of their days, one worry they should not have is about their benefits. This bill will rectify that worry by allowing surviving spouses to retain benefits if they remarry at 65.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, is the increase in the cost of living adjustment for disabled veterans. The veterans of Indiana with service connected disabilities will appreciate an increase in their cost of living allowance, to allow them to be able to afford what could be considered the smaller things in life, but which make the quality of life more enjoyable. This increase will be tied to the increase in Social Security benefits, which is estimated to be 2.3% on December 1, 2002, when this COLA will go into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and support the veterans of Indiana and this country.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank our Committee Chairman, CHRIS SMITH, our Democratic Ranking Member, LANE EVANS, and my good friend MIKE SIMPSON, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits, for their work in promptly bringing H.R. 4085 to the floor. It is always good to see members of this Committee from both sides of the aisle working together to improve benefits for our Nation's veterans and their family members.

I am pleased that we will again be increasing the monthly benefit paid to disabled veterans and their survivors according to increases in the consumer price index. We must never allow the value of compensation paid to our Nation's veterans to decrease because of changes in the cost of living.

I support the provision drawn from H.R. 1108 which would allow the surviving spouses of veterans who remarry after age 65 to retain their Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) and related benefits. I am pleased that the amended bill includes, as I requested, the small number of survivors receiving benefits under the older death compensation program. I also believe that surviving spouses who have already remarried after age 65 should have an opportunity to have benefits reinstated if they request reinstatement within one year after enactment of the bill. I would prefer that the age at which remarriage would be allowed be 55, as Mr. BILIRAKIS, the author of the original bill, requested. Nonetheless, I recognize the difficulty in obtaining accurate cost estimates from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) when a new program, without historical data is proposed. As CBO stated the cost of this program "could be much higher or much lower, depending upon the portion of eligible people that apply for this benefit." I believe that the cost will be much lower and expect that data concerning the new program will provide us with a more realistic basis on which to cost future legislation to make the age at which remarriage is allowed, consistent with other federal programs.

I agree with my friend the distinguished Ranking Member of the Full Committee, LANE EVANS, that Members of the Selected Reserve should not be required to pay an extra fee in order to qualify for a home loan through the Department of Veterans Affairs. As the attached sheet "Comparison of Fiscal Year Liquidation Rates Reservists vs All Others" indicates, the foreclosure rates for reservists is more than a full percentage point lower than all others. As we ask Members of the Selected Reserve to assume more and more responsibility for national defense, we must provide

them with commensurate benefits. I support removing the additional and unjustified funding fee imposed on the Selected Reserve, as provided by H.R. 2095, for three years and hope that funding will enable us to make this reduction permanent in the future.

Mr. Speaker, no one has a stronger claim on the public fisc, than those veterans who have been severely disabled as a result of their military service. The provisions in H.R. 4085, drawn from Mr. FILNER'S bill, H.R. 2222, will provide veterans who qualify for the Vet-

erans' Mortgage Life Insurance (VMLI) programs, closer toward the goal of meeting the needs of these veterans in the 21st century. By increasing the amount of the mortgage insurance to \$150,000, and by eliminating the current requirement that the insurance be terminated at age 70, our severely disabled veterans will be assured that in the event of their death, their home mortgage can be paid off. If we can not afford to help our Nation's most severely disabled veterans, who can we afford to help?

As an original cosponsor with our Subcommittee Chairman, MIKE SIMPSON, our Full Committee Chairman CHRIS SMITH, and our Ranking Democratic Member, LANE EVANS, I fully support additional funding for the State Approving Agencies. When we ask that agencies assume additional responsibilities, Congress must provide the resources to see that those responsibilities can be met.

I urge all Members of the House to support our Nation's veterans and this bipartisan bill.

COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR LIQUIDATION RATES RESERVISTS VERSUS ALL OTHERS AS OF END OF MONTH, MARCH 2002

Fiscal year*	Total guaranteed	Total fore-closed	%	All others				Reservists				Reservist rate compared to All Others Rate	
				Total No.	% of total	Frcl		Total No.	% of total	Frcl			
						No.	%			No.	%		
2001	265,306	83	0.03	256,858	96.8	82	0.03	8,448	3.2	1	0.01	62.9%	Lower
2000	184,494	1,227	0.67	177,645	96.3	1,196	0.67	6,849	3.7	31	0.45	32.8%	Lower
1999	403,936	5,508	1.36	391,069	96.8	5,385	1.38	12,867	3.2	123	0.96	30.6%	Lower
1998	408,930	9,946	2.43	395,332	96.7	9,707	2.46	13,598	3.3	239	1.76	28.4%	Lower
1997	260,326	10,946	4.20	250,310	96.2	10,668	4.26	10,016	3.8	278	2.78	34.9%	Lower
1996	314,825	19,427	6.17	303,878	96.5	18,939	6.23	10,947	3.5	488	4.46	28.5%	Lower
1995	249,670	17,110	6.85	240,345	96.3	16,645	6.93	9,325	3.7	465	4.99	28.0%	Lower
1994	493,441	29,018	5.88	483,474	98.0	28,534	5.90	9,967	2.0	484	4.86	17.7%	Lower
1993	475,038	27,593	5.81	469,346	98.8	27,327	5.82	5,692	1.2	266	4.67	19.7%	Lower
	3,055,966	120,858	3.95	2,968,257	97.1	118,483	3.99	87,709	2.9	2,375	2.71	32.2%	Lower

*Based on Date of Loan. (AMH-26A2B) 5/02/2002.
Source: SAS GILFYLIQ. File: H:\gy-26\265\26A2B\excel\reservist and service frcl rates.xls

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4085, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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.

ROBERT J. DOLE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4608) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Wichita, Kansas, as the "Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4608

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

SECTION 1. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL AND REGIONAL OFFICE CENTER, WICHITA, KANSAS.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Re-

gional Office Center". Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the chief sponsor of this legislation and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 4608 to name the Department of Medical Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center.

Though he is often remembered today for his service to our country as a congressman, a U.S. Senator, and a Presidential contender, Bob Dole's courage and determination on the field of battle in World War II as a second lieutenant is what we are here today to recognize. His bravery in battle truly reflects the character of this Kansan.

Dole is a native of Russell, Kansas, population 4,500, just 25 miles from my hometown. As an energetic young man, Dole gained popularity with the young and old in that Russell community while working at the local soda fountain. A good student and a good athlete in high school, Dole had little trouble enrolling at the University of Kansas to pursue his lifelong dream of becoming a physician.

But Dole's life, like the lives of millions of other men and women of his generation, was changed when the U.S.

entered World War II. Never before had there been such an assault on our country's way of life, and America was calling on its young men and women to fight to defend our freedoms.

In 1942, while a sophomore at the University of Kansas, Dole enlisted in the U.S. Army. After attending basic training in Texas, he was eager to defend his country, and transferred to the Army Specialized Training Program in New York City. It did not take long for Dole to establish himself as a leader. He was accepted into Officer Candidate School, and traveled to Georgia for his training. He entered as a corporal and graduated 2 years later in 1944 as Second Lieutenant Robert J. Dole. He was then sent to Italy in the midst of some of the fiercest fighting toward the end of World War II.

That next spring, Dole was assigned to head a platoon in the Tenth Mountain Division after the previous lieutenant in charge had been killed. On an April morning that spring, Dole led his troops into battle in northern Italy. In his own words, Dole describes that day, a day that would forever change his life. I quote Bob Dole:

"On the morning of April 14, we were part of a major assault. Pinned down by sniper and small-arms fire, I chose a small squad to help me find a safer route up the slope. We ran into a hail of German machine gunfire. I tossed a grenade at a farmhouse from which the bullets were spraying, and then pulled the lifeless form of my platoon's radio-man into a foxhole. Scrambling back out again, I felt a sharp sting in my back. Most likely it was an exploding shell that smashed my right shoulder, scattering metal fragments along its path.

"I lay down in the dirt, paralyzed from the neck down, until Technical Sergeant Frank Carafa dragged me to safety. My second in command, Sergeant Stan Kuschik, gave me a shot of

morphine. With my own blood Stan made a cross on my forehead, a precaution to warn medics who might happen by against administering a second and fatal dose of that powerful drug. Nine hours later, I was at the Fifteenth Evacuation Hospital. My war ended there, or so I thought. Actually, my war . . . was only beginning."

Dole continues: "Don't believe that wars are concluded by treaties signed by diplomats between gilded chandeliers. Each veteran has his own war, which lives on not just in scrapbooks or at reunions where old stories get retold, but in midnight memories and sudden flashbacks. For me, it all comes back each morning getting dressed, tying a knot, or even looking in the mirror."

For his service and bravery in World War II, Senator Dole was honored with two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star medal. This week is a fitting time for us in the House of Representatives to consider this legislation, the week of Memorial Day.

Bob Dole is one of the millions of brave men and women who have defended our country during war. A tireless advocate for veterans and veterans' rights, Dole's story is one we should memorialize. Despite the fact that his injuries in World War II left him partially paralyzed, he became one of the most influential American political figures in the latter half of the 20th century. Part of that greatest generation, Dole is an example of an ordinary American who was called upon to meet extraordinary challenges.

Throughout his time as a congressman and senator, his appreciation for the doctors and nurses who assisted him in recovery was never forgotten. Dole authored and had passed legislation to improve the conditions and services offered to veterans, as well as the disabled.

Each year, in April, on the anniversary of his World War II injuries, Dole would make special recognition of the disabled by discussing the status of the disabled in America. His understanding of those less fortunate led Senator Dole to become a leader in efforts to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act, a landmark piece of legislation.

Dole's work to recognize and honor veterans continues today. Most recently, Dole chaired the committee that raised \$160 million to construct a memorial on the National Mall honoring the hundreds of thousands of men and women who fought in World War II.

This legislation is sponsored by many Members of Congress, has the full support of the Kansas delegation, the gentlemen from Kansas, Mr. MOORE, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. RYUN, and has been endorsed by the major veterans' service organizations in Kansas.

Today, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Bob Dole for his military service and for his bravery and dedication to his country in time of battle in this legislation

that will further recognize Bob Dole by naming the Wichita VA hospital the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Regional Office Center.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this legislation that renames the Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas, in honor of Robert J. Dole, a tireless advocate for our Nation's veterans.

This honor is certainly well-deserved. During his sophomore year in college, Bob Dole set aside his studies to enlist in the Army. Like many others of his generation, Bob Dole set aside personal plans to fight in World War II.

Though severely injured in action in Europe, after 3 long years of convalescence in 1948 Senator Dole was separated from the service and returned to Kansas. In 1950 he was elected to the State legislature. The rest, as they say, is history.

I thank and want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), for his leadership on this legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), former world record-holder in the mile.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation renaming the Wichita Veterans Medical and Regional Office Center for Senator Bob Dole. As we wage war against terrorism, it is particularly appropriate that we in Congress recognize the service and sacrifice of Senator Dole. Senator Dole's service in combat during World War II, his leadership in the Senate, and his commitment to America serve as examples for each of us to emulate.

Senator Dole joined the Army's Enlisted Reserve Corps in 1942 to fight in World War II. After graduating from Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Lieutenant Dole was sent to Italy to join the Tenth Mountain Division.

As a result of his service in World War II, Senator Dole has sacrificed in many ways, in ways that all of us can imagine. In April, 1945, while Dole crawled from a foxhole to rescue a wounded radioman, German machine gunfire tore through Dole's back and right arm.

His injuries were so severe that he was not expected to live. However, Senator Dole never gave up. Through his faith in God, his determination, the support of his family, and the people of his hometown of Russell, Kansas, Senator Dole fought back to recover from his wounds.

Through adversity, Senator Dole has exhibited an overcoming spirit that should inspire all of us. Perhaps the successes of his political career were gained through the tenacity that can only come through hardship.

Senator Dole was twice decorated for his action in combat, receiving two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star. Senator Dole first entered politics in 1951, when he was elected to the Kansas legislature in 1960. Dole sought and won election to the House of Representatives, where he served four terms before entering the Senate. For the next 27 years, Senator Dole served the Nation and Kansas in the Senate. Through his service there, he became the longest-serving Republican leader in that Chamber's history.

In a speech he gave in 2000 as part of the Senate Leadership Lecture Series, Senator Dole remarked that those in politics have a unique opportunity to use their personal experiences to make a difference in the lives of others.

Throughout his career, Senator Dole did just that. Senator Dole's first Senate floor speech highlighted the challenges faced by disabled Americans. Never forgetting the people of Russell and his Kansas roots, he tirelessly championed for farmers in rural America. Understanding the importance of America's leadership, he worked to ensure that the Nation remained strong, able to protect freedom and peace. And knowing of the sacrifices of those who served in our military, he worked to ensure that America kept its promise to its veterans.

President Reagan once said of Senator Dole, "The title of leadership is not just a job title, it is the description of the man."

Throughout his service to our country, Senator Dole has exemplified commitment, courage, and integrity, and it is only fitting that we honor him in this way. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1515

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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 time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of H.R. 4608, the Robert Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center Designation Act; and I commend the distinguished gentleman from our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) for their support of this important legislation.

This measure names a VA medical and regional office center in Wichita, Kansas, the Robert J. Dole Department of Affairs Medical and Regional Office

Center. Our distinguished former colleague in the Senate served in World War II as a second lieutenant in the Army's Tenth Mountain Division. His unit was sent to Italy where as a platoon leader on April 14, 1945, his platoon was attacked by German force, and while aiding a wounded soldier in his platoon, Lt. Dole was seriously injured by mortar fire. He recovered during a period of 3 years of hospitalization in Army and VA hospitals, surviving numerous surgeries and undergoing rehabilitation.

Bob Dole was awarded the Bronze Star for his heroism and selfless effort to aid a fellow soldier and two Purple Hearts for injuries he sustained. He was further awarded the European-African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with two Bronze Stars for participation in the Po Valley and Northern Apennines campaigns. Additionally Bob Dole is the recipient of the American Campaign Medal and World War II Victory Medal.

Following the war, Senator Dole entered a life of public service, culminating in his tenure as Senate majority leader. He has been a lifelong advocate for the disabled and was a leader in the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, a landmark piece of legislation that significantly expanded the rights of disabled individuals in all walks of life. Moreover, he has been a tireless champion of our Nation's veterans and has been instrumental in fostering the right to build a national World War II memorial on the Mall in Washington.

Given his commitment to the interest and causes of all veterans, it is entirely appropriate that the VA Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita be named after former Senator Bob Dole. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in fully supporting this measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 4068, as amended, the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center.

Mr. Speaker, American history is filled with men and women who have made great sacrifices and performed great services on behalf of our Nation. It is one of the privileges that we in the House and Senate, the Congress, have to be able to recognize these individuals before our fellow countrymen and for all future generations. One such American worthy of honor is former soldier and Senator Bob Dole of Kansas.

Bob Dole was probably one of the best known World War II veterans. As a young officer in the famed Tenth Mountain Division, he was severely wounded during fighting in Italy and spent 3 years in Army and Veterans

Administration Hospitals recovering. He was permanently disabled with a shattered shoulder; yet by his personal courage and persistence, he overcame a boatload of crushing obstacles. He went on to become a national leader as a United States Senator, he was a presidential candidate, and a tireless advocate for veterans and the disabled.

So it is extremely fitting that in his home State of Kansas, the VA facility in Wichita be named the Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center.

I would especially commend the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), who is the author of the bill, to honor Bob Dole. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is chairman, as we know, of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and I am very proud to be a co-sponsor of this bill, which he has spoken about with great eloquence earlier.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4608, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas, as the 'Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4608, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND BIO-TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2002

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3253, as amended, be vacated to the end that question be put de novo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the gentleman's request to vacate the yeas and nays on H.R. 3253 is granted and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3253, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the establishment within the Department of Veterans Affairs of improved emergency medical preparedness, research, and education programs to combat terrorism, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMVETS NATIONAL CHARTER DAY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 314) recognizing the members of AMVETS for their service to the Nation and supporting the goals of AMVETS National Charter Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 314

Whereas on July 23, 1947, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam) was chartered by the United States as a not-for-profit corporation;

Whereas membership in AMVETS is open to veterans who have honorably served, or are serving, in the Armed Forces, including the Coast Guard, National Guard, and Reserves, during or since World War II;

Whereas the veterans of the Armed Forces have made great sacrifices to ensure the peace and security of the United States;

Whereas the members of AMVETS are dedicated to providing important services to their local communities and to their fellow veterans;

Whereas the motto of AMVETS is "We fought together, now let's build together";

Whereas the members of AMVETS consistently honor that motto through countless hours of patriotic service, including providing services to hospitalized veterans, assisting veterans with their problems regarding housing and employment, marching in parades, participating in color guards and burial details, and educating the Nation's youth;

Whereas the war on terrorism has emphasized the sacrifices that veterans have made, and continue to make, for the benefit of the Nation;

Whereas AMVETS has designated July 23 as AMVETS National Charter Day; and

Whereas the goal of AMVETS National Charter Day is to raise public awareness regarding AMVETS's commitment and service to veterans, the families of veterans, and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes the members of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam) for their service to the Nation and supports the goal of AMVETS National Charter Day.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI), the prime sponsor of this resolution.

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

Throughout history, young men and women in uniform have fought to protect America's freedoms and liberties. They have served our Nation during war and peace and have consistently illustrated their dedication to the United States of America. Today, we look at these brave men and women as heroes and appreciate their past service as soldiers, sailors and airmen. However, the great service of these heroes has never stopped after their days in uniform. As veterans, these same men and women continue to serve their communities and their fellow veterans.

On July 23, 1947, President Harry S. Truman chartered AMVETS, a veterans' organization that seeks to serve veterans and their communities.

Today, with more than 1,300 posts throughout the country, AMVETS members help their fellow veterans in many ways, including helping veterans with housing and employment problems, providing services to hospitalized veterans, and assisting their fellow veterans in obtaining their entitlement benefits.

From raising funds for VA facilities, to marching in local parades, members of AMVETS dedicate countless hours of service to America and to American vets. Their motto, "We fought together. Now let's build together," could not be more appropriate when observing the American pride and dedication behind every member of AMVETS. The same heroes that saved the lives of fellow soldiers in battles ended long ago, now work to help their fellow veterans and those veterans that are sure to follow after the battles of today come to an end.

One of my constituents, Ron Fox, is one such American that typifies the members of AMVETS. Mr. Fox, a former corporal in the Army during the Korean War, is a member of AMVETS Post 111 in Patchogue, New York. Mr. Fox volunteers at local hospitals, serves as the chaplain of his post, and proudly participated as a member of the colorguard. We owe him and his fellow members a great amount of gratitude for their commitment to our communities.

H. Con. Res. 314 highlights the importance of AMVETS throughout America and supports the goals of a national charter day. July 23 will mark the 55th anniversary of AMVETS. The invaluable service provided by these American heroes for the last 55 years cannot be matched in appreciation or gratitude; but it is my hope that we will continue to honor AMVETS and its members for their services to this country beyond their years in uniform.

As we continue to keep the soldiers pursuing the war on terrorism in our

thoughts and our prayers, let us also remember the fathers and grandfathers of those soldiers who fought similar battles years ago that now serve our communities, help their fellow veterans, and advocate for those in the military today.

I would like to thank Ron Fox and all the AMVETS members whose pride for America and continued service to our veterans serves as the inspiration for this resolution. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for helping to bring this legislation to the floor.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this resolution and supporting AMVETS and the goals of AMVETS National Charter Day.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 314. This measure recognizes the members of AMVETS for their service to our Nation, provides important support for AMVETS National Charter Day.

AMVETS has designated July 23 as AMVETS National Charter Day to encourage greater public awareness of their commitment and service to veterans, the families of veterans, and the Nation as a whole.

I commend and applaud the members of AMVETS for their past, present, and future service to our country. As a lifelong member of that organization, I strongly support this concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 314, legislation recognizing the members of the AMVETS for their service to the Nation, and supporting the goals of AMVETS National Charter Day. I want to especially recognize and thank the prime sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI), for his fine work on this legislation, and for his very strong support of the many veterans bills that we have moved in this Congress.

From its origin in the middle of the World War II, Mr. Speaker, AMVETS has had a long and distinguished history of service to our Nation. They held their first national convention in Chicago in October of 1945; and just 2 years later, on July 23, 1947, President Harry Truman signed the AMVETS charter.

Originally organized for World War II veterans, AMVETS had their charter amended in 1966 to include veterans who served honorably during the Korean conflict and the Vietnam War and, again, in 1984 to include those who served honorably during peacetime as well.

From its humble origins, AMVETS has grown into a national organization with over 250,000 members, in addition to another 60,000 members of their la-

dies' auxiliary. As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I can attest to the important role that AMVETS plays in Washington in advocating stronger Federal policies for supporting veterans, their surviving spouses and dependents as well. Their legislative staff is among the finest, and they have played a key role in many important public policy debates. I know I can count on AMVETS for advice, counsel, and support as we continue developing national policies to benefit our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and commend their national commander, Joseph Lipowski. He should be proud of the success AMVETS has achieved and continues to achieve, not just in Washington but also in communities across America. In addition to providing benefits and services to their fellow veterans, they also play an important role in the civic life of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge strong support for passage of this resolution.

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 want to recognize with gratitude the contributions made to the work of our committee by Kathleen Greve. Kathleen has been a pinch-hitter with our Democratic staff and has earned the respect and help of the Republicans as well. I am grateful for her assistance to the veterans of this country.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me time and commend him as the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs; along with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS); and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI) for their support for this very important measure.

On July 23, 1947, AMVETS was officially chartered by our Nation as a not-for-profit corporation, and that organization has been open to veterans who have honorably served or are serving in the armed services, including Coast Guard, National Guard, and the Reserves during or since World War II.

The members of AMVETS are committed to providing important services to their communities and to their fellow veterans. Their motto is: "We fought together. Now let's build together."

The members of AMVETS have honored their motto through countless hours of patriotic service, including providing services to hospitalized veterans, assisting veterans with their

concerns regarding housing and employment, participating colorguards, burial details, and educating our Nation's youth about the sacrifices made to our veterans.

□ 1530

The events of the past year that coincide with our ongoing war on terrorism have underscored the important role played by our veterans in the defense of freedom. Many Americans now recognize veterans in a new light, one of greater respect than ever before. This resolution expands this improved view, declaring July 23 to be AMVETS National Charter Day. There is no finer tribute to our Nation's esteemed veterans' service organizations than by honoring them in this manner.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this timely and appropriate measure.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 314.

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. GRUCCI. 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. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. Con. Res. 314.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONTINUAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION INTO CAUSE AND CURE FOR FIBROID CANCER BE ADDRESSED

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 165) expressing the sense of the Congress that continual research and education into the cause and cure for fibroid cancer be addressed.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 165

Whereas the vast majority of fibroids occur in women of reproductive age, and between 20 and 40 percent of women are diagnosed;

Whereas African American women are twice as likely to be diagnosed with fibroids than Caucasian women;

Whereas fibroids are the most frequently diagnosed tumor of the female pelvis and range in size from 1mm to more than 20cm (8 inches) in diameter;

Whereas they are not associated with cancer and almost never develop into cancer (less than one percent becoming malignant);

Whereas the symptoms of fibroids can include excessive bleeding during menstrual periods, spotting or bleeding between periods, frequent urination, and/or lower back pain;

Whereas the preferred method of treatment for fibroids is a hysterectomy, which is the complete removal of the uterus, leaving the woman unable to bear children for the rest of her life;

Whereas diets rich in fatty foods have been a contributing factor to an increased risk in fibroid tumors;

Whereas there are alternative methods to a hysterectomy available, but they are less permanent, and have menopausal symptoms;

Whereas, in cases of hormonal treatment, the fibroids will regrow should the treatment cease; and

Whereas research conducted by the National Institute of Environmental Health indicated that while estrogen and progesterone are contributing factors, fibroids can be targeted by environmental chemicals whose effects are mediated through the estrogen and/or progesterone receptors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress recognizes the health and educational needs of women in the United States who may be suffering from fibroids;

(2) it is the sense of the Congress that the medical community should explore alternatives to hysterectomies in greater detail, so that women who choose to bear children in their lives may do so, while eliminating recurring fibroids; and

(3) the Congress—

(A) encourages women to pay greater attention to their reproductive health by making regular visits to their OB/GYNs; and

(B) encourages women and their physicians to know all safe options available for the prevention and cure of fibroids.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 165, which expresses the sense of the Congress that research and education on fibroid tumors be increased. This resolution was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Energy and Commerce on April 24. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, which will help place a much-needed focus on fibroid tumors and their prevention.

As a firm believer in prevention, I am pleased that this resolution places such an emphasis on providing women with the information they need to make smart decisions about their health. For example, fibroid tumors are linked to diets rich in fatty foods. Women need this important information so they can modify their eating habits to reduce their risks of developing fibroid tumors.

The vast majority of fibroid tumors occur in women of reproductive age. Today, a hysterectomy is the most common treatment for women with fibroid tumors. This procedure has devastating consequences for women as they are unable to have children, as we know, after a hysterectomy.

The resolution calls on the medical community to explore alternatives to hysterectomies for the treatment of fibroid tumors. We must focus research efforts on the development of alternative therapies that will increase the treatment options for women. Therapeutic advances are the surest way to enable women to receive care and preserve their ability to bear children.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her good work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 165.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today the House is considering my bill, H. Con. Res. 165, which deals with uterine fibroid tumors. I want to express my gratitude to the House leadership and to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Subcommittee on Health.

My thanks also to the ranking members, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and my dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), for their efforts to bring this measure to the floor for consideration.

I also want to recognize the respective majority and minority committee professional staff for their work.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, expresses a sense of Congress that continual research and education must be directed to the causes and cures for noncancerous uterine fibroid tumors. These tumors afflict women of reproductive age and affect African-American women 2 to 3 times more frequently than other women. Although the tumors are usually benign, they are quite painful, troublesome and dangerous, depending upon their size and their location.

It has been estimated that 20 to 30 percent of women experience fibroid tumors, even though many of the cases

are not diagnosed. Although these tumors can be quite small, they can multiply and cause great physical discomfort. For many years a surgical procedure known as a hysterectomy, the removal of the uterus, has been used to eliminate the tumors. This surgery unfortunately also eliminates a woman's ability to have children. Therefore, it is imperative that women become more educated about the nature of fibroid uterine tumors and the possible implications for women who suffer from this debilitating health problem.

The best approach for women to effectively deal with this unique health dilemma involves regular exams by their doctor. Furthermore, it is paramount that the medical community explore alternatives to eliminate recurring fibroids by other than a woman having to undergo a hysterectomy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H. Con. Res. 165 has been brought before the House for consideration. For much too long women have suffered terribly with uterine fibroid tumors. I applaud my colleagues for bringing this bill before the House for a vote. This legislation, when enacted, will be implemented to encourage women to seek early detection of uterine fibroid tumors and will further enable doctors to pursue research concerning better treatment to avoid unnecessary and painful surgery.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 165.

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. BILIRAKIS. 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.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF GOOD CERVICAL HEALTH AND DETECTING CERVICAL CANCER DURING EARLIEST STAGES

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 309), recognizing the importance of good cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 309

Whereas approximately 12,900 women are diagnosed with, and 4,400 women die from, cervical cancer in the United States each year;

Whereas women who are members of certain racial or ethnic minorities and women who have a low income are more likely than other women to die from cervical cancer;

Whereas cervical cancer is primarily caused by the human papillomavirus (HPV) and can be detected by a Papanicolaou test (Pap test) or other early detection tests;

Whereas the earlier cervical cancer is detected the better chance a woman has of surviving cervical cancer;

Whereas women of certain racial or ethnic minorities, women who have less than a high school education, and women who have a low income are less likely than other women to receive a Pap test or other early detection test for cervical cancer; and

Whereas cervical cancer survivors have shown tremendous courage and determination in the face of adversity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the importance of good cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages;

(2) urges health care facilities and other medical institutions to continue to raise public awareness about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection;

(3) urges the people of the United States to learn about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection; and

(4) recognizes the survivors of cervical cancer for their tremendous courage and determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 309, which recognizes the importance of good cervical health and detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages. This resolution, which was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Energy and Commerce on April 24, would help increase the public's awareness of cervical cancer and the importance of early detection.

Approximately 12,900 women are diagnosed with, and 4,400 women die from, cervical cancer in the United States each year. I was pleased to sponsor legislation in the 105th Congress, the Women's Health Research and Prevention Amendments of 1998, that included provisions to increase the emphasis on the early detection of this terrible disease. I am, therefore, pleased we are considering this important resolution today that will help us to continue focusing on prevention and early detection of cervical cancer.

Since many vulnerable groups of women are less likely to receive

screening tests for cervical cancer, it is critical that we continue our commitment to education programs so that these women increase their utilization of these important preventative services. This resolution is another positive step in that direction.

We are again indebted to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for this legislation, and I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in support of H. Con. Res. 309.

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise representing the 62 women Members of the House who have worked tirelessly to address these issues, thereby choosing the theme in this 107th Congress, The Wellness of Women.

Today, the House is considering H. Con. Res. 309 as one of these important pieces of legislation. This resolution recognizes the importance of good cervical health and detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages.

I want to thank the Committee on Energy and Commerce chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), for their leadership, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for their efforts in the committee to report this bill favorably out of that committee.

I also want to commend the committee staff for their work.

H. Con. Res. 309 is important because cervical cancer can be fatal for a woman if it is not detected in its earliest stages. In 2002, the American Cancer Society estimates that there will be approximately 13,000 new cases of cervical cancer and, of that number, approximately 4,100 American women will die from this disease.

Cervical cancer can be detected by screening via a Pap smear test. Public awareness of utilizing Pap smear tests is especially important for racial and ethnic minority groups, and those segments of women who exist at or below the poverty level.

I cannot overemphasize the need for early screening because statistical data indicates that the 5-year survival is 70 percent for all stages of cervical cancer when it is detected early. Early screening can also detect pre-cancerous lesions, which can ultimately protect against a woman's contracting cancer.

Mr. Speaker, today the House has taken a huge step forward in educating women and potentially saving lives by passing this legislation. It is often said that acquiring knowledge can be empowering. In the case of cervical cancer, this is absolutely true.

Women throughout America can and will be destined to gain more peace of mind and even greater longevity by

virtue of enhanced awareness and greater application of Pap smear technology once this measure is enacted. Furthermore, generations of women will be able to experience more wholesome and productive lives devoid of cervical cancer.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 309, recognizing the importance of good cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages.

According to the National HPV & Cervical Cancer Campaign, each year approximately 12,900 women are diagnosed with cervical cancer, with 4,400 dying from this dreadful disease.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not to cite statistics, important though they are, but rather to talk about how cervical cancer affected my life. I lost my mother to this dreaded disease.

I can remember the great strength and courage my beloved mother showed even though she was in great pain as she battled for her life.

When she passed away, medical breakthroughs to detect cervical cancer were still far in the future. However, as science progressed we were able to identify that the Human Papillomavirus (HPV) causes this disease and, better yet, able to create tests for early detection. If detected early enough, most women have a good chance of defeating this disease, and living long productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this resolution. I urge our health care facilities to help raise public awareness about the importance of early cervical cancer screening. In addition, I urge all citizens to learn about cervical cancer, and the importance of early detection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before you and my colleagues in support of H. Con. Res. 309, which recognizes the importance of good cervical health and its early detection.

Cervical cancer is nearly 100 percent preventable, yet according to the American Cancer Society, an estimated 13,000 new cases of invasive cervical cancer will be diagnosed in 2002 and about 4,100 women will die of the disease. The good news is that cervical cancer is preventable and curable if it is detected early; in fact, the occurrence of deaths from cervical cancer has declined significantly over the last 20 to 30 years.

Screening younger women using the Pap test is an importance strategy that can actually prevent cervical cancer from developing almost 100% of the time. Research and studies have been found to note that minority populations and persons of low socioeconomic status are affected disproportionately as well.

Early detection of cervical cancer can be the first major victory in the fight against cancer. Research is being done to develop a vaccine, but in the meantime, early detection is the key. The primary purpose of the Pap test screening program is to detect abnormal cellular changes that are not yet cancer. These changes, and very early invasive cancer, are virtually 100% curable. When preventative tests are used following an abnormal Pap test, the rate of detection of cervical cancer can be increased. The majority of deaths from cervical cancer are unnecessary and preventable. The key is early detection.

Mr. Speaker, my message is simple. Go for screening! I encourage women to make their

January calendars each year with this message. With early detection and prevention, no woman need die from cervical cancer.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 309.

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. BILIRAKIS. 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.

2002 COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON U.S. TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY TOWARD SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-216)

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 Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 106 of title I of the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-200), I am providing a report prepared by my Administration entitled, the 2002 Comprehensive Report on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 20, 2002.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT STAFF ASSISTANT OF HONORABLE ED BRYANT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Woody Parker, district staff assistant of the Honorable ED BRYANT, Member of Congress:

CLARKSVILLE, TN,
April 24, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for testimony issued by the Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Tennessee.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

WOODY PARKER,
District Staff Assistant.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 314, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 165, by the yeas and nays; and

House Concurrent Resolution 309, by the yeas and nays.

Votes on the remaining motions to suspend the rules considered earlier today will be taken tomorrow.

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

AMVETS NATIONAL CHARTER DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 314.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 314, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—360

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Bereuter
Ackerman	Baldwin	Berkley
Aderholt	Ballenger	Berman
Akin	Barcia	Berry
Allen	Barr	Biggert
Andrews	Barrett	Bilirakis
Armey	Bartlett	Bishop
Baca	Barton	Blumenauer
Bachus	Bass	Blunt
Baird	Bentsen	Boehler

Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutierrez

Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
Goss
McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore

Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)

Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutierrez

[Roll No. 172]
YEAS—363
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo

Lofgren
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders

NOT VOTING—74

Baker
Becerra
Blagojevich
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Callahan
Cannon
Clay
Clement
Keller
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Davis (IL)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Emerson
Fattah
Flake
Greenwood
Harman
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hulshof
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Mascara
Matsui
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Riley
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanders
Schaffer
Sessions
Simmons
Snyder
Stump
Taubin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Towns
Traficant
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1857

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to clause 8 of 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT CONTINUAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION INTO CAUSE AND CURE FOR FIBROID CANCER BE ADDRESSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 165. The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 165, 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 363, nays 0, not voting 71, as follows:

Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

NOT VOTING—71

Baker
Becerra
Blagojevich
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Callahan
Cannon
Clay
Clement
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Davis (IL)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Emerson
Fattah
Flake
Greenwood

1905

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Expressing the sense of the Congress that continual research and education into the cause and cure for fibroid tumors be addressed."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF GOOD CERVICAL HEALTH AND DETECTING CERVICAL CANCER DURING EARLIEST STAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 309.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 309, 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 361, nays 0, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—361

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich

Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson

NOT VOTING—73

Baker
Becerra
Blagojevich
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Callahan
Cannon
Clay
Clement
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Davis (IL)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Emerson
Fattah
Flake
Greenwood
Harman

1915

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed recorded votes on Monday, May 20, 2002. I would like the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

On. H. Con. Res. 314, Recognizing the Members of AMVETS for Their Service to the Nation, I would have voted "yea"; on H. Con. Res. 165, Sense of the Congress regarding Fibroid Cancer, I would have voted "yea"; on H. Con. Res. 309, Recognizing the importance of Good Cervical Health, I would have voted "yea."

PESONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows. I would have voted "yea" on

H. Con. Res. 314, Recognizing and Supporting American Veterans, H. Con. Res. 165, Support for Continued Fibroid Cancer Research and H. Con. Res. 309, Importance of Good Cervical Health & Early Detection of Cervical Cancer.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the opportunity to record my position on rollcall votes 171, 172 and 173. I was regrettably absent from the chamber today during rollcall votes 171, 172 and 173. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all three votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4187

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4187, Presidential Records Act amendments.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). 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.

TRIBUTE TO THE FOUNDERS AND MEMBERS OF THE U.S. PROFESSIONAL VOLLEYBALL LEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a special tribute to some very special athletes and to an incredibly important entrepreneur. To paraphrase one of my favorite Presidents: "Those who say that there are no more American heroes, well, they just don't know where to look."

For too long, there have been too few women athletes for girls to look up to. A brave entrepreneur named Bill Kennedy decided to change all that. He created the U.S. Professional Volleyball League. This was their inaugural season.

They assembled some of the finest women athletes and put together an exciting season. If you thought 30-inch vertical jumps were only for the NBA, you would be wrong. Fans responded by filling arenas and cheering to the top of their lungs.

Now, I admit that we are especially proud of Coach Tore Aleksandersen, General Manager Kevin Rueten, and all the members of the Minnesota Chill. They won both the regular season and the playoff championship. Rochester is proud to call them our home team.

Perhaps even better than seeing the Chill win the championship was to see

the adoration in the eyes of young girls who came to cheer for their local heroes.

We all need heroes and role models. We were blessed to find a new group in the Chill and in the entire league. We saw little of the bad behavior which has become so commonplace in modern day sports. We were treated to spirited competition that parents could be proud to take their children to. I have little doubt that the league will grow and prosper.

Congratulations again to all the members of the Minnesota Chill for their championship in this inaugural season and thank you again to Bill Kennedy for giving us this new league and a wonderful group of new heroes.

EAST TIMOR'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, this week, on the other side of the globe, the world celebrates the creation of a new democracy, the Democratic Republic of East Timor. I congratulate and honor the people of this island nation for their perseverance and for the triumph of freedom over oppression.

The effort to bring self-determination to East Timor was a dream back in 1994, when I first came to the House. But now, today, it is a reality. Since coming to Congress, I have seen how the East Timorese people have stood against tremendous odds, resisted military rule, despite the killing of one-third of the population in the 1970s and the oppression and massacres of subsequent years.

There have been many of us in Congress dedicated to the plight of the East Timorese largely because of the information we learned over years of meetings and visits with the residents of East Timor. I personally had the opportunity to go to East Timor to visit with Bishop Belo, one of the two Nobel Peace prize winners. They and others were willing to give me their stories, tell me what was going on.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, and with the work of groups such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, and I might add the Catholic Conference of Bishops was a tremendous help in this effort, as well as the Indonesian Human Rights Network, and, of course, East Timor Action Network, all who were instrumental, everyone should feel very proud of this effort and outcome.

Let me just conclude by saying we are at a critical time now with this new democracy. We need to give it all the support it can get so that it can establish itself and make a difference for the people of East Timor.

As we move forward, however, we cannot forget the need to continue to show our support for East Timor's sustainable development and a positive future.

The United States should work with the United Nations and its members to make sure that the job of preparing East Timor for self-rule is completed.

Enough proper expertise and funds must be provided to ensure a smooth transition in government services and to train East Timorese to fully manage their own affairs.

After decades of tremendous suffering under military occupation, we need to give generously to East Timor to ensure that children are guaranteed a quality education, adequate healthcare and shelter, and that other needs for a decent standard of living are met.

This is especially crucial in light of the recently released United Nations Development Program Report that classified East Timor as one of the twenty poorest countries in the world and the poorest in Asia.

Life expectancy in the island nation is just 57 years, and nearly half the population lives on less than fifty-five American cents (\$.55) per day.

This burgeoning democracy will need our hand as we move into the Twenty First Century.

I look forward to working with my Colleagues in Congress on these issues and these challenges.

But today, we celebrate the perseverance and the spirit of the East Timorese and we celebrate the creation of democracy.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight, May 20, 2002, to file a privileged report on a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 1 of rule XXI, points of order are reserved.

SUPPORT OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, a number of Members came on the floor during 1-minute speeches, based on a report that was in on CBS News reporting that there was some speculation, if you will, that President Bush actually knew the events of September 11 would happen and that he did nothing to prevent them. To say I was outraged would minimize my feelings on this issue.

I wanted to address this Chamber late Thursday because, as I heard these speakers one by one mount the podium to challenge the Commander in Chief

of this country, I was not only shocked but chagrined that, in the middle of a fight against terrorism, while our men and women are in Afghanistan and our soldiers are standing vigil around the world, that Members would actually speculate not only openly but antagonistically impugn the President's reputation.

I heard this weeks ago, when a Member of this body speculated that not only did he know but he kept the information quiet so people could profit from their knowledge; that investors and people who bought defense stock and others, and this Member actually singled out a few and suggested they were in fact in on the game. Now, clearly, I thought that was so far out in left field that I would not even give it credence. But then respected Members of this body got up and continued the assault this week, including a gentleman from New York, who even speculated that the President, if he knew, was personally responsible for the deaths in New York.

Now, talk about shock, talk about outrage, talk about reckless commentary. We all want to know what happened September 11, and we all want to talk about the failures potentially of intelligence, and we all want to look at the system and try to perfect it so it does not happen again. The warnings in the last 24 hours are shocking and are of great concern to every American and should be to every Member of this body. But for a Member to sit here and randomly speculate that he or she believes that this President, or any President, would know of this information and sit on it, is just sheer lunacy, and it is regrettable. I think those that made those comments should seek to have them taken down, because I think they are not only reprehensible but they diminish our united efforts on terrorism.

There is one thing certain in America, as we all think about the tragedy that began in New York and spread to Washington and to the fields of Pennsylvania, that many lives were lost due to people who did not respect our country. They do not respect what we stand for. They do not respect democracy. But to have our own Members of this Congress speculate alongside them and question the dedication of a President?

I remember when there was an invasion of Bosnia, and there was speculation because of a scandal enveloping the President that he may have proceeded to bomb Bosnia because he was trying to deflect the attention from the scandal in Washington. I myself, as a Republican, took umbrage to that. I was outraged by that comment as well, because I felt to speculate that a good, kind man, like President Clinton or President Bush, would knowingly risk innocent lives, one to deflect criticism from themselves and one because they were not paying attention to the job, is just the height of irresponsibility.

We have a lot to do in this body, and we have a lot of questions to ask.

Seems like those questions are fired fast and furious at the other end of this hall by those who want to interview Governor Ridge; they want answers to all these questions; they want to see the detailed briefings; they want to lay out all of this for the world to see. And the ones I am concerned about seeing this the most are the terrorists that may still be residing in this country.

So rather than be divisive, let us pull ourselves together. There will be plenty of time to lead inquiry; but we are actively engaged right now in the pursuit of freedom, we are actively engaged in protecting our citizens from terrorism, we are actively engaged in trying to get all agencies of the Federal Government to cooperate, the FBI, the CIA, Border Patrol, and Immigration. So I think our collective efforts, rather than to see who can point fingers and accuse the Commander in Chief and the President of this great country, we should be focusing our efforts to strengthen our common resolve against our enemy.

Our enemy is not at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Our enemy should not be the Republican or Democratic Party, or who controls this Chamber. This fight is not over who runs this place. It is a fight for democracy, and it is a fight for freedom. And I hope my colleagues will be cautious when they seek to accuse this fine President of shirking his responsibility and his duty.

I am proud of him. I think he has done a masterful job. And I continue to give him 100 percent of my support.

CRISES IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from a recent report called, "A Future With Hope," prepared by Bread for the World. It says, under the policy to address world hunger, and I quote, "The terrorist attack of September 11, 2001, profoundly affected the United States. Psychologically the Nation was wounded, the vulnerability exposed, and its sense of security shattered. The attack pushed an already faltering economy into recession, yet much of the developing world would suffer even greater devastation as a result of the attacks. A World Bank study reported that the ripple effect from September 11 would hurt economic growth in developing countries, especially in Africa."

Mr. Speaker, in the last years, there has been much discussion about assistance to Africa by Western countries, including the United States and Europe. With the crisis of AIDS and other infectious diseases continuing to grow ever more menacing, the wealthy countries of the world are finally, though still inadequately, taking notice, and we support them, taking notice of a pandemic and the devastation directed

every day upon our African brothers and sisters.

□ 1930

AIDS does not discriminate. Killing off entire generation of Africans, both adults and children, it empties rural communities, towns and villages and professional urban classes indiscriminately, without regard for class or clan. However, the level of newfound interest in Africa remains insufficient and indeed grossly lacking. AIDS is not the only crisis that is causing great harm on the continent of Africa right now. As AIDS devastates African nations with frightening speed, so too do the specter of hunger and the shadows of famine fall across southern Africa.

I ask my colleagues, in our newfound interest in Africa, to consider the widespread incidence of hunger in Africa. The reports are arriving with greater frequency and they are chilling. As many as 20 million people in the region of southern Africa are suffering from hunger and insecurity of food. My friends, this is equal to the population of the entire State of Texas. Let us just consider for one moment that we knew the entire State of Texas was dying for insufficient food. We indeed would do something.

Please consider The Washington Post article, and I quote. I want to just read a part of that:

"Please forgive my ramblings," said the old man, stooped and still as he sat on a wooden stool in front of his mud hut. The hunger makes my mind wander."

"In his lucid moments, Lucas Lufuzi recites the numbers, calibrating his catastrophic situation. Three days since he's eaten. Thirty-one cobs of unripe, green corn. One son: 29 years alive and 21 days dead. Two seasons of crops spoiled by erratic weather, rain one year, drought the next."

"What is taking place across southern Africa is the perfect famine, a disastrous collaboration between nature and man that has caused the region's worst food shortage in nearly 60 years."

The worst food shortage in 60 years. Let us remember that we had the Biafran tragedy, the Ethiopian famines of the eighties, the long hunger march of the Sudanese which continues to this day. Sixty years, Mr. Speaker. We can do better.

We will consider a bill on emergency funding, and I ask my colleagues to consider no better cause than to respond to the hunger of the world. Until this is done, we cannot claim to be really concerned about our brothers and sisters in Africa.

In the last year, there has been much discussion about the assistance to Africa by Western nations including the United States and Europe. With the crisis of AIDS and other infectious diseases continuing to grow ever more menacing, the wealthy countries of the world are finally, though still inadequately, taking notice of the pandemic and the devastation that it wreaks every day upon our African

brothers and sisters. AIDS does not discriminate. Killing off entire generations of Africans, it empties rural villages and professional urban classes indiscriminately, without regard for class or clan. However the level of newfound interest in Africa, it remains insufficient and is grossly lacking.

However, AIDS is not the only crisis causing great harm on the continent of Africa right now. As AIDS devastates African nation's with frightening speed, so too is the specter of hunger and the shadow of famine fall across Southern Africa. I ask my colleagues in our newfound interest in Africa to consider the widespread hunger? The reports are arriving with greater frequency and they are chilling. As many as 20 million people in the region of Southern Africa are suffering from hunger and insecurity of nutrition. My friends, this is equal to the population of Texas. Let us imagine that the entire state of Texas were suffering through an extreme shortage of food. What would our response be then?

Last week the Washington Post ran an article on this horrible situation. I would like to read the first part of it.

"Please forgive my ramblings," said the old man, stopped and still as he sat on a wooden stool in front of his mud hut. "The hunger makes my mind wander."

"In his lucid moments, Lucas Lufuzi recites the numbers, calibrating his catastrophe. Three days since he's eaten. Thirty-one cobs of unripe green corn. One son: 29 years alive and 21 days dead. Two seasons of crops spoiled by erratic weather—rain one year, drought the next."

"What is taking place across southern Africa is the perfect famine, a disastrous collaboration between nature and man that has caused the region's worst food shortage in nearly 60 years."

The worst food shortage in 60 years! Let us remember the Biafran tragedy, the Ethiopian famines of the 80s, the long hunger March of the Sudánese, which continues to this day. For someone to contend that this is the worst food shortage in the region in nearly 60 years is no small statement, it is a call to action.

I see very little action. Relief organizations estimate that they will need 145,000 tons of food, or about \$70 million worth, to prevent widespread starvation. According to the Washington Post, donors have thus far pledged only \$3 million.

This week the House of Representatives will consider a supplemental appropriations bill that will cost over \$25 billion. Much of the spending in this bill will be legitimate.

But to the best of my knowledge this bill will not contain funds to address the looming crisis in Southern Africa. It will not provide the resources necessary to prevent suffering and misery in Malawi, in Zambia, in Zimbabwe.

Let there be no doubt. This body would be hard pressed to find a better, more humane, and more necessary way to spend \$50 million to address the famine that is ravaging Southern Africa.

My colleagues, let us not mistake idle chatter for a real concern about Africa. Let us not believe that a minor increase in African development assistance is an adequate response to the cries for help now coming from Southern Africa. My friends, until the suffering of Africa is brought to a halt, until AIDS is contained, until the ravages of famine are dispersed like dust—until that day—our concern for Africa,

no matter how real or how genuine, will not be concerned enough.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 2002]
FAMINE LOOMS FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA—MILIONS SUFFERING IN CRISIS CREATED BY NATURE, EXACERBATED BY MAN

(By Jon Jeter)

MCHINJI, MALAWI.—"Please forgive my ramblings," said the old man, stooped and still as he sat on a wooden stool in front of his mud hut. "The hunger makes my mind wander."

In his lucid moments, Lucas Lufuzi recites the numbers, calibrating his catastrophe. Three days since he's eaten. Thirty-one tiny cobs of unripe, green corn. Two grandchildren to feed. One son: 29 years alive; 21 days dead. Two seasons of crops spoiled by erratic weather—rain one year, drought the next.

"I have never seen such starvation," said Lufuzi, who does not know his age but says he believes he is close to 60. "Our family relied on my son to work the farm and for the income he earned [working part time on commercial farms].

"When my grandchildren's feet began to swell from hunger, I had no choice but to harvest the crops before they were ready. This," he said, nodding to a basket of shriveled corn, "is all that keeps us from death."

What is taking shape across southern Africa is the perfect famine, a disastrous collaboration between nature and man that has caused the region's worst food shortage in nearly 60 years.

Officials in the region say as many as 20 million people are suffering from hunger and malnutrition. The U.N. World Food Program is already feeding more than 2.6 million in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia and other countries in the region, and agency officials say that number will at least double in the coming months as peasants finish off the meager yields from this season's harvest.

Overall, relief workers anticipate they will need roughly 145,000 tons of food, worth about \$69 million, to plug the immediate shortfall in domestic crop production in the region. So far, donors have pledged only about \$3 million.

Officials with the Southern African Development Community (SADC), a coalition of 14 nations, say they will need to import 3.2 million tons of corn—the region's staple food—to offset the deficit, about double the amount imported last year.

"We've got a full-scale famine on our hands," said Kerran Hedland, a spokeswoman for the World Food Program in Malawi.

A year of flooding followed by a year of drought are largely to blame for the widespread crop failure. But international donors, Western diplomats and civic organizations say the crisis has been aggravated by graft—or at least mismanagement—in Malawi and by political upheaval in neighboring Zimbabwe, usually one of the continent's most reliable food producers.

Malawian officials last year inexplicably sold the country's 167,000-ton emergency grain reserve and have not accounted for the proceeds. Officials have denied any wrongdoing and promised an investigation, but the International Monetary Fund, Britain, the European Union and other sources have frozen at least \$75 million in aid payments as a result.

President Robert Mugabe's seizure of white-owned commercial farms in Zimbabwe has hurt not only that country's crop yields but those of its neighbors. With one of the region's most robust agricultural sectors, Zimbabwe for years sold or donated surplus crops to other African countries that needed help.

But Mugabe's violent, two-year-old campaign to redistribute farms to poor, landless blacks has disrupted farming and cut off routes used to transport food to neighboring countries. Food production in Zimbabwe has dropped by nearly 40 percent this year, according to SADC officials, and last week Mugabe joined Malawi's president, Bakili Muluzi, in declaring a state of emergency.

"Land acquisitions in Zimbabwe have had a dramatic effect on the amount [of food] that should have been produced in the country," said Judith Lewis, the World Food Program's regional director for eastern and southern Africa. "Much needs to be done. The time is running out."

The food reserve scandal in Malawi and Zimbabwe's political turmoil have compounded the problem by depleting stocks and driving up the price of corn by as much as 300 percent here in Malawi and in Zambia. What food is available is simply unaffordable to many people in the region.

Tipilire Kasingiro and her three small children ran out of corn from last year's harvest in December, and the shortage of food has kept her busy caring for her 18-month-old daughter, Marizani, who has frequently been sick. That left her unable to work part time as a housekeeper and earn spare money in the months before the harvest.

"Even if I had worked, it wouldn't be enough to buy the maize like I did last year," she said, as she held Marizani, a wraith of a girl, sunken-eyed and unmoving. "The maize is so expensive this year."

So she foraged the village for fruit, and when she was unable to find more, she and her neighbors dug up the roots of a banana tree, pounded them in a bowl and made a foul-tasting porridge, knowing that it would eventually make them ill.

"We were desperate, and we knew it would fill our bellies, if only temporarily," she said. "My babies were swelling up like they were going to burst. I had to do something."

Southern Africa has endured widespread food shortages before, most recently a decade ago when drought struck the region. But the situation now is far worse, many Africans say, partly because famished peasants are eating tree stems, sawdust and wild leaves, causing an increase in disease.

"You would see people eating green maize" during the drought in the early 1990s, "but you didn't see people eating the roots of trees," said Sister Agnes Eneyasicio, of St. Mary's Catholic Church in the village of Ludzi, in Mchinji district near the border with Zambia.

When St. Mary's opened a feeding center for 600 children in January, "our two schools were completely empty," she said. "The children were too hungry to come to school. You'd go and find whole villages empty because everyone was out searching for food. We've never experienced anything like this in Malawi."

The AIDS epidemic, which was only beginning to surface in southern Africa a decade ago, is deepening the misery. An estimated one of every six adult Malawians is infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, and hunger has accelerated the onset of debilitating diseases and even death among many household breadwinners here, according to relief and medical workers.

The epidemic has further cut into the country's crop production by leaving the elderly, children and orphans to care for the sick, assume the responsibilities of planting and harvesting crops, or take odd jobs for extra income.

Herein Mchinji, AIDS, and other illnesses have compounded the food problems, Lufuzi's son, James, fell ill and died three weeks ago, though his father does not know exactly what caused his death. "He did not discuss that with me," Lufuzi said.

James Lufuzi had sporadic bouts of illness, but when the family ran short of food late last year, his condition deteriorated. He died at home last month, leaving his father, a widower himself, to care for his two daughters, 9 and 7.

When asked if his son may have had HIV, he nods. "I believe that may have been the case. The hunger fed his illness until he could not hold on any longer."

Amid such privation, food is precious to those who have it and tempting to those who do not. When Goodson Mussa was accused of stealing corn from a field near the capital, Lilongwe, three men used a razor blade to cut off one of his ears.

"They beat me and spit on me, and one of them threatened to douse me with [Kerosene] and set me alight," said Mussa, 33. Asked several times if he was indeed trying to steal corn, Mussa refused to answer directly.

"Hunger is terrible," he said, holding his hand up to his bandaged head. "What man wouldn't steal if he's watching his own children starve to death before his very eyes?"

CORPORATIONS SEEK TAX DODGE IN BERMUDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, not that long ago, more than 88 million Americans dutifully filed their individual income taxes. But now we find out that a growing number of United States corporations have developed a new tax dodge, a new sort of Bermuda Triangle to disappear their tax obligations to the Federal Government and the United States of America.

That is not too surprising, given the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. O'Neill. He said that absolutely he backs the abolition of taxes on corporations. "The clear economic truth is that businesses and corporations don't pay taxes, they just collect them for the government," he told the *Financial Times*. He is part right. Many corporations do not pay taxes anymore. The burden is growing on individual Americans. Thirty years ago when our corporations were the envy of the world and we were the manufacturing capital of the world, 25 percent of the taxes of the United States were paid by corporations. Today, it is less than 10. Of course, most of our manufacturing has fled overseas and now those companies that have remained here are hoping to move their tax obligations offshore to places where they do not pay taxes. They say, as Stanley Works did in defending this practice when they held a recent vote of stockholders, it is all about the stockholders.

From today's *New York Times*, it is not about the stockholders. It is about the CEOs. It is all about the CEOs. According to the *New York Times*, the CEO of Stanley Works will get 58 percent of the \$30 million they expect to not pay in Federal income taxes by moving the corporation to Barbados and Bermuda. So we screw the American taxpayers. We screw the stock-

holders, too, because they are going to have to pay capital gains taxes. But the gentleman who runs the company will get a huge bonus. He might still have to pay some U.S. income taxes, but he probably has some smart accountants who will figure out how he can get around that, too.

What is the reaction of the United States Congress to this scandal? We had hoped here in the United States House of Representatives, the people's House, that there would be some outrage about this shift of taxes from large, profitable corporations and their CEOs on to individual Americans and small businesses. But instead, on the Republican side, the reaction is protect these tax dodges at any cost.

We were going to take up a bill on the marriage penalty, which is a real problem for American families. But on the Democratic side we were going to offer an amendment, an amendment to close this tax loophole, to break up the new Bermuda Triangle, to not allow companies that are based in, manufacture in, employ people in the United States of America to pretend that they are in Barbados and pretend that they are in Bermuda in order to avoid their tax obligations.

It should not be very controversial, should it? This is a time, as we heard so eloquently from the gentleman before me, of great threat to our Nation where people should not be asking questions about who knew what, when, where and how. But this is something we know, and we should be asking, why should we allow these corporations to avoid their tax obligations? Why should they not join in the great patriotic need to raise funds to fight the threat of terrorism? Why should they enjoy all the privileges of American citizenship and pay not a whit for it? But the reaction of the House leadership was to cancel the consideration of the marriage penalty on another day as a regular bill and bring it up instead as a suspension tomorrow with no amendments allowed. God forbid that the United States House of Representatives should break up this little scam. I mean, after all, this CEO of Stanley Works will probably send a good part of his little take there, his \$17.8 million to one of their fund-raisers in gratitude, maybe 10 percent, maybe 20. Who knows what the share will be.

This is absolutely outrageous. The American people are paying their taxes. The country is under attack. We are in a huge deficit. We are spending the Social Security trust fund. The lockbox for Social Security is long gone. We are piling up a huge and growing deficit. We have enough controversy over the proposals by the Republicans to make permanent the tax cuts for the largest estates and the wealthiest Americans, but to allow this outrage, companies based in the United States of America, in all reality, to rent a post office box in Bermuda and a filing cabinet in Barbados and pretend they are not U.S. corporations anymore and not pay any taxes.

I am ashamed of the Republican leadership.

CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

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, when the supplemental appropriation bill comes up this week, largely for defense purposes, the Republican majority will try to play games and use sleight of hand to slip an increase in the debt ceiling past the American people. These issues should not be linked. They should be voted separately.

Yes, America has returned to the days of a growing budget deficit. The President's economic policy will reduce our surplus by nearly \$1.7 trillion. That is 42 percent. The government, therefore, is about to bump its head against the debt ceiling.

This situation makes it all the more irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, for this Congress in the same bill to throw more than \$100 million in taxpayer money to the wind to protect a private oil pipeline in the nation of Colombia. Yes, that is right. American taxpayers are being asked to pony up over \$100 million to protect a private oil pipeline in a foreign country. This oil pipeline is owned by two multinational corporations and also by the Government of Colombia.

I will be offering an amendment to strike the first \$6 million down payment in funding in this bill to protect what is called the Cano Limon oil pipeline. Most Americans do not even know about this pipeline; but they should, because the Bush administration wants to use their tax dollars to protect it. This pipeline that pipes Colombian oil is owned by U.S.-based Occidental Petroleum, along with Repsol, a Spanish-Argentine combine, and Ecopetrol, which is an arm of the Government of Colombia.

Can you believe it? This is where our lack of a national energy policy has led us, into the jungles of a Colombian war and into the middle of a civil war that has raged for two generations. The Bush administration wants Congress to spend American tax dollars to defend a pipeline that is owned by the Government of Colombia, a Spanish-Argentine multinational corporation and Occidental Petroleum, an American-based multinational giant, to pump Colombian oil.

When you think about it, this first \$6 million is but a down payment on \$104 million which is supposed to come later. This particular pipeline has been repeatedly attacked in Colombia's 38-year-long civil war.

Occidental Petroleum is not a poor company. In fact, it earned profits of more than \$2 billion over the last 2 years. So why in the world should the American people have to foot this bill?

This gift to Big Oil is a waste of our taxpayers' money and will only lead to other Big Oil giants lining up for similar corporate handouts. We are going backwards. We have gone from shoveling money into the pockets of American multinationals like Enron, that is outrageous enough, to shoveling money into the pockets of foreign multinational corporations and foreign governments.

Where does it stop? Where do we draw the line? When do we adopt a real energy policy in this country that promotes biodiesel, ethanol and other renewable fuels and cures our addiction to foreign oil? How many wars do we have to fight? How many people have to die? How many taxpayer dollars have to be wasted to keep the foreign oil flowing?

The Colombian army brigade that will be trained with these funds will protect a pipeline that, when operational, will pump about 35 million barrels per year. This adds up to \$3 per barrel in costs to U.S. taxpayers to protect a pipeline for which Occidental currently pays security costs of about 50 cents per barrel. Very interesting. Moreover, as military Occidental Oil spokesman Larry Meriage admitted before Congress in February 2000, "This pipeline is 483 miles long, and so there aren't enough troops in all of Colombia to protect that pipeline along its corridor."

Americans should not be in the business of paying for the protection of privately owned foreign oil pipelines abroad. We must act now to defeat this dangerous and wasteful pipeline protection proposal. If this \$6 million down payment is provided now, it will be extremely difficult to stop the \$98 million that is still due when the 2003 foreign operations bill is debated later this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to just say no. Say no to the Cano Limon pipeline. Say no to foreign oil. And say no to the Bush administration policy to keep our Nation addicted to foreign oil.

REGARDING EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, you have to have some patience to be sitting over here and listening to the last 20 minutes of Democratic rhetoric. Let us start with a little rebuttal because under the rules of the House, as you understand, they do not have to yield time and, of course, they would not yield time so their remarks all tell one side of the story.

Let us start with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). In the West we would call the gentleman from Oregon on this subject kind of a Johnny come lately. Where has he been? I noticed he

just ran onto the House floor, still in his Levi's, puts a suit coat on and starts talking about what the Republicans have not done with a company called Stanley Works which makes Stanley tools up there in Connecticut and is trying to avoid U.S. tax by registering with a post office box in Bermuda. He says nobody has heard anything about this. He acts as if he is breaking new ice.

The gentleman from Oregon should have signed on to my bill. I have got the first bill on that to close that loophole. It is a terrible loophole. I had the chairman of that corporation in my office, and I gave that chairman a list of the American soldiers that lost their lives in Afghanistan trying to defend this country and the interests of this Nation. I said that any corporation that does business in America has more than an economic interest in this country. They have a moral responsibility to their community.

□ 1945

They have an inherent obligation to their country that provides them with the freedoms and the fruits of freedoms that this Nation offers to business people.

This country provides the defense for Stanley Tool Company. And, by the way, Stanley Tool Company, which is registering in Bermuda, has zero sales in Bermuda. They freely admit all they are going to do is get a post office box and save \$30 million.

What bothers me about this, I think we can all agree on the issue, Stanley Tool Works, and many of you today, by the way, if you buy Stanley tools, you ought to quit buying them, because Stanley Tools is no longer that American company. They will keep all their manufacturing here, for a while, anyway, but they are going to put that post office box so they do not have to pay taxes, like any of the rest of you in this room. So keep that in mind. Next time you go down and want to buy a tool, you need a tool, do not buy Stanley tools.

What bothers me about the comments of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), he comes in here strictly on a partisan issue and starts bashing the Republicans. I would say to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), we have had this bill in place, it is my bill, I know a lot about it, we have had this bill in place for a couple of months. I did not see the gentleman at any of the meetings. I have not seen the gentleman at the Committee on Ways and Means. We have had several meetings in regards to this tax issue.

For the gentleman to come up to the floor, just like a greenhorn, that is what we would call you in the West, somebody that pops on the scene, you know, is kind of fresh to the thing and thinks they know everything, before the gentleman starts up here giving these blasphemous words and language and partisanship against the Republican leadership, the gentleman ought

to look up his bill directory, and I think the gentleman would be surprised. Not only do I have a bill there, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) has a bill, and the gentleman might be surprised there are a couple of people on his side of the aisle that have bills.

To the best of my knowledge, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has not been at any of these meetings in regards to our effort to stop corporations like Stanley Tool Company from incorporating in Bermuda for the simple reason of avoiding taxes in this country.

So if the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) would spend more time working with us on our side, we are the majority. You were the majority. You could have shut this loophole when you were the majority; you did not. I hope we as the majority, in combination with people like the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) who want to work with us, will shut this loophole.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) was correct, it is not fair to the American people what this corporation is doing. I hope that the chairman of that corporation who the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) says will make many, many millions of dollars, and I happen to believe he probably is correct, I hope the chairman of that corporation has that list that I gave him of the soldiers who have given their lives so far. Now, this is up to a week ago. I know we lost a soldier yesterday. But up to a week ago, those soldiers who had given their lives so you would be free to do business in this country. I hope that chairman is having second thoughts ever since the moment he left my office. My guess would be that he has not.

But the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), in my opinion, next time the gentleman wants to start blasting, it is obvious it is a political year, next time the gentleman wants to start blasting us, he ought to figure out if we have not already done the work on it.

I think it gives the gentleman a little more credibility to come in here, not as Johnny-come-lately, but come in here and really come up with some new information and come up with something positive that will help us move the ball.

Now, how interesting, I see in regards to the second speaker that attacks on a very partisan basis and says it is Bush's policy that we have to rely in the future on foreign oil, how little knowledge that individual, in my opinion, has on ethanol, for example.

Take a look at I think today's Wall Street Journal. I would ask my colleague to take a look at that column, on the editorial, guest column on ethanol. Do you know it takes more fossil fuel to generate the Btus of ethanol, to provide a gallon of ethanol, than a gallon of ethanol can give off?

This article points out there is a reason that the people who produce ethanol use fossil fuels for the generation

of the ethanol. It is because fossil fuels are cheaper to produce, and ethanol, in the long run, you are better off to pour the gasoline in the ground than replace it with ethanol, because you use more gas, more Btus, to produce less Btus through ethanol.

My colleague goes on and says all we have to do is have alternative energy. She ignores the facts, either intentionally or accidentally, ignores the facts of alternative energy in this country. Today if we took all of the alternative energy known to the world, all of the alternative energy known to the world, and were able to somehow magically put it in the United States of America, it would only meet about 4 or 5 percent of our energy demand. The fact is that alternative energy is the future of this country, but that future is still 15 or 20 years out there, and, in the meantime, you have got to have oil production in this country.

Now, if you do not support that kind of thing, then you yourself ought to quit driving an automobile. You yourself ought to quit appearing in a Chamber like this, look how many lights are lit in this Chamber, so you can present your point of view. You ought to quit using anything that has an oil base to it, which includes, by the way, prescriptions, medicine, clothes, you know the gambit. Our everyday life is very dependent on those fossil fuels.

The Republicans have led the way, in my opinion, with the help from Democrats, and there are a lot of things we have had a bipartisan effort on, of trying to work off fossil fuels. But before we leave fossil fuels, we had better figure out something that is going to work. We had better figure out something that is going to work. And today, throughout the whole world, as I said, everything that works outside of fossil fuels, including solar power, would only provide about 4 percent of our needs.

What I would suggest to my good colleague from the State of Ohio, instead of coming up here hollering about alternative fuels and about this President, which is a direct misstatement, about how President Bush's policy is to remain committed to foreign oil, what my colleague would be much better, much better off doing is talking about conservation.

If you want to save energy immediately, it is not alternative fuels, it is conservation. Put out every fourth light up there in that ceiling. Drive your car a little less. Do not idle your car. Turn off your light when you leave the room. Make sure your dishwasher is full when you wash your dishes. If you want to make a real dent in U.S. consumption of foreign oil, conservation is the answer, not come up here with some kind of partisan bashing of the Republican Party, which seems to be a favorite thing of the Democrats in this election year.

Now I want to move on to another topic. I hope this evening, I really, really want to spend some time with

my colleagues talking about the land issues in the West. My district is in Colorado. I am very proud of the State of Colorado. Colorado is a very unique State when it comes to whether it is energy issues, whether it is water issues or land issues or forest fire issues. I want to spend some time this evening talking about that.

But I feel compelled, I feel compelled to come up and give the other side of the story. And there is something else that I want to give the other side of the story. Last week as we were about to adjourn, colleagues, oh boy, guess what happened? We had a media circus around here. We had a media circus. And I am not trying to be partisan here, but the fact is, just like this energy thing, just like this Bermuda tax shelter thing, the Democrats last week were jumping for joy as we were about to get out of here thinking that Bush knew that this country was going to be attacked on September 11 and he did nothing about it.

That is, on its face, absolutely unfounded, absolutely ridiculous, and, in my opinion, scandalous. Show me one colleague, whether it is the most liberal Democrat we have in the House Chamber, whether it is the most conservative Republican we have in the House Chamber, whether it is the one independent or socialist, whatever he is, that we have in the House Chamber, show me one person, one person in here, that has ever served in here, that would get information about something happening like September 11 and would sit on it and do nothing about it.

There is not a person that holds public office in America, whether it is the local mayor, whether it is the county commissioner, State legislator, governor, congressman or senator or the President, that would get information that September 11 was about to happen and sit on it, which was exactly the implication the Democrats tried to paint on our President last week. And guess what happened? You know, they accomplished their goal.

Here is the kind of headlines we see coming out in this weekly magazine. "What Bush Knew." One of the senators over there stood over there with the New York Post, I think, "Bush knew about September 11."

You know, the problem we have got, and let us talk about these briefings and the information we get. I got information not too long ago from a fortune teller, and she swore to me that there was a bomb that was going to go off on a cruise ship. I mean, what do you do with this kind of stuff?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINNIS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman in a moment, if he will just give me a couple of minutes, because I would like to have a conversation about this.

I am very upset about this. I am trying to say come on, instead of running right over here, and I will tell you, the minority leader did not even have time

to put his suit coat on before he was over there preaching about what did the President know? We need to have a task force. The United States Congress ought to get a task force to find out what the President knew, when he knew it.

Look, we are not investigating the President. Why are we trying to eat our own? The President did not know September 11 was going to occur. For God's sake, he is a Texan. Have you ever seen a Texan that knew a fight was coming that did not stand up to give the first slug? He did not sit there. He did not have the information September 11 was going to happen.

Now, we all wish that our intelligence network would have been better, and it is always easy, it is always easy after a fire to figure out where the fire trucks should be, and it has never failed. I used to be a police officer, and I can tell you every serious crime I ever investigated, I would have people come up as we were doing the investigation that would say, you know, I told them there was going to be a murder over here in this neighborhood. I told them they were going to have a car accident at this intersection and they needed to put more traffic lights in here. I told them this school child was going to get hit and they needed to have intersection guards 8 hours a day instead of 7½ hours a day.

It is always easy to second-guess. But what does this do to our country, what does it do to our Nation, when on a Friday we can get a little partisan pool of people speaking up, and the next week it leads to these kind of headlines? What do you think the foreign press does with that kind of stuff?

We have a war to fight here. We ought to stick together, instead of coming up with this hodgepodge stuff about, well, Bush must have known, and Congress ought to be privy to all of this intelligence. Oh, yes, see how long a secret could remain if you had a task force made up of congressmen with highly sensitive material.

Let the President do his job, and rest assured, not one Democrat or not one Republican in the Senate or in the House or any level of government would have sat on information that said you are about to lose 3,000 of your citizens on September 11, and say, well, let us put it in this drawer. I do not want to act on that.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Colorado for yielding. I understand the gentleman's concern and passion.

I would just like to share with the gentleman that some of us feel the same as does the gentleman, and that is that the President would not have sat on information, had he known.

My criticism, and I have been critical, and I might add I think it is legitimate, is the way they choose to do business in secrecy, and that is why

some of us call for an independent commission such as the Kerner Commission or the Watergate Commission to go forward and make an investigation in this matter.

Finally, I do genuinely feel that most Democrats do not impugn the integrity of the President. I certainly do not. But I do believe that in this instance, with information that was available, not to the President's desk, but the CIA and the FBI, that they did not serve him well by coordinating that information, for had he had the information, he may have acted in a different manner.

I thank my colleague very much for yielding, and I will do likewise when I get an opportunity.

Mr. MCINNIS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would stay around. I have the gentleman from Florida that would like to join in the conversation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Does the gentleman mean my buddy, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY)?

Mr. MCINNIS. The gentleman's buddy, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. Speaker, I think we can have a good, legitimate conversation right here. Let me tell Members, the gentleman is well spoken and well thought. I agree with the gentleman, I do not think the President was well served. I do not think the dots were connected that maybe could have been connected. That is not my point here.

My point is for people to come out here, and I agree with the gentleman, not all the Democrats did this, but the gentleman would agree with me, I think, it was your minority leader in that room over there, talking to the media, what did the President know, when did he know it, et cetera, et cetera.

The implication of that, and, of course, one can see what the implication of it is as in Newsweek and all the newspapers throughout the weekend. That is what concerns me.

First I will yield to the gentleman from Florida and then we can just kind of all join in, if you do not mind. Let us talk about what level of intelligence we should put out here in the U.S. Congress.

My concern is that several of these memos, for example, may release innocently, may release the name of individuals, or somebody brighter than us can connect some dots out there and we are going to blow the cover of people, like Condaleeza Rice says, who are trying to protect these people. So I would look forward to just a few minutes, if the gentleman does not mind, to talk constructively about, okay, what should our role be and what, by necessity for the security of the people of this Nation, has to remain secret with the President and cannot be disclosed with 535 Members of the Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

□ 2000

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me underscore the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS); I agree. I think we need to find out what the agencies knew at the time and why they were not, if you will, cross-pollinating that information, because that is one of the problems we have to review.

What I take umbrage with is I think there was a certain amount of glee in some of the voices here in this Capitol because they had sensed that finally, they thought they found a weakness in the President to exploit for political purposes. That is what troubled me. I sense that we do have a lot of work to do, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is on the Select Committee on Intelligence; and he probably is privy to a lot more than I.

We do have to find out the failures of the FBI, the CIA, Border Patrol, Immigration and Naturalization, student visas. I mean, we have a tremendous amount of activity that we have to undertake collectively as Democrats and Republicans. But I just in my heart of hearts was so startled when we left here last Thursday. I know politics, believe me. Both sides play it; our side played it in the prior administration, and I am sure that when one is the target of it, one becomes somewhat anxiety-ridden, as I was, over the weekend.

I cannot tell my colleagues how much more distressed I became as the days went on when I felt in my heart that individual Members had actually not just speculated, but impugned the President, suggesting that he not only knew, he almost knew the date, time and sequence of events. That is what I found startling. I thought that was launched strictly to weaken him up and to potentially create the political atmosphere that we currently find ourselves in.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the President himself, President Clinton, our previous President, his comments were when they asked him, what do you think about these reports, he said, it was nothing to do with intelligence. He said, generally what those reports are used for is public sources to speculate on what bin Laden might do. A lot of that is pure speculation.

Our government every day, as the gentleman from Florida knows, especially on the Committee on Intelligence, we get thousands, thousands of reports every day about this could happen, that could happen; and I have had a number of my colleagues, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Florida, not my colleagues, but a number of citizens from Colorado who have come up and said, look, I think they are going to get our water supply here, or I think they are going to blow up the tunnels on the mountain.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I especially am appreciative

of both of the gentlemen, and I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know my colleague's district abuts mine, and we have 50 percent of all of the vegetables grown in the United States, or grown in my and the gentleman from Florida's district. So when the gentleman talked about the failure to cross-pollinate between two of our agencies responsible to report to the President, I know he knows that from agriculture, our cross-pollination.

I always say that for humor, I say to the gentleman from Colorado. I want the gentleman to know that I think the Vice President was correct when he said that we need to lower the volume. But I think the Vice President is incorrect when he advises the President that this matter should not be made known, particularly having to do with the briefing that he received; it could be appropriately redacted. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), our colleague that is involved in this colloquy, was involved in the Florida legislature when we passed the sunshine law in the State of Florida. And do my colleagues know what? The executive branch of government moaned and groaned, and they were Democrats in the executive branch then, they moaned and groaned all the way to openness.

When I go with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) next week in Russia and in Beijing and in Korea, do my colleagues know what we are going to say to those people? That they should be transparent with reference to their government and that they should have openness. The one thing I caution is, and I think the gentleman from Colorado got it right, that a media circus can develop; and those of us who serve our own egos find ourselves in a position of being consumed by the media. That Newsweek report did not come from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT); that came from the minds of some editor who quoted what the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), as the gentleman from Colorado correctly pointed out, said.

I thank the gentleman so much for yielding, and I must take my leave; but I will come back another time to discuss this matter with the gentleman.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I would say to the gentleman, he is a member of the Committee on Intelligence, and if he does not mind staying for a couple of more minutes, maybe the gentleman could very briefly advise the rest of us of the differences in the secrecy levels, we are classified top secret, the secrecy levels between the gentleman from Florida and I. I take some comfort in what the gentleman is saying as far as it goes with the Committee on Intelligence, because the gentleman is trained; the gentleman knows he cannot do that. But when it goes beyond to the general body, our life rotates around the media; and that is where the media circus starts. So if the gentleman would just explain a little for the rest of us

the difference between his secrecy and my secrecy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. First, I appreciate the continuing compliment, and I do likewise. I want the gentleman to know that a month ago I took leave from the Committee on Intelligence to allow the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), our colleague, to go on the committee. That does not mean that all that time before then that I was not a full member.

To answer the gentleman specifically, there are 1,000 people that get a general report on a regular basis that are in the loop, so to speak, about classified information. There are 20 individuals who get a higher clearance and a more detailed and specific report. The report that the President of the United States receives, unless the President determines, and those determinations are made by him and his advisors, are not to be made public, nor at any point in time are they to be revealed unless they become unclassified. And there is dispute about even that unclassified portion as to whether or not they should be in the public realm.

What I am saying is that in this case, so many people were victimized that we would be very wise to take it out of our political hands. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) who just came in, he and I get along extremely well until we start talking about politics; and when we start talking about politics, we have a different point of view.

What we need this thing to be is in the hands of some people that can look at the CIA and the FBI and, guess who else? They need to look at the Committee on Intelligence members and all of us and see whether or not we were discharging our oversight responsibilities. The secrecy part of it can be handled with open meetings and closed meetings where necessary. We did it every day in Federal court; every day, and we protected the source and methodology of our very critical intelligence-gathering apparatus.

The gentleman has been very generous with his time, and I hope I get an opportunity to do likewise.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman joining in on a constructive conversation during Special Orders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate joining the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Florida. I wanted to speak about this notion of an independent investigation, which I think, unfortunately, if we look at those who are supporting that, Senator DASCHLE, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), there is a real partisan question, along with Senator LIEBERMAN, for crying out loud. Senator LIEBERMAN, incidentally, is actually on the committee and does not show up. That is a matter of record. But he is calling for an independent investigation.

I think there are three reasons we do not need it. Number one, we already have it; number two, it is going to drain the sources of the Committee on Intelligence; and, number three, it would become a political football. And I will explain why.

Since February, and earnestly since January, the chairman of the House Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), a Republican, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence, who is a Democrat, Bob Graham, have been talking, and are forming what is a bicameral, both House and Senate, and a bipartisan, one Democrat, one Republican chair, investigation of what went wrong on 9-11. They have hired 100, maybe 200, staffers, all have been given top secret security clearance. They have the cream of the cream of the intelligence community together, some of the best minds that are available; and they have been looking into what went wrong, what lessons have been learned, what can we do right, what can we do better, all of the good stuff. So this blue ribbon committee is already going on, and it is balanced.

Number two, if my colleague can imagine already, there is something like 184,000 documents that have already been turned over to this committee, and they have the cooperation and the work of over 200 FBI agents who are right now working on that. I think it is good for them to. But what seems to be suggested is that we take even more FBI agents and put them to yet another committee doing the exact same thing. Well, somebody has to make sure that the world is being watched and we have our surveillance going. I would rather leave the soldiers on the frontline fighting the battle than coming back to the headquarters and hobnobbing with the desk jockeys, but that seems to be the assertion.

Number three, the other reason we do not need this is that who in the heck do people in this town think will control this? Congress funds all committees. It would become a political football because Congress would ultimately control what decisions are made through the appropriations process, and what appointments are made through our powers. I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), for example, would have a different view than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a Democrat who seems to be a little bit more balanced, who just left. I am sure the gentleman from Colorado and I would have a different view of who should be on that committee, but Congress would be the ones appointing it. Then, since we already have this bipartisan, bicameral committee working, what are we going to do, take the resources away from them? It is ridiculous. It is purely politically motivated.

Yesterday in Afghanistan, we lost yet another American soldier. We are really getting down to the tough part of this war, because the ones who are

left in al Qaeda are survivors, they are smaller in numbers, harder to find, harder to identify. The fact that they are still around shows something, and so this is not the time for the Democrat leadership to jump ship with soldiers in the war theater and start their political sniping. Do they really think that George Bush would sit on information and knowingly endanger lives of Americans? There are a lot of Republicans who had some tough opinions of President Clinton, yet I never heard any Republican say that President Clinton would sit on information.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people elect somebody in the Oval Office who would do such a thing, there is also the CIA and the FBI. Is the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) saying, and he seems to be, that members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, the CIA, the FBI, the national security advisors, knew about something and sat on it?

One can play partisan with the President, and that is maybe fair game; but I think it is pretty low when someone starts picking on members of the intelligence community, who are non-partisan, patriotic, professional men and women.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman. I do not think we need another task force. My main focus here this evening was the allegations and the points that were made by the minority, frankly, last week as we were getting out of session. If the gentleman will recall, there was media running all over the place, the headlines: What did Bush know, as if Bush knew something.

This media circus was fed by the minority leader, frankly, the Democratic leader on the other side of the aisle. That is not fair game. I mean, it is so preposterous to think that any Member of Congress, let alone the President of the United States, who I think has performed admirably since September 11 in response to September 11, it is out of line to come up here and for the sake of media and an election year, start saying, well, the President knew about this before September 11 and we could have avoided it. As the gentleman knows, we have a very active Democrat here on the House floor who goes so far as to allege that the President not only knew about September 11, but let it happen because he was somehow benefiting from military contracts that were going to friends of his in the defense contract. This thing is getting out of hand.

As the gentleman from Georgia has very correctly stated, we lost another American yesterday or the day before. We have a war going on here. We have a very capable President. We have a very capable Vice President, Dick Cheney. We have Condoleezza Rice; we have Colin Powell. We have our Joint Chiefs of Staff of the military, our military soldiers, from the private on up. Let them do their jobs.

□ 2015

They are not back holding secrets from the American people that would cause harm to the American people, but by necessity, there are secrets that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence knows that we should not know in order to protect the lives of the American people.

The security of America is number one. I cannot think of a job, I say to the gentleman from Georgia, and he would agree with me, I cannot think of a responsibility that is higher in its calling to the gentleman and I as Congressmen, elected by the people of this country, I cannot think of any other issue that is more important than for us to provide for the security of the people of this Nation, not only today but in the future, whether we talk about missile defense, whether we talk about the war in Afghanistan.

When we start eating up each other, people would think we were Siamese fish. Friday or Thursday over here with this media circus going on, it was like putting 2 Siamese fish in the same bowl together. We are the same team. Siamese fighting fish are bred to fight each other. We should not be bred to do that. These allegations against the President were strictly for Democratic partisan purposes.

As the gentleman from Florida said, not all of the Democrats agreed with that, and I agree that that is right. So I am not labeling all of our colleagues, but that is their leader. They need to get him back in the corral, in my opinion. We need to get on with the business at hand, which is not creating new task forces or so-called blue ribbon panels to oversee the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and then pretty soon we'll need a task force to oversee the blue ribbon committee that oversees the task force that oversees the intelligence force that shares intelligence with the President.

Wake up. Common sense will tell us the American public wants us to get on with the business of protecting the people of this country and settling the score, frankly, of what happened on September 11.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I think the gentleman is certainly right.

One of the things that is important to remember is that when a committee is briefed in a classified manner so that that information does not get outside the room, and they have all taken an oath to that effect, some of the reasons for keeping that information quiet are not just to protect our own soldiers on the ground, but the informants in various places of the world, all of the countries in the world. I am not sure if they number 170, or something. We have intelligence coming in from every corner of the globe. We cannot endanger those networks.

But another factor that is equally as important, some of this has to do with the judicial sensitivity, prosecuting folks. We do not go out when we are in-

vestigating and tell all to the other camp because they can cover their tracks, so sometimes we just have to be quiet. This idea that everything has to be on the front page of The New York Times in order for it to be real is absolutely absurd.

Mr. McINNIS. I might say to the gentleman, The New York Times is not charged with the protection of the people of the United States of America. In fact, we saw during the Afghanistan war several reporters, including Walter Cronkite, were critical of the media because they were taking too much of America's side.

They are Americans. They are U.S. citizens. But we can see that several people in the media take it as their responsibility, although they are American citizens, although they receive all the privileges of this Nation, that they should be neutral parties.

The fact is, if they want to assume that role, their utmost responsibility is not to provide for the security of the people of this Nation. That is our responsibility, and we do it at different levels.

The President obviously has to know secrets. We do not allow everybody access to the nuclear codes, for example. We allow a very, very thought-out, delicate system to have that occur, and we do not have 435 congressmen and 100 senators who have that capability. We structure this thing.

Last week we saw very quickly where I think several Members were perhaps envious of the fact that they are not the President; or for political purposes, they just got out of line. That is what I am saying tonight, that we have to come back together.

This war is a war that is going to last for a long time. The tough part of the war has not even begun. We have not been hit twice. We got hit once. We got hit with the embassies and so on, but I mean since September 11. We know it is going to happen again. We have to be on our toes.

On the other hand, we have to be reasonable about this. Every time somebody calls an office and says, hey, I think they are going to hit the Sears Tower today in Chicago, if they know that every time somebody puts an anonymous phone call in that they are going to blow up the Sears Tower, that the Sears Tower has to be evacuated, they can paralyze this country.

It is like calling in bomb threats to a school. If we call one in day after day after day, there are lots of these kinds of things that go on every day in this country.

What we do, what our responsibility is at the congressional level, is to make sure we have properly funded and properly provided for the staffing and properly provided other resources that are necessary for our Federal Bureau of Investigation and for our intelligence agencies to go out, pick up the dots, put the dots together, and present those dots, put together, to the President and to the Security Council and

to our national security adviser, et cetera. That is what needs to occur.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, the other thing is what the gentleman is saying is there is such a thing as a specific threat. A specific threat is when we know the time and place and what method of weapon or destruction that is going to be used against us and we can act very quickly against the specific threat, if given all the information.

But a general threat, which there must be hundreds of them that go out each year.

Mr. McINNIS. Thousands.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thousands, it does not give a time specific, a place specific, or a method specific. So what happens is we are guessing.

Okay, there is going to be something that happens to the water system in New York. Do we close down all the drinking water that day? That is a general threat, and what is the practical way out of it? There are so many things, like the gentleman is saying, are like a bomb scare. The gentleman will know that the intelligence-gathering system is not perfect.

I remember that we evacuated on September 11. When we were in the Longworth Building we were not told actually to evacuate. There was confusion. In fact, I personally went downstairs to the police and said, I have some employees here. Are we evacuating? And they said no, because at that time nobody knew what was going on.

We went outside the United States office buildings, outside of the Capitol, and we were told that the Capitol had been hit. This was just the rumor, not by the police, but this was the rumor on the street, that the Capitol had been hit, the mall area had been hit, the State Department had been hit, and the Sears Tower. That was the street discussion, because no one could get out on their cell phones because all the communication was jammed.

Later in that day, Congress gathered in a safe spot. The gentleman will remember that. And those Members of Congress who still had their beepers on that could get the word to gather in this particular location, we were given our first post-morning of 9-11 briefing. I think it was about 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock on September 11.

At that time, there were still a few airplanes in the air unaccounted for. Some of them were off track. Nobody knew for sure what to do with those airplanes.

We were also told at that time that there were 5 airplanes that had been involved; that along with the one that had crashed in Pennsylvania, another one had crashed just outside of Kentucky. That is the information level that was available at that time to Members of the United States House and Senate. It is not classified information, but that is what we were told.

So this is a very inexact science. And again, that was from the best sources

to people who wanted to have the best information. So it is not—for anybody who knows anything about intelligence, they know that we cannot always trust the sources. It is an inexact science.

For somebody at a time of national tragedy to grab this, this question, this uncertainty in the name of partisanship is just disgusting and disturbing.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, we saw it on Thursday. I am telling the gentleman, we saw when the minority leader, and this was strictly for political purposes, went out there and did this little media circus. That is the kind of thing that I speak so strongly about up here.

Let me also point out that we have sources that are bad sources. We have false rumors. We have people who want to paralyze us by calling in false alarms.

But the fact is, we have good sources out there. Maybe the most important key we can talk about here is the necessity to protect the good sources. The President has access through our intelligence network to many, many people. I think Condoleezza Rice said it yesterday, that many, many people throughout the world care about the United States of America. They have good information to give to the United States of America, and they share it. Those sources need to be protected.

Those names should not be given to a task force or a blue ribbon committee here in the United States Congress. They should not be given to us at all, except under extraordinary circumstances. These sources need to be protected.

It is a part of the structure of the protection blanket that we are trying to form over the United States of America and for our allies. It is just as important as our missile defense system to keep our sources secure, and we have a structure in place that does it. We have got to let that structure work, and we have got to refrain from making the kind of partisan attack that we saw that took place against President Bush when he was, as our local newspaper in Colorado said, bushwhacked. Then they went on to say, what did Bush know prior to September 11? Their conclusion was, very little, let him do his job, get off his back, and this is nothing but a political distraction.

That is what has happened. That is exactly why I took the podium this evening. We have to call it as we are seeing it. What we are calling here is what took place last week was not right. They hurt the efforts of the country.

It seems to me that apparently there has been some backpedaling by the minority leader and some of the leadership of the Democratic party, although I must say there is a colleague from the gentleman's State who certainly has not backpedaled from her allegation that Bush did this on purpose to assist military contractors.

But the realization is, we have to come back to our senses. We have to get back to steady as she goes. We have good guidance of this country with President Bush. He is doing a remarkable job under these kinds of circumstances. He is leading this country in a time of war, and he is fully and completely focused. DICK CHENEY is completely and fully focused in responding to the President. Condoleezza Rice is fully aware, as the national security adviser; Colin Powell, as our Secretary of State. I could go through all the list of names.

We have probably the most experienced team by far anywhere in the world in a government and military structure protecting this country over any other country in the world, but it still has some holes in it. So we can talk about how we patch the holes, but in the process of doing that, in the process of figuring out how to get our goose to lay a better egg, we do not pull the goose's neck off.

So this is the point, that I think we are well prepared, and I think we have had a good discussion this evening. I might add, I would ask if the gentleman has any concluding remarks. Our time is narrowing.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say that this House has taken a lot of action on a bipartisan basis to try to analyze 9/11, some of it that is appropriate to have in the open, and some of it is secret. It has been bipartisan. It has also been bicameral.

But we, Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, we want to avoid any possible terrorism, not just America but anywhere in the world. So it is in all of our interests at this time to keep the shoulders to the grinder and to fight this war in a unified manner, and keep the partisan politics in a back room somewhere and let us just get this job done.

Mr. MCINNIS. I might say to the gentleman, take a look since last Thursday when this media circus began, take a look at how much time President Bush and his staff and his intelligence organization, our country's intelligence organization, take a look at how much time they had to devote to rebutting some of the allegations that were implied by the minority leader of this House.

Look how much time was devoted from our national leaders to address these kinds of headlines. This is exactly what our enemy wants to see us do. They want to see us so confused within our own government. They want to see us like Siamese fighting fish, fighting each other within our own government. That is exactly what happened over this last weekend.

We can bet that the President of the United States, instead of having his full attention focused on the war and on the possible threats against this country, they had to prepare for talk shows on Sunday, they had to defend themselves, and they had to get all of their staff to spread them out to talk

to the media to try and defend themselves, that our President did not have knowledge prior to September 11 that this country was going to receive a surprise attack that killed 3,000 people.

Let me conclude with this. I dare any of my Democratic colleagues, I challenge them, any of them, I challenge my Republican colleagues, I challenge anybody in America, show me one elected official today that would take information, knowing that one of the most horrible events in the history of this Nation was going to occur, and they would sit on it. Show me one. It does not exist.

So before any of my colleagues go out there and make the implication or the allegation or the outright statement that the President of this country, who has done a tremendous job in his leadership as a result of September 11, show me, just show me one time where any of these people would have gone out and in effect have been a traitor to the country. It does not exist. We all care about the security of this Nation. It is incumbent upon us to provide for the security of the people of this country, and we are doing the best job we can.

If we can improve our job in a constructive fashion, I am all for it. Last week, instead of contributing to or initiating the media circus, in my opinion, the minority leader maybe even could have called the President himself and said, Mr. President, I do not want to go out and talk to the media implying you knew something prior to September 11. How can I help?

□ 2030

That phone call did not take place, and that is what ought to be happening. Instead of making our President spend an entire weekend trying to defend this position, we should have had our President spending the entire weekend doing what he was going to do, and that was focus on the immediate needs of all of the citizens of the United States instead of having to focus on political defense strategy throughout the weekend.

I will yield to my colleague but would advise we are probably down to the last few minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say we have heard so much from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), Senator DASCHLE, and the partisans about the August 6 memo; but there was not a warning in there and it was not a threat report. What it was it was an analysis of al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, and it talked in general terms about the threat that they posed to general world problems; and they did not mention anything about using aircraft as missiles. It did say they could hijack a plane, but up until then no one had used an airplane as a missile.

So all of this stuff sounds really great for Senator DASCHLE and the Democratic National Committee to sit around and say this is what they

should have done, but the reality is nobody knew this information. But, again, if he wants to criticize President Bush; let him attack him for health care, Social Security, whatever, but a war effort while we have soldiers on the ground and a very unstable situation in the Middle East with our ally, Israel, is very poor judgment, not just bad politics but poor judgment.

Mr. MCINNIS. The gentleman agrees with me there is something to be learned by September 11. We have learned a lot of things, whether it the design of our skyscrapers, what we could have done to assist our firefighters and our policemen more, maybe what we could have done for our fighter jets that scramble out there. There are lots of things we could learn from that. That was not the effort that was being made on Thursday. It was not an approach that said let us get together and figure this out. Maybe put our minds together and think out what constructively we could do to improve the situation.

Instead, it was a very targeted attack on the President of the United States alleging or implying or outright saying the President of the United States had knowledge prior to September 11 that would have allowed us to avoid September 11. That did not exist. And there is not anybody in these Chambers that had that kind of information. And to the best of our knowledge only the hijackers and bin Laden and his organization knew what was going to happen on September 11.

If we come together as a team, we can continue to put together or march forward to do, again, what was our number one calling. And our number one calling is to provide for the security and the protection and safety of the people of the United States of America.

LIFT THE RUSSIAN POULTRY BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am actually here tonight in cooperation with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), who I understand to be on his way over here, but wanted to talk about an issue to Georgia that has become a big economic issue; but it is also one of international trade having to do with Russia and its trade embargo against United States poultry.

I wanted to make a few points about that, Mr. Speaker, that according to the U.S.A. Poultry and Ag Export Council no U.S. poultry exports shipments have moved since the ban on American poultry was lifted in Russia. And Russia because of the competition used a non-tariff trade barrier to stop American chickens from coming into Russia, and then that ban was lifted. However, nothing has happened since then. And because of Russian paper-

work, at least 20,000 metric tons of U.S. poultry shipped prior to the ban that was imposed on March 10 now sit in Russian ports waiting to be unloaded. The import ban is costing the U.S. poultry industry more than \$25 million a week.

Although Russia has issued few import permits, it is abundantly clear that Russia wants to stop or substantially reduce the United States poultry program. Again, it is such a huge issue to our area, a big employer in Georgia.

Here are some of the impediments that Russia is using to stop the poultry: all previously issued import permits have been rescinded by Russia, even though these licenses were valid for additional quantities.

Russian importers are being advised that not only must they apply for new import permits to import poultry from the United States, they are also being told they must apply for new import permits for products currently waiting unloading at the port.

The Russian minister of agriculture told the U.S. that permits would be issued more or less automatically. That is not the case. Russia issues an import license but it is only a portion, sometimes as little as 25 percent of the requested quantity. So one cannot get in there with this.

Russia has issued as few of these import permits as possible. Even though they are not adequate standing alone, they still will not issue all of them. Despite the fact that on March 31, U.S. and Russia protocol does not call for the original USDA export certificate to be on board the ship that is transporting the poultry, the Russian minister of agriculture is demanding that the original certificate be on the transport ship. This is extremely costly and cumbersome. No other nation does these kinds of things.

Mr. Speaker, I can go on because there are lots of other issues that Russia is using as basically a paper tiger to stop American imports, but it is something that we urge the President to bring up on his trip to Russia and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has been a lead on this. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is from the poultry country of Georgia. He is the one that has been leading our experts to try to get Russia to quit playing games and open their borders.

RUSSIAN POULTRY BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, many of us have lived through some very interesting times in the international political atmosphere. I think all of us were very pleased, of course, years ago when we saw the Berlin Wall collapse and when we saw the Soviet Union literally dissolve. And over the years that have passed, one of the

things that many of us have been encouraged about is the fact that Russia has become a new partner with the United States.

I know personally I was very pleased with the past visit with President Putin with our own President Bush and the relationship that they developed. I think that is certainly an encouraging sign, certainly something that our two nations will benefit from in the short term as well as the long term.

But I am here tonight to talk about a subject that I believe the Russian Government must address if they are to lay a foundation for a continued good working relationship with our country; and that is a result of a ban that was placed by the Russian Government on March 10 of this year on the import of all American poultry.

Poultry is somewhat unique in the agricultural scheme of things. It is totally unsubsidized. We have debated a farm bill, and it was a controversial bill in many respects in which we were attempting to do what we could to support production agriculture in this country. Much of it did involve subsidies; it involved quotas and allocations of production capacity. But the poultry industry stands on its own.

It is a very successful industry, and it has proven that it can compete all around the world. What has happened, though, is that Russia with this import ban has placed a tremendous burden on American poultry companies. In fact, it is estimated that they are currently losing in the neighborhood of \$25 million a week. Now, even though the ban has been supposedly lifted, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) referred to, there have been all sorts of artificial barriers that have been placed that as a practical matter have made it impossible for us to be able to ship any poultry. In fact, the indications are from the United States Poultry and Ag Export Council that no United States poultry export shipments have been moved since this ban was supposedly lifted. And, further, due to the Russian paperwork impediments, at least 20,000 metric tons of United States poultry that was shipped prior to the ban on March 10 are still sitting in Russian ports awaiting being unloaded or disbursed. And it is costing approximately \$10,000 a day for those shipments to remain there in the Russian ports.

There is a serious problem. It is one that the United States Poultry Industry needs the assistance of the President and his visit to Russia to talk with President Putin to stress on him the importance of taking affirmative action to remove these impediments.

Currently there are still bans on some States in the United States, namely, North Carolina, Virginia, Maine, and Pennsylvania; and that is because of an avian influenza outbreak and they are on the restricted list. My State of Georgia, which currently is the largest poultry producer in the United States, supplying somewhere in

the neighborhood of 42 percent of all poultry produced in the United States and the exports from my State of Georgia alone are about \$300 million a year.

It is a tremendous issue economically and one that impacts not only poultry but it has a spillover effect because as poultry prices continue to decline and supplies continue to build up domestically, it begins to affect the beef industry, the pork industry, the turkey industry, and, likewise, the grain producers who supply the feed that goes into feeding the poultry flocks. So it does have a very detrimental effect overall unless Russia is willing to make some changes and to live up to their trade agreements.

They have done that before. I believe it was in 1998 that Russia first imposed an embargo on American poultry. And as a result of that, it had tremendous economic impacts on the poultry industry in the United States. And the industry, even though it is heavily located in my State and in other southern States, it is an industry that employs people in 38 of our States. And half of the poultry exports of the United States are actually going to Russia. So when we see this import ban being placed by Russia, we know that it has long-term consequences.

Now, we also know that Russia wants some things from the international community. From the United States they want the repeal of the Jackson-Vanick statute. They also want admission into the World Trade Organization. All of these are issues that I think we are all willing to consider. But we expect them to do so as they approach international trade with a fair and even hand, and that is what we are asking.

LIFTING THE RUSSIAN POULTRY EMBARGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has said and what he brings before the House here tonight about the embargo and how the Russians are holding up the shipment of poultry products from Georgia.

□ 2045

We all in Georgia have poultry plants within our districts, and I do have a letter I would like to submit to the RECORD, a letter that the delegation has sent to the President asking him to involve with the President of Russia on his visit later this week to talk about this very important issue because not only will it have an effect on the poultry business, but it will have an effect on trade between our two countries and could be negative, but it could also be turned into a positive position.

At this point, I will insert the letters into the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2002.

President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House, Pennsylvania Ave.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: We, the members of the Georgia Congressional delegation, appreciate your Administration's active engagement to restore U.S. poultry exports to Russia to normal, pre-embargo trade levels. Since there remain a number of hurdles in achieving this goal, we are writing to request your continued personal involvement so that this issue can be resolved as timely as possible.

With poultry contributing one-fourth of total U.S. exports to Russia, the severe trade disruption has exacerbated the trade imbalance Russia has with the United States. The disruption of poultry exports to Russia has caused U.S. chicken companies to experience a cost of over \$25 million per week in terms of lost sales opportunities overseas and depressed domestic prices for chicken. Further, the price impact has rippled to competing meats, such as pork and beef, because the chicken leg quarters originally destined for Russia are now competing with other meats in U.S. supermarkets. Corn and soybean farmers are beginning to feel the economic impact too, as chicken companies start to adjust their production plans in the wake of the depressed Russian market for U.S. poultry.

Georgia is the Nation's leading poultry state so the economic damage is being felt more severely than in many other states. Also, with much of Georgia's exports being shipped to Russia, the problem is compounded.

Of particular concern is Russia's demand that a new U.S./Russian veterinary agreement be negotiated and agreed-upon by June 29, 2002. Such a demand will be very difficult to meet for a number of reasons. On April 30, 2002, Russia proposed a new, revised veterinary agreement to replace the 1996 agreement. This version contains many unworkable provisions, such as prohibition against the feeding of genetically modified grains and oilseeds, banning of many FDA-approved antibiotics, and other so-called sanitary requirements that do not improve food safety but are, in fact, potential non-tariff trade barriers for U.S. poultry.

We are very concerned that Russia has not accepted the idea that international trade is a two-way path. Russia has a more than two to one favorable trade balance with the United States.

Sincerely,
Jack Kingston, Johnny Isakson, John Linder, Charlie Norwood, Cynthia McKinney, John Lewis, Saxby Chambliss, Mac Collins, Bob Barr, Nathan Deal, Sanford Bishop, Members of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2002.

Hon. ROBERT B. ZOELLICK,
U.S. Trade Representative, Department of State,
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR ZOELLICK: I am writing today to express my concerns about the continuing ban by Russia on U.S. poultry and poultry products. The Russian government, despite an announcement that it was ending its embargo on April 15, 2002, is continuing to prevent U.S. poultry and poultry products from entering the country. According to some estimates, no U.S. poultry products have been imported into Russia since the announcement was made that the ban was being lifted. Also, at least 20,000 metric tons of U.S. poultry products, shipped before the embargo was announced on March 10, are

still at Russian ports waiting to be unloaded. This ongoing ban on U.S. poultry is costing producers in this country at least \$25 million dollars per week.

Sending \$308 million in poultry and poultry products abroad in 2000, Georgia is the leading exporter of poultry and poultry products in the United States. On behalf of the growers and 18,000 employees who process chicken in Georgia, I request that you contact the Russian government and urge them to quickly end this de facto embargo of U.S. poultry.

I appreciate your on going efforts to ensure fair trade practices and international market access for U.S. products.

Sincerely,

MAC COLLINS,
Member of Congress.

GEORGIA POULTRY FEDERATION,
Gainesville, GA, May 15, 2002.

Hon. MAC COLLINS,
Member of Congress, Longworth House Office
Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On Monday, Congressman Jack Kingston volunteered to coordinate a Georgia delegation letter to the President and other key officials about the Russian situation and we were very appreciative of this.

Russia continues to ban U.S. exports of poultry through various unreasonable trade demands. This unfair situation is having a tremendous impact on the poultry industry in Georgia and if not reversed will have a serious impact on all agriculture in our State and Nation.

As mentioned before, even with full poultry exports, Russia ships produces valued at \$6.5 billion to the U.S. while receiving goods valued at only \$2.7 million from the U.S. This 2.4 times ratio is not good for the U.S. balance of payments or for poultry and agriculture. It is a very dangerous trend.

We hope that you will join with Congressman Kingston and others and sign this very important letter.

Sincerely yours,

ABIT MASSEY.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). 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, I would like to take the time this evening during this special order to discuss the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the floor many times in the last few weeks, within the last few months, concentrating on the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and the reason I say that is because I get more and more calls every day, every week, every month from my constituents, my senior constituents, complaining about the cost of prescription drugs, the inadequacy of Medicare or whatever kind of health insurance they have to cover prescription drugs, because Medicare generally does not provide for a prescription drug benefit, and most seniors do not have it through any kind of other supplemental health insurance that they might have.

The need for an affordable, adequate prescription drug coverage, in my opinion, continues to grow, and I am very

concerned about the failure of the Republican leadership in this House to address this concern in any meaningful way.

The House Republican leadership presented itself to the media a few weeks ago in a way that would suggest that they intended to bring up a prescription drug proposal. In fact, they promised to mark up the legislation in committee last week and to have it on the floor of the House by Memorial Day, by the Memorial Day recess, which most likely will begin this Thursday or Friday.

Obviously, the time has come, and once again promises have come and gone unfulfilled. I do not hear anything from the House Republican leadership about addressing or bringing up a prescription drug proposal this week. The legislation that has been announced for the floor this week is the supplemental appropriations bill, bioterrorism conference, a few other suspensions, but no mention of prescription drugs, even though it was much heralded just a few weeks ago.

It makes me believe that the Republican leadership does not want to even address this issue, but what concerns me even more is that when they do talk about it, and again, they are not talking about it much right now, what they seem to be planning to introduce is a proposal that they claim is under Medicare and that will cover all seniors but, in reality, is not under Medicare. It covers very few seniors and is administered in a way to give money to private insurance companies in the hope that they will insure seniors, and I do not think that will ever happen. I do not think that will ever occur.

Based on what I know about the GOP prescription drug proposal that was discussed, not in any detail a couple of weeks ago, but what was discussed at a press conference, I think that there is very little likelihood that their proposal would provide any kind of meaningful relief in terms of prescription drug coverage for most of the 30 million seniors who have no prescription drug coverage.

It appears that what they have in mind is trying to provide a benefit for very low income seniors, maybe about 6 percent of the seniors, but even if that were to be the case, even if they did try to pass such a bill, I think because of the way they go about it, as I said before, in just trying to throw some money to private insurance companies and hoping that they will take care of these very low income seniors is not likely to even help those very low income seniors that maybe they are trying to help.

The problem is that when my colleagues talk about privatization, when they talk about trying to give money to insurance companies so that they offer a drug-only, a prescription drug policy, most of the health insurance companies will tell us that they do not want to provide that type of coverage. In other words, they tend to provide

coverage that is more broad-based, not just for prescription drugs, and we even had representatives of the Health Insurance Association of America testify before the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means in the last session of Congress when the Republican leadership tried to bring up a similar type of privatized drug-only policy for seniors. We even had the representatives of the Health Insurance Association of America say that they wanted nothing to do with this kind of a proposal.

What I would like to explain in a little bit of detail, if I could, is that right now when someone has Medicare, Medicare covers every senior, about 40 million seniors, and they have their hospitalization covered in Part A. They have their doctor bills covered in Part B if they choose to participate. They pay a premium of maybe \$44, \$45 a month for their doctor bills and 80 percent of their doctor bills are paid for by Medicare but they can go to any doctor if they are in a traditional program. If they are not in an HMO, they do not have to go any HMO, they can go to any doctor, and 80 percent of the doctor's care is covered.

What the Democrats have been saying is that the easiest way to expand Medicare or to provide a prescription drug benefit is to simply expand Medicare and add another part, maybe call it Part C to Medicare and use Part B for their doctor's care. As an example, in other words, have a very low premium that they pay per month, \$25, \$30, \$40, then say that the Federal Government will pay, if they use Part B, as an example, about 80 percent of the cost of their prescription drug coverage, very low deductible, very low copayment, just like Part B, and all seniors get a prescription drug benefit, and most of it is paid for by the Federal Government.

It is a very simple concept. It is what Medicare does now, as I said, with doctor bills, but what we are finding is that the Republicans do not like that. They never liked Medicare from the beginning. When Medicare was passed back in the 1960s, most of the Republican Members of the House then voted against it, and I think from an ideological, rather than a practical perspective, most of the people, most of the Members who were in the leadership of the Republican party do not like Medicare. So they do not want to expand Medicare, a program they do not like in order to cover prescription drugs, and give all seniors a guaranteed prescription drug benefit. Instead, they are trying, through their ideological mischief, to come up with some kind of program outside of Medicare where they would throw money to private insurance companies and hope that they will be able to provide policies for low income seniors.

The problem is it does not work, and last week, Mr. Speaker, there was a report that was put out by Families USA, which is one of the senior organiza-

tions that is the biggest advocate for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, and I am not going to read the whole report, but I just wanted to run through sort of a summary of what it said about trying to cover prescription drugs through private insurance or through privatization.

I am reading from the report from last week. It says, "The report is failing America's seniors. Private health plans provide inadequate Rx drug coverage. The United States House of Representatives will soon consider legislation to provide prescription drug coverage for America's seniors. The proposal that will be considered, developed by Republican Ways and Means Committee Chairman William Thomas, relies on private health insurance companies to provide drug coverage and to bear the financial risk entailed. Insurance companies will be expected to offer drug only insurance policies that cover no other health services.

"In its reliance on the private sector to provide coverage, the pending bill is similar to H.R. 4680, the Medicare Rx 2000 Act which passed the House of Representatives on a partisan basis during the last Congress. At that time when H.R. 4860 was being considered, the insurance industry, acting through the Health Insurance Association of America, made clear that it had no intention of offering drug-only policies.

"The industry reasoned that drug-only insurance policies would be subject to adverse risk selection, that is, they would disproportionately attract consumers who have existing health conditions or are sick or disabled. As a result, the policies would be very expensive and would have few takers among younger, healthier Medicare beneficiaries."

I do not want to go through the whole thing, but I want to read a little more here. It says, "The reliance on drug-only policies is not the only troubling feature of the pending Republican proposal. In the traditional Medicare program, beneficiaries can count on a uniform benefit no matter where they live.

"As the following analysis demonstrates, relying on private insurance companies to deliver drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries, rather than incorporating a drug benefit into the Medicare program, virtually guarantees that coverage will be uneven in availability, cost and value."

Now, the last point that this Families USA report makes is that the problem with privatization in terms of providing drugs already exists when we look at the Medicare Plus choice, the HMO program, under Medicare. It says in the report, "This unevenness is common both in the Medicare Plus choice program under which HMOs offer Medicare coverage, often with some drug coverage, and in medigap policies which provide supplemental coverage for seniors. Experience under Medicare Plus choice and medigap policies shows that those that offer prescription drugs

are very expensive, are not always available and, when available, offer vastly different coverage in their costs from one geographic area to another. In addition, the coverage diminishes and the prices increase significantly over time. Because of these limitations, such private insurance policies provide an unreliable mechanism for delivering much-needed prescription drug coverage to America's seniors."

There is a whole report, Mr. Speaker, about 20 pages here, where they have done an in-depth survey to show why the privatization does not work. Yet we hear the Republicans talk about it like it is the panacea for tomorrow and for all the problems that seniors have with prescription drugs.

I do not understand where the Republicans are coming from other than that ideologically they are in some sort of straitjacket that determines that they cannot add a Medicare benefit because of some right-wing ideology against government.

I see that one of my colleagues is here who has been out in front on this issue, particularly on the rising cost of prescription drugs which I have not even mentioned so far tonight. So I would yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I was interested in what he was saying.

We are going to see sometime eventually here over the next week or two or three the unveiling of a Republican prescription drug benefit plan. It will be dressed up. It will be described as a Medicare prescription drug benefit, but it will not be real. That will be the paint, that will be the veneer, that will be the cover, but it will not be real, and it will not be real for a couple of reasons.

First, as my colleague mentioned, the Republican plans that we have heard of so far are plans which say to the American public, we are going to tell my colleagues here is the plan, these will be the benefits, and this will be the cost. Of course, we are not going to provide it to seniors, they will not be able to get it through Medicare; we are going to rely on private insurance companies to come in and offer seniors these benefits at this cost.

In the true private sector, those decisions about benefits and costs are made by private insurance companies. They are made by the private sector, but the Republican prescription drug plan will basically say here they are and now we put all our faith in the insurance industry to come in and give seniors these benefits at that cost. That is the first problem.

It is not the real world, and as my colleague pointed out so well, this is great theater down here in Washington right now. We have the two biggest lobbies in this city, the pharmaceutical

industry and the health insurance industry. The pharmaceutical industry says what we need to do is rely on the health insurance industry. They will provide people with stand-alone prescription drug coverage.

□ 2100

And the health insurance industry says, well, we really do not want to do that. And the response of the House Republicans is, well, we think you will if we just pass this plan. And it will never happen.

Back in Maine, I say over and over again to people, you know, if 85 percent of the people in Maine filed a claim for flood insurance every year, you would not be able to buy flood insurance in Maine at any price. But 85 percent of our seniors use prescription drugs, and it just is not possible for insurance companies that have 20 percent overhead and profit that they have to earn, it is not possible for them to provide prescription drug coverage to seniors at a price lower than Medicare could provide.

What we are working on is a real prescription drug plan, a Medicare prescription drug plan, a plan that will provide a benefit that is generous enough to attract everyone, get everyone into the pot. Medicare's overhead is generally around 2 or 3 percent, not 20 percent, because they do not pay huge salaries to their executives and they do not have the same kind of overhead. That is the kind of efficient plan that we really, I think, need to pass. But I do not think we will see it coming out of the Republican majority right now.

The gentleman from New Jersey was talking not so long ago about the issue of price. Here is another case. If you want to have an affordable prescription drug benefit, and by that I mean affordable to seniors on the one hand and affordable to the Federal Government on the other, you have to contain price. As the gentleman knows, I have a bill that would reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by about 35 percent simply by saying we will not let you charge our seniors more than you charge people in Britain, in France, in Germany, in Italy, in Canada, and Japan. That is it, end of story. 35 percent average discount.

Every time this comes up, the House majority, the Republicans, or the pharmaceutical industry will stand up and say you cannot do that. If we have discounts of that size, then we will not be able to do research and development anymore. We will not be able to develop new drugs, and people in this country will not be able to get the medicines that they need. And yet these companies have just started promoting their discount cards. And what do they say the discount will be? Oh, 25 to 40 percent.

One company is out there with a card for a significant percentage of Medicare beneficiaries; and they are saying to that group, we will charge you \$15 a

month for all of our drugs. For any of our drugs, \$15 a month. Now, the average cost of those drugs right now at the pharmacy is \$61 or \$62. They are not talking about a 35 percent discount, they are talking about a huge discount, from roughly \$61, \$62 to \$15 for all their drugs.

Now, it turns out that, according to them, that discount will not affect the bottom line. That discount will not affect their research and development. But here is this discount card, here is another discount card. What are we really talk about here?

The bottom line is this, and then I will yield back to the gentleman, the bottom line is that if we are to contain drug prices for our seniors, all of whom are in a Federal health care plan called Medicare, if we are to do that, Medicare has to have the negotiating power to drive down price for the benefit of our seniors and for the benefit of our taxpayers. That is what we need to do. And if we do that, we can have the kind of Medicare prescription drug benefit that will not be just a veneer, just a sort of painting, something that will never happen in the real world; but it will be something that will be of great benefit to all Medicare beneficiaries.

At some point here I think what we will hear from the other side is smoke and mirrors and surface, anything to avoid a confrontation with the pharmaceutical industry. But, frankly, we cannot help our seniors without doing something that the pharmaceutical industry will not like.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Maine. I am so glad the gentleman constantly brings up the cost issue, because I think it really is the key. The bottom line is, when my constituents are calling, and they do not even have to be seniors, and they are complaining about their inability to get prescription drugs, it is because of the cost. The cost is the main issue. I think if anyone around here, on the Republican or Democrat side of the aisle, thinks that we are going to be able to address this issue in a meaningful way without reducing costs, they are from another planet.

As the gentleman knows, in putting together a benefit under Medicare, which we as Democrats want, we have to be mindful of how much it is going to cost. If you do not find some way for the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the government in general to reduce cost, then the price of the benefit will skyrocket. It has to be an important part of this; otherwise we are kidding ourselves in saying we are going to provide a meaningful benefit.

The Republicans have just totally ignored this. Again, they have the press conference in the same way that they say, oh, this is going to be a Medicare benefit, and then we find out it is not; in the same way they say everyone is going to get this benefit, and then we find out it is not, it is maybe just a few low-income people; and then they say, oh, and we are going to lower cost, and there is nothing in it to lower cost.

The only thing we have seen so far, which the gentleman has mentioned, was President Bush's pronouncement about the drug discount cards. And that is a sham, first of all, because they are already available. On closer reflection, when asked by some reporters about what the government was going to do, the President actually said we are going to promote the existing cards. He was not proposing some new program or new benefit, just promotion of what drug companies already offer. So what is there? There is nothing. The government is doing nothing.

I guess he announced this about a year ago, this discount card promotion; and at that point he said, well, this is just an interim measure until we come up with a prescription drug benefit. But now, when the Republicans talk about cost, they talk about the discount card only. So the interim measure, which was nothing, has now become their permanent solution to cost. And, obviously, it is no solution at all.

There are many ways of going about the cost, and I would just like to address a few of them. I think the gentleman's bill is great, and I have cosponsored it, and I think now the gentleman links it, he said, to the cost in other developed countries. Is that how it is done?

Mr. ALLEN. Basically, it works the way other companies hold down the cost to their citizens. It is really simple. It would allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at what is called the average foreign price. That is defined in the bill to be the price at which that drug can be purchased in Britain, in France, Germany, Italy, Canada and Japan, the rest of the G-7 countries, industrialized countries.

It would obviously hold down costs, because in those countries the average foreign price for any particular drug is typically about \$60, \$63 or \$64 compared to \$100 a month here. So it is about a 35 to 40 percent reduction that we would be talking about.

Mr. PALLONE. And the fact of the matter is, and the thing that really bothers me, and the gentleman is in Maine so he really sees it, and those in Michigan and other border States with Canada, you see people taking buses on a regular basis to go to Canada to buy the drugs at a significant reduction. It is outrageous they have to do that.

My understanding is that in some of the border States, like Maine, that is routine. People take a bus once a month or whatever.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, in my office we are helping people all the time purchase their drugs at discount, and there are ways to purchase drugs through a Canadian physician and get that help.

But let me tell my colleague about the last bus trip that seniors took to Canada from Maine. It was a few months ago. There were 25 seniors on this trip. Twenty-five. They went over the border. They checked in with a Ca-

nadian doctor. They got their prescriptions written, and they went to the pharmacy and came back. Those 25 people saved \$16,000 on their prescription drugs; \$16,000 for 25 people in one bus trip.

Let us talk about one important drug, Tamoxifen. Tamoxifen, as the gentleman knows, for 15 or 16 years has been the standard accepted treatment for breast cancer in this country. Well, in Maine, as in I assume most of the United States, if someone does not have health insurance, a month's supply of Tamoxifen is about \$112, \$114. In Canada, it is \$13 or \$14. There is a ten-to-one differential. Now, that is greater than the average of other drugs, but it gives us some indication.

Here are people out there fighting for their lives, needing Tamoxifen in order to get by, low-income people, middle-income people; and they have to worry about how on Earth they are going to pay for their drugs.

I heard a story the other day, an older couple in Maine, both of them have significant drug expenses, so what do they do? How do they manage to both eat and pay the bills and then purchase their prescription drugs? Well, one month he takes his medicine and she does not. The next month she takes her medicine and he does not. There is not a doctor on the planet that thinks that is the way you should manage your prescription drugs. But they have no choice.

I have talked to people who are basically slowly sliding into bankruptcy because of the cost of their prescription drugs. Through my office, we do everything we can for them, but what they need is what working Americans have. Working Americans who have health insurance typically have prescription drug coverage through their health insurer. For seniors, the health insurer is Medicare. And yet, on the Republican side of the aisle, the thought of strengthening Medicare, strengthening Medicare, because it is a Federal Government program, the thought of strengthening it to provide a significant additional benefit seems to be something they just cannot abide. So they try to find out how possibly the private sector could do something that they cannot possibly do as efficiently as Medicare itself.

Mr. PALLONE. It is an ideological problem, I am convinced of that. They have a problem with Medicare because it is a government-run program, and they do not believe in government-run programs.

I always say that when you come down here you cannot be that ideological. You have to be practical about what works, and Medicare works. So we should expand it to include prescription drugs.

I hate to say this, and I do not want to cast aspersions, but at least in Maine there is an option to go someplace. If you are in New Jersey, it is too far. And I think that is the unfortunate part of this. We are looking at

these options, but they are not options really for most people.

The gentleman's bill is great, and I certainly support it and would love to see it enacted, but there are many other ways we could reduce costs that the Republicans have essentially rejected. Obviously, if you have a Medicare benefit, and all 39 or 40 million American seniors are in that program, that gives the Department of Health and Human Services tremendous bargaining power, like we do with the VA or like we do with the military hospitals; and they should be able to negotiate prices that would bring costs down.

There are other things. I know that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), has a bill with regard to generics to try to encourage generics, which is another way of bringing costs down. But we do not see that happening. Republicans do not like that too much. Some do, but the leadership does not, so we do not see anything on that.

In the other body a couple of weeks ago, one of our former House Members, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. STABENOW), introduced a bill, which I will introduce in the House, which basically says you cannot get any tax credit or deduction on your advertising expenses. In other words, as the gentleman said before, most of the pharmaceuticals say, well, we need to drive up prices in the U.S. because you are paying for the research.

Well, I do not know if I agree with that. I do not know why we should be paying for all the research here in the United States and no one else does in these other countries. But right now they are mixing the advertising cost and the research, and they are getting some kind of tax deduction or credit for it; and there is absolutely no reason why they should get that kind of credit or deduction on the advertising portion, which I think is a huge part of it. So her bill says that you cannot get the tax credit or the deduction on the advertising.

There are so many ways to reduce costs, but so far we cannot even get the bill in committee at this point. We cannot even get a markup on the bill, so they are not even considering some of these cost measures.

□ 2115

Mr. ALLEN. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of TV advertising. A few months ago the Kaiser Foundation came out with a study. They looked at the difference in cost, the difference in spending on prescription drugs in the year 2000 as compared to the year 1999, just that 1-year differential. They found a 20 percent increase in expenditures on prescription drugs. Then they started looking more closely at particular drugs. They surveyed almost 10,000 drugs and looked at the price increases and increased spending on prescription drugs. They found that half of that 20-percent increase was related to just 50 drugs.

Fifty drugs accounted for half of the increase. They were the 50 drugs that were most heavily advertised. Those were the drugs that were on television all the time. So half of the increased expenditure came with 50 drugs and the other half of the increased expenditure came with 9,950 drugs. Fifty drugs over here; 9,950 drugs over here. Each of those accounted for half of the increased expenditure.

There is no question that pharmaceutical spending on advertising is driving up the cost of prescription drugs in this country at an alarming rate. That is why they do it. Let us face it. That is why they do this heavy advertising. Part of the problem has nothing to do with Medicare. Part of it has to do with our businesses. Health care costs for small businesses and large businesses in this country are skyrocketing. We have got small businessmen and women in Maine who just cannot abide 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent increases this year. I have been talking to them. I have got a piece of legislation that I think would help. But that kind of increase is going to drive the small business community out of small business entirely if we are not really careful. One of the major drivers is the high cost of prescription drugs and one of the drivers for that, it is not really research. It is really the advertising.

Look, the pharmaceutical industry has to maximize the bottom line. God bless them, that is the American way. There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong is for government to sit back and do nothing to protect our consumers from inflated prices. This is not a free market. This is a case where we provide money, tax credits. We do half of the basic research through the National Institutes of Health for the development of new drugs. Then we provide a research and experimentation tax credit to encourage the development of new drugs. Through that mechanism, the pharmaceutical industry winds up paying one of the lowest taxes as an industry in the country. Yet they are the most profitable industry. And we do not do a thing. We give extended lengths of time in the patents.

This is not about them. This is a good industry. They make a good product. But the Federal Government has fallen down. We have not protected our people. That is why we need a Democratic prescription drug benefit, one that works through Medicare, that covers everyone, that provides a generous enough form of coverage so everyone will sign up. If we do that, we will finally, I think, get this problem of our seniors and ultimately of the business community as well, start to get this problem of health care costs under control. I get a little wound up about this.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate it. I am amazed how people do not even know about generics. We know, for example, when we talk about generics that in many cases, probably in most cases,

there is a generic alternative to some of the name-brand drugs; but the problem is that people, physicians and seniors just get hit and bombarded with all this advertising, they do not even have any education about generics, they do not even know whether there is an equivalent, the fact that it is just as good, they have no knowledge whatsoever.

Then, as you say, you get the companies coming in trying to extend the patents and using all kinds of gimmicks to prevent the generics from even coming to market, using procedural tactics and lawsuits and everything else half the time; and if that does not work, then they invite a Member of Congress to sponsor a private bill to just extend the patent. There is getting to be less of that because it has been brought out into the light; but for years that was happening on a regular basis, and it is probably still happening.

But I think the ultimate irony is that they get some kind of a tax break for the advertising. Here they are, convincing people that this is the only alternative, which is not true; and then they get to take some sort of a tax break to pay for the advertising. It is unbelievable.

If I could maybe just conclude, and the gentleman may want to join me on this, I just wanted to explain again what we have in mind as a Democratic alternative, because I spent a lot of time criticizing what I think the Republican plan is going to be, and my biggest concern is that they have not unveiled it and they have not moved on it. Maybe I will get criticized for saying this, but the way they have handled themselves in the last 2 weeks in promising that they were going to come out with this, and then promising it was going to come to committee and promising it was going to be on the floor before the Memorial Day recess and all of a sudden there is quiet and a big hush, I have not heard anything for a week and the Memorial Day recess is in a couple of days. I am beginning to think they are never going to bring this up in this session of Congress, between now and the end of this session. I hope I am wrong.

Mr. ALLEN. We should be so lucky and the American people should be so lucky. We would be better off if we got a real plan. There is no reason to put up a plan which is just a shell, the kind of plan which is going to be supposedly funded or operated by an insurance industry that does not want to do it; that purports to cover everyone, but in fact will only make economic sense for people at the lower-income levels and at the end of the day will not be a Medicare prescription drug benefit at all. It will be some sort of shell of a benefit. Many of the proposals seem to be saying that one way to pay for this is to drag money out of other health care providers. But the doctors and the home health care agencies, they cannot keep going.

When you really think this through, it is worth remembering a little bit of history. The reason in 1965 that Medicare was created was because the private insurance market would not cover people who were older and sicker than the general population, people over 65. In 1965, half of all seniors in this country had no hospital coverage. It was the trip to the hospital and surgery that would drive people into bankruptcy. That is still true today for people who do not have health insurance. But our seniors have it. They have Medicare. The problem, of course, is they do not have the kinds of prescription drug coverage they need. Almost 40 years ago, the answer of the Republican Party, the position of the Republican Party, is that somehow the private sector will provide; and that is still the same answer today. But if you look at the Medicare+Choice, managed care under Medicare, that is not working. That is not working. It costs more according to the GAO to fund Medicare+Choice, Medicare managed care plans, than it does clunky old ordinary Medicare.

And what are we talking about here? The way to do real Medicare reform is to provide seniors with a Medicare benefit that they need, not to try to go back to pre-1965 times when it was the insurance companies, that we are going to rely on insurance companies to provide health insurance and prescription drug coverage to a population that they did not want to cover then and do not want to cover now.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the leadership, Mr. Speaker, that both of my colleagues from New Jersey and Maine have shown on this issue, but I do not want us to appear too partisan. I do want to acknowledge that the Republican Party, the President, Members of this body, have not been totally neglectful of the health problems of older people. The difficulty is that they really have so far only tried to deal with the health problems after they are quite severe, in fact, after they are fatal.

So far, what we have to deal with the problems of elderly people who are severely ill is a total repeal of the estate tax. Now we are told that we cannot afford to have a Medicare drug prescription benefit because there is no room for it in the Republican budget. One of the things that crowded it out was the ability of an older person worth \$47 million to die and have the heirs who inherit this pay no tax at all. Obviously, older people who have died have had severe health problems; and it is not as if, as I said, the Republicans have ignored them. They have chosen, however, to focus all of the financial relief on those people who were elderly and quite wealthy who died, and that has left us no money for the people who were middle class and sick.

So we do not want to suggest that there was no concern whatsoever. If, in fact, we would have adopted a plan that, for example, exempted the first \$5

million of someone's estate from taxation and put a reasonable level of graduated taxation above that, we would have, as my colleagues know, a significantly larger amount of money. And simply doing a reasonable reform of the estate tax rather than a total repeal would free up this money so you could have a meaningful prescription drug program.

So we are deciding at what stage in the illness cycle to intervene. I think this is a case where our Republican colleagues have waited far too long, literally after people have unfortunately passed away, and they have taken that money and that is the money that could have been used to make a prescription drug benefit a significant one.

Mr. PALLONE. That is a good point. I think it also dovetails with what my colleague from Maine said before, and one of the reasons I believe why the Republicans are having difficulty coming up with a plan and probably have postponed this at least until after Memorial Day if not indefinitely is because they have insisted that if they are going to pay for it, they have to take money from other parts of Medicare, in other words, cut back on the amount of money that goes to hospitals, cut back on payments to doctors. They cannot do those things, practically speaking, because hospitals will close, doctors will simply close the door and they have put themselves in this financial box, if you will, that has made it impossible for them to offer any kind of generous plan the way the Democrats feel we need to have it.

Before we close tonight, I think we should talk a little bit about what the Democrats have in mind.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the gentleman describes the Democratic plan, and I know he wants to do that, but the gentleman from Massachusetts made a good point and I cannot resist going back to it for a moment, because back in the campaign for President, the current President said during a time of great economic prosperity that what this country needed was a huge tax cut. He said, "It's not the government's money. It's your money." Eventually, 5 months after he was put in office, the tax cut went through. Of course by the time the tax cut went through, we were slipping into a recession. And then the argument was not that the tax cut will not overstimulate the economy, it was that the tax cut will help stimulate the economy. So whether we were talking in times of prosperity and budget surpluses or whether we are talking about a time of a bit of a recession and budget deficits, in any case the solution is always the same, "What we really need is a tax cut." I should have brought down my chart that I have got here, but it is remarkable. The gentleman from Massachusetts was talking about the benefits to someone who dies with millions and millions and millions of dollars from that estate tax. The Republican majority was down here recently saying, We have got to make

this tax cut permanent. That is what is needed for this economy.

When you look at the numbers, which they will not show you, but when you look at the numbers, here is what it shows: the bottom 60 percent of people in this country in terms of income run from \$44,000 on down. Sixty percent of the entire country comes from households of \$44,000 or less. From the tax cuts that have been passed but not implemented, that group will get an average annual tax cut of \$104. \$104. When you look at the top 1 percent, the people in this country who earn over \$370,000 a year, the top 1 percent in income, they will get from tax cuts passed but not yet implemented an average annual tax cut of \$50,000.

In other words, the tax cuts that the Republican majority is rushing to make permanent, if they can, those tax cuts will give a tax cut on an annual basis to people earning over \$370,000 a year. They will get a tax cut that is more than roughly 60 percent of the people in this country even earn in a year. That is somehow described as a notion of fairness. But if we are going to do that, if that is a higher priority than making sure that seniors struggling to get by on 20 or \$25,000 a year, struggling to pay for their prescription drugs, if tax cuts for those wealthy people are more important than prescription drugs, I have to say that is a value system I do not understand.

I am actually anxious to hear the gentleman's description of the Democratic plan which is a real plan, a real Medicare prescription drug plan for seniors.

Mr. PALLONE. I think that what we need to point out is that we are talking about expanding Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit for all seniors because, practically speaking, we know that Medicare works. The reason this works is it makes sense. If you take the 39 or 40 million seniors that now are eligible for Medicare, all seniors are eligible for Medicare, and you make a huge pool that includes all these seniors, then it basically goes along with the whole idea of insurance. In other words, the idea with insurance policies is to have as many people participate in the plan as possible because then those who run up huge costs are in it, but those who spend very little if anything on drug costs are also in it.

□ 2130

That evens the cost. We know that the Republicans have boxed us in, so to speak, in terms of the financing of this.

But if you think about it from a practical sense, the best thing to do is to pool all the people, which is really what Medicare is all about. The Republican proposal, which says give a little money to private insurance companies and hope that they will attract some low-income seniors to this benefit, does not make sense, and the insurance companies have said it, because the only people that will seek out that option will be people who have huge drug

costs and who figure by paying so much a month, or whatever, they are going to get a huge windfall in terms of their drug benefit.

If you do what the Democrats are proposing, which is to analogize our proposal to Part B, where you pay a very low premium per month, I don't know if it will be \$25, \$35, \$40 a month, you get 80 percent under Part B of your doctor bills paid for by the Federal Government, the deductible, I think, is \$100, and, of course, the copay is the other 20 percent that the Federal Government is not paying, then you are going to create an incentive for almost every senior to join. I do not know what the percentage is, but it is something like 90-something percent of seniors pay the premium and join Part B, because it is worth doing.

So if you have the same phenomena, where you have a very low premium and you get 90-something percent of the seniors to participate in this Part C or Part D Medicare benefit, you have created this huge pool, which I think from a financing point of view makes sense. That is what the insurance pool is all about.

Then you go ahead and you say through some way, either you give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate prices, I do not know if you do something like what the gentleman is proposing, or just give a negotiation ability with a mandate to reduce prices, he or she is going to have the ability to go out with the 40 million seniors and really get a good deal, presumably because he has such bargaining power. So we are trying to address the costs by giving the Secretary that power.

We are trying to come up with a guaranteed Medicare benefit that everyone would be able to take advantage of, which is generous enough for people so that they would sign up for it, so that you would have everyone participate in it, and I have no doubt it would be as successful as what we have under Medicare now with Parts A and B.

The one thing I would say, because sometimes people say what about the seniors who cannot afford the premium, the Democrats would do the same thing we do with Part B. If you are below a certain income, then the Government pays for your premium, or if you are a little better off, you have to pay a little less than the average premium and the Government subsidizes your premium. Those people would have the advantage now, as they do with Part B.

Mr. ALLEN. Could the gentleman describe the catastrophic coverage.

Mr. PALLONE. The catastrophic would also be very low. I will not get into the details, but you have to have a very low catastrophic figure, too. In other words, above a certain point, whether it be \$2,000 or \$3,000, whatever it is, if your out-of-pocket expenses exceed that, then all your costs would be paid for by the Federal Government. That should be fairly low as well, if it is going to be meaningful, I would say.

Again, this is not rocket science here. We are just basically talking about what we already have for your hospital bills, and we are just saying we want to build on a very successful Medicare program to provide coverage for all seniors. There is no magic here. I believe that with the cost factor and the large pool, that the cost probably would not be that much, considering what we are spending on everything else, as our colleague from Massachusetts pointed out.

So if I could just conclude and thank my colleagues for participating tonight, the main concern I have right now, to be perfectly honest, is that we do not have any action by the Republicans on this issue. They talked about it 2 or 3 weeks ago and promised they were going to bring it up before Memorial Day. They have not.

I disagree with the gentleman in the sense that I would just as soon they bring some bill to the floor and have a debate, because I am fearful we are not going to get to it at all. Clearly when that debate occurs, what the Republican leadership talked about is not acceptable. It is not going to do anything. It is not going to provide any meaningful coverage for anybody. Hopefully we will have the ability as Democrats to bring up a proposal similar to what we outlined today and have a debate on something so important to the American people. I would say we are going to come back here. I know the gentleman from Maine is going to come back here, and we are going to keep talking about this over and over again until the Republicans bring it up and allow an opportunity to address the issue.

SUPPORTING ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hard-working members of our staff for keeping them here at this hour. I do not often indulge in long speeches at this time of night, but I do feel an obligation to talk about the situation in the Middle East, particularly the security of Israel and the position of Israel vis-a-vis the United States, for 2 reasons.

First, it is a subject both very important and very emotional. A large number of people in my district, as in every other, care deeply about this. I believe the people who feel the most strongly and the largest number are people who, like myself, have both an emotional attachment to Israel and also a strong intellectual degree of support for it. There are others who are troubled by what is happening in the Middle East and are somewhat critical or harshly critical of the Israeli government.

I think it is an obligation of those of us in elected office when an issue is of this importance to explain ourselves,

and I find here, given the complexity of the issue, I think it is an essentially simple one. I believe that simplicity consists of the fact that for more than 50 years, until maybe recently, and we still do not know this, there has been an unwillingness on the part of the Arab community in the Middle East to allow Israel to exist.

The troubles began when the UN voted in a resolution, UN resolutions have become the currency in the Middle East of late, but the most important UN resolution, the one which said that there should be 2 states, Israel and Palestine, was not only disregarded by the Arab world at that time, but became the occasion for violent attack, and it always ought to be remembered if the Arab world had abided by UN resolutions 50-some years ago, we would have the 2-state solution which so many, including myself, think is the best ultimate answer, without a lot of killing and without a lot of misery and pain. But while there is essential simplicity to the issue, there are, when things have been going on for 55 years, a great deal of complexity, and that needs to be addressed.

But I also want to talk about it because precisely because I do believe very strongly that the continued existence of Israel as a free, democratic society, with secure boundaries, is important morally for the world, as well as in our interests as a country. I worry that some people, particularly within Israel, may have misinterpreted recent events in the United States.

I think there continues to be very strong support for Israel's right to exist and for its right to have secure boundaries. I think there is a great deal of admiration, as there should be, for what Israel has accomplished economically and socially and politically in the broadest sense, that is, maintaining a democracy.

The excuse we often hear from violators of human rights, people who disregard democratic procedures, is that democracy is kind of a luxury for a nation that is at peace, but we are often told when a nation is at war, it really cannot afford to be democratic, it cannot afford such luxuries as electing a government and then throwing it out of office by open means, a freely critical parliament, open press, free speech.

In fact, Israel, from the moment of its existence, was under siege, indeed, people were attacking it before it existed as a sovereign nation. It has been in a war-like state, unfortunately, I think not through its own choice, for its entire existence, and, despite that, has brought forward one of the most flourishing democracies in the world and, sadly, the only democracy of any consistency in that part of the world. So I am grateful to the people of Israel for showing that democracy is not a source of weakness, not something to be put aside when things are tough, but a source of great strength.

That respect for Israel, that admiration for it, that understanding that it

has played a very important role as an ally of America, all contribute to a great deal of American support for Israel, as does the fact as it is, as we know, the successor state to that horror, the Holocaust, in which an organized state tried to wipe out a people, and came closer than anyone would have thought before could have been done.

Yes, there is a moral obligation to the remnants of the Holocaust and they were given a safe haven. As we know, had there been such a place during the time of the Holocaust, many who died, many who escaped only to be sent back because no one would take them, would still be alive.

So there is legitimately a great deal of support for Israel. What I fear, however, is that some within Israel will assume that that support is there, here in America, no matter what, despite policy decisions Israel might take.

Now, Israel is a democracy, as I said, and people will say, you know, a democracy has a right to make its own choices. Of course it does. The people of Israel have a right to elect governments, advocate positions, as any democracy does. I will note that there is a certain inconsistency from some who now say that because when Ehud Barak was prime minister and trying very hard with the support of former President Clinton to reach a reasonable peace, some of those who now tell me that it is inappropriate to differ with the government of Israel were much less reluctant to do that under Prime Minister Barak or under the martyred Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin. But Israel has a right to make decisions.

On the other hand, it is also the case that the United States is a democracy and it has a right to make decisions.

Now, American support at a very high level is essential, I believe, for Israel to be able to survive as a free and secure society. It is a small population. They have done wonders. But they are so heavily outnumbered, they are devoid of the kind of resources that many of their historic enemies have had, and there has been, for reasons that do the rest of the world no credit, a great deal of unfair criticism, I think, of Israel, so Israel has really found itself consistently bereft of friends in many cases when it counted, with the consistent exception of the United States.

It is entirely valid for the United States, in my judgment, to provide a degree of military assistance to Israel. This is a nation which is forced to survive to spend a very high percentage of its own income on the military. I think America plays a very useful role in helping them deal with that.

It is a nation which has had a policy of taking in people from the former Soviet Union, from Ethiopia, from Arab countries who were driven out, Yemen, Morocco and elsewhere. It is very important that they be able to play that role, and I think the money we provide is helpful.

We should note, of course, Israel is the number one recipient of American foreign aid, and Egypt is the second largest recipient of foreign aid, and that is probably because 25 years ago the leaders of Egypt and Israel, Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat, took great risks for peace and engaged in a great transfer of land, really a somewhat extraordinary example in history, where the victorious nation, Israel, gave back to the defeated nation a very large piece of land, the Sinai desert, so that you could begin to have peace.

While there have been problems and difficulties, peace has in fact survived there, and I think the work of Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat was vindicated. People should note that Menachem Begin, who was one of the intellectual and political founders of the current conservative movement in Israel, not only made peace with Egypt, not only gave back land, but presided over the dismantlement of a settlement, a Jewish settlement, in the Sinai, so that it could be given back. I think that is a very important precedent that I will get back to.

But we should understand that the United States gives high levels of aid to Israel and Egypt in part because of a perception that these are allies, in part because of the great admiration we have for Israeli society, but also since 1977–78 because these two nations undertook that peace agreement, and I think it was an entirely constructive policy begun in the Carter administration and carried through Presidents Reagan and Bush and Clinton, and now President Bush again, to say that if countries in an area that is very important to America take risks for peace and try very hard to overcome these difficulties, the United States will try to help out. That was an entirely fitting situation and people should understand.

□ 2145

That is the biggest single reason why there was this ongoing degree of aid. So I think that is entirely appropriate. I look forward to continuing to support a level of aid appropriate to Israel until and unless there is a peace; and if and when peace is achieved, yes, it will be possible to reduce the level of aid.

For a variety of reasons, then, it is clearly important for Israel to be able to maintain this degree of support in America. I worry that there are people in the United States, some of whom are genuine, strong, emotional supporters of Israel; some of whom are unable to resist the temptation to use Israel for domestic American political purposes, who may be giving Israel the wrong kind of support. It is no service to a friend to encourage that friend to misunderstand the situation and, in particular, to feel that it has a degree of invulnerability when there may be some vulnerability.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I think the recent resolution by the Likud

Party to say that under no circumstances would they support, if they were in control, those who passed that resolution of the Government of Israel that under no circumstances would they support a Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. I think that was a grave error.

Now, I think it was a grave error from the policy standpoint. As I have said, one of the great sources of strengths of Israel is that it is a democracy. I mentioned how democratic Israel is, even in the face of all these attacks. I recently got a great example of Israel's commitment to human rights in an area that probably would not have gotten much attention 20 years ago; it probably would have not been able to be something to be discussed 20 years ago.

But when I was in Israel in January of this year, having participated for 5 days in various political discussions with Israeli officials and others, including the Palestinians, about the state of peace, I then spent a few days meeting with people in Israel's gay and lesbian community. I was very pleased to be at a meeting in Tel Aviv of a city council member in Israel who is a lesbian and able to be open about it. I went to the Jerusalem Open House, a community center, for gay and lesbian people of Arab or Jewish background in Israel. I met with the head of the Aguda, the overall umbrella Israeli activist organization.

I was pleased to learn that not only do gay and lesbian people serve openly in the Israeli Army; by the way, for those who think that having open gay and lesbian military people undermines the morale and the effectiveness of the Army, I think they will have a hard time explaining that to people in the Israeli Defense Force whose morale and effectiveness I do not think has recently been questioned and where openly gay and lesbian officers not only serve, but whose domestic partners have benefits.

I contrast that, Mr. Speaker, sadly, with the degree of oppression of the gay and lesbian people that takes place in the Arab world. I have recently had occasion to write several letters along with my colleague who is the ranking Democrat on the Committee on International Relations and my colleague, who is the Republican Chair of the subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Florida, and some others, the gentleman from Connecticut. We have had to complain to the government of Egypt because of a pattern of systematic oppression of gay people simply because they were gay. They gave other excuses, but that is clearly not what is at issue. Nobody was imposing himself on anyone else, no one was molesting young people. These were gay men who were being prosecuted.

Well, the contrast between an Israel in which, frankly, Palestinians who are gay who live in the occupied territories come to Israel proper because they can

get protection, because they get a degree of security within Israel that they cannot get at home. I am very proud of that. I am very proud of the democracy of Israel. I am proud, I say, because I have been a supporter of that state, and I believe it is a very important example it gives to the world about how to be democratic. And let me repeat, the Israeli Defense Forces, there are few militaries in the world that have been under consistently a greater strain, and they have openly gay and lesbian military officials, and they serve with great distinction and no negativism whatsoever.

Now, it is important, I believe, for Israel's position that it continue to be democratic. When we have a major political party say that they do not want to see a Palestinian state, the implication there is that Israel continues to be a nation which has a democratic population, a democratic legal population, which includes, of course, a considerable Arab population; and while there are shortcomings in the way in which Israel has dealt with its Arab population, the fact is that Arabs have been in the parliament, Arabs have full political rights, and the democracy that exists even regarding Arabs in Israel sadly exceeds that in terms of democracy for most of the Arabs in the Middle East who are not allowed the freedom to criticize the government. I hope that the Israelis will understand the importance of preserving that. I believe that they do.

But in addition to a democratically ruled society within Israel, Israel has found itself presiding over territories inhabited by Palestinians outside Israel who do not have those kinds of rights.

Now, at this point I do think it is important to look at history. One of the problems that has affected, unfairly, it seems to me, negatively, the opinion people have had of Israel is that history is not always known to people. If one just turns on the television today or picks up a newspaper and sees a situation where this nation, Israel, is ruling over Arabs in the Gaza Strip and West Bank, if one believes in democracy and self-rule, that does not look good. And if, in fact, Israel had gratuitously simply marched into those territories at some point and established some deal with them, Israel would have been wrong. It is, therefore, important at this point to look at the history.

I mentioned that the history here begins with a universal Arab rejection by Iraq, by Jordan, by Egypt, by Syria. A universal rejection of these nations of Israel's right to exist, and an invasion of this small group of Jews, many of whom are recently come from the Holocaust, others, of course, who had been there for some time; and the new Nation of Israel managed without a lot of help at that point to defend itself and establish its position. So at that point in 1948, when Israel was able to declare its independence right about this time of year, we had the State of Israel.

Now, I have a question for those who say, well, what we really need is a two-state solution. Why did the Arab world not implement one 54 years ago? The U.N. called for a two-state solution, Palestine and Israel. The Arabs attacked and tried to prevent that from happening. The nation that became Israel was able to defend itself. At that point, there was an Israel. Also at this point, the lands that we now refer to as being occupied by Israel, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, were under the control of Arabs. Jordan controlled the West Bank, including eastern Jerusalem, the Old City. Egypt controlled the Gaza Strip.

From 1948 to 1967, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank in east Jerusalem, were controlled by Arab nations. Why, and I really think this is a valid question not often enough asked, why did they not create a Palestine then? If the Arab world genuinely believes in a two-state solution, why did they not implement one when they had the chance? There was certainly a period when Israel did not have the strength, even if it had the interest, in trying to prevent that from happening. I do not understand why the Egyptians and Jordanians did not get together and create that two-state solution. They talk about how much of the West Bank they had; they had it all, by definition, before 1967.

The reason, I am afraid, is, and this is very relevant and continues to be, the reason the Arab world did not implement the two-state solution is that they were not for a two-state solution. They were for a one-state solution. Palestine, no Israel. They did not use their ability to implement an Arab nation of Palestine in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank from 1948 to 1967 because to do so would have meant accepting the reality of Israel, and they were not ready to do that. Instead, what they did was to use the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and the Golan Heights of Syria and other lands as a basis for continuing to attack Israel. There was a continuing effort to undo Israel's existence militarily.

So in 1967, I believe entirely in self-defense, Israel moved into those adjacent areas, which had been used as places from which Israel was attacked. That is when Israel moved into the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, after the Arab nations, for 19 years, declined to create a state there and, instead, preferred to use them as bases to attack Israel. Israel wound up with the Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, and the Golan Heights.

Since that time, the Israelis and, obviously, a lot of history goes back to the 1973 war, which was more of a standoff, although it was again an effort by the Arabs to destroy Israel, the 1973 war was the Arabs taking another chance, as they did in 1948, of trying to dismantle Israel and they made some gains at first but were ultimately unable to do that with some help from the Nixon administration; the Israelis

were able to defend themselves and maintain that status quo. Then ensued a period of people feeling each other out.

The next thing that happened was that Menachem Begin met with Anwar Sadat; Menachem Begin, the leader of the right in Israel and the man who undid the previously uninterrupted rule of the left in Israel politically, and what he did was to proceed to give the Sinai Peninsula back to Egypt, not for any material gain, but remember what the deal was. Israel gave back the Sinai Peninsula and dismantled a settlement of Jews in that peninsula solely for Egypt's recognition of Israel's right to exist. Until then, that did not exist.

That was a big deal when Anwar Sadat, the leader of Egypt said yes, okay, there can be an Israel. That took from 1948 to 1978. Sadat, of course, was reviled by many of the Arabs and ultimately murdered within his own country. Why? Because he dared accept back a big chunk of Egyptian territory and said, in return, it is okay, they can be in Israel. That is a sign of how, as recently as 21 years ago when he was murdered, how deeply rooted the unwillingness to even allow Israel to exist was.

Things evolved further. Obviously, many Israelis believed, I think accurately, that while they had the right to defend themselves, if they could come to some peaceful agreement, that would be preferable to living the way they were living. If they could find a way for there to be some self-rule in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank that would relieve them of the need to be there, would relieve them of the contradiction in their democratic ideology of ruling over people in a way that was necessarily undemocratic, if they could refrain from the military attacks on both sides, that would be healthy.

So they began a process, ultimately, of trying to negotiate a global peace. It culminated, most recently, in the Barak administration offering to give back almost all of the Golan Heights to Syria, a hostile nation not just to Israel, but to the U.S., a nation whose record of harboring terrorists is one of the worst, run by one of the most brutal dictators, and now his son is in power and there appears to be no significant improvement from any human rights rule, but still Israel was willing to try. That culminated with the offers made by Prime Minister Barak, with the support of President Clinton, to Yasar Arafat in the year 2000.

There was a lot of debate about why there was an agreement, but we do know this. Prime Minister Barak offered a significant return of territory that had been captured in what I think were legitimate defensive wars, including almost all of the Golan Heights. By the way, he had previously, of course, drawn away from Lebanon where Israel had gone in before, and he offered a great deal more with regard to the West Bank than people had thought previously would happen.

□ 2200

At the time, I remember the argument was not that this was an unfair deal, but I ask people to go back and look at this. We were told this was a mistake because Arafat was not ready to make peace. Arafat, we were told, could not at that point really still sell to the rest of the Arab world a deal which, once again, meant the entire acceptance of Israel's right to exist.

It is significant here to remember what a fuss was made a couple of months ago when Saudi Arabia said, do you know what, if Israel totally withdraws from every inch that it captured in 1967, we will recognize its existence. Now, that was considered to be a major breakthrough in 2002, and given the eternal hostility that they had pledged to Israel, it was.

But understand this point: If, in fact, it was a breakthrough for Saudi Arabia in 2002 to say that there should be an Israel, what that means is that in 2000, when Bill Clinton and Ehud Barak were trying to get Yasser Arafat to make a deal, the Saudis were on the other side. The Saudis obviously, by their own acknowledgment, were not ready to support that in 2000. It could not have been a big deal in 2002 for them to say, okay, we are ready to recognize you, if they had been ready to do that in 2000.

In fact, by the closing days of the Clinton administration, an offer was made to Arafat which obviously from one standpoint was not perfect, it was made by the military victor in a more generous way than victors usually are, but it did not become the basis for negotiation. It still was essentially rejected.

Then, of course, the Clinton administration was out of office and the Barak administration soon after that, and I think the Bush administration made then the very grave error of instead of picking up where it had left off trying to find out if things were close enough, the Bush administration decided to just let things alone, incredibly thinking somehow this would make it better.

I do not think there is a worse prediction in recent diplomatic history than the Bush administration view that walking away from any effort to bring the Israelis and Palestinians into a negotiation early in 2001 would somehow make things better. Clearly, the consequence has been that things were much worse.

At any rate, that is where we now are. And it is in this context that I think it is a mistake for former Prime Minister Netanyahu and his allies in the Likud party to announce that they are no longer interested in trying to reach an agreement that would lead to a Palestinian State in the West Bank and Gaza. And as I said, from the standpoint of Israel's own interest, that seems to me a mistake, but I have no authority to make that decision for the Israelis.

On the other hand, a continued strong degree of support in the United

States is important to Israel if it is going to be able to continue to live as a free and prosperous society, which it has become through its own extraordinarily successful efforts.

And here is where the problem is. I think people within Israel, particularly within the Likud, and obviously former Prime Minister Netanyahu, misunderstand the nature of American support for Israel. It is strong, it is morally based, it is based on a recognition of a common strategic interest, it is based on an admiration of what Israel has done, it is based on a recognition of the debt on the Holocaust, but it is not infinite. It is not a support that will be there in the same degree, no matter what Israel's policy is.

The one area where I think there is a danger that the degree of American support that Israel deserves and needs could erode has to do with the policy of settlements, and whether or not there should be ultimately a willingness on Israel's part to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and most of the West Bank.

I would remind people that in recent times, there was one occasion when those of us who were strong supporters of Israel in Congress were unable to accomplish a policy of American assistance to Israel. It was when former Prime Minister Shamir made a pronouncement that sounded like he was saying that he had no intention of giving up any of the West Bank or Gaza strip to a Palestinian state; that he intended to maintain all of the settlements and that the land would remain under Israeli control indefinitely.

It was at that point that President George Bush, the President's father, was able to revoke what people had thought was a commitment to provide loan guarantees to Israel. Remember, this is a time when the Soviet Union had collapsed and there was massive immigration possible from the former Soviet Union, from Jews who had enough of the anti-Semitism in their areas. There was a continuation of the policy of taking Ethiopian Jews from Ethiopia. There was really great need for absorption of the immigrants. The U.S. had promised to guarantee some loans.

When George Bush became angry at the settlement policy and for other reasons, not just the settlement policy, but when it became the perception that Israel was no longer interested in a negotiated settlement in which it would withdraw from much of the West Bank and from the Gaza strip, George Bush said no to the loan guarantees.

While people talk about the great power of the friends of Israel in Congress, this was a time when that did not avail. George Bush won that fight: There were no loan guarantees. He won that fight because on that issue, American public opinion was not sympathetic to Israel.

It is important for people in Israel to understand that there is, as there should be, a great deal of sympathy and support and admiration for Israel,

but it is not unconditional. Indeed, it is based on aspects of Israeli government and society which include its democracy and its openness. If it can be made to appear that Israel forever might be maintaining, or indefinitely, a situation in which it is an occupying power in the West Bank and Gaza strip without any effort to implement an ultimately democratic solution, that will cause trouble for Israel within the United States.

Now, I want to be very clear: I do not believe that the critical elements in American public opinion will hold Israel responsible if it fails to reach an agreement on setting up a Palestinian state. It may not be possible to do that. As I have said, from 1948 until fairly recently, there did not seem to me to be a willingness on the part of the Arab world to accept the legitimate needs of Israel to the point where such a state could be accomplished.

Maybe that has changed. The Saudi offer is a step forward, but it is far from an acceptable offer for Israel. People who talk about a right of return, which would allow millions of Arabs hostile to the very notion of Israel to move back into Israel, cannot seriously think Israel would accept that, or be critical of Israel for turning that down.

While the Gaza strip does not appear to me to pose strategic problems, there are legitimate concerns about the West Bank, particularly in the areas close to Jerusalem. There is the great sensitivity of Jerusalem. I think if Israel tries sincerely to reach an agreement and it fails over some of the specifics in the areas closest to Jerusalem, that is a sustainable position politically in America.

But I do not think it is sustainable, and I must say that I think people here should note that while Prime Minister Sharon is a member of Likud, this resolution was adopted to embarrass him and his government, and it is not the policy of Prime Minister Sharon and his government, but a major political figure led by a very popular political figure, Benjamin Netanyahu, said this.

And that is, I think, a mistake; a mistake, as I said, not from the standpoint of what is good or bad policy for Israel. I have my views on that, but I acknowledge that the democratic country of Israel has a right to make its own decisions. But I believe it is a mistake from the standpoint of maintaining within the United States the degree of support Israel ought to have.

Now, I think part of the misunderstanding came because of the terms in which we debated a resolution a couple of weeks ago. I voted for the resolution that spoke out for Israel's right to defend itself. I must say that I do not believe Israel has behaved any differently with regard to the suicide bombings that have plagued it than the United States would.

Indeed, we have been very aggressive in Afghanistan, thousands of miles away, and sadly, some innocent people

have been killed. Some appear to have been killed just recently who were quite innocent. That is a terrible incident of war. When people are in a war-like situation, innocent people die. We can try to minimize that, but it cannot be totally avoided.

Thus, we had that situation in Afghanistan and we had it to some extent in Israel. The basic right of self-defense is there. It needs to be exercised very carefully. But when a nation has its young people at war defending it, they are not going to err wholly on the side of avoiding any collateral damage to innocent civilians.

I believe there was a great deal of support for Israel's defending itself in that way, as Americans felt we had a right to defend ourselves. I think it helped that it showed that some of the arguments about how many people had been killed in Jenin were in fact greatly exaggerated.

So overwhelmingly the House of Representatives voted to support Israel's right to defend itself. But I think that the leadership of the House made a mistake. That resolution came before the House unamendable. I voted for the resolution, but I voted against the procedural motion which brought it forward. It is not, it seems to me, appropriate that this great democratic institution, the United States House of Representatives, ought to be expressing its support for the democratic nation of Israel in an undemocratic fashion. I do not think it was a good idea to come to the defense of democracy in Israel by degrading it in the United States.

And I think it has contributed to a misunderstanding. There was overwhelming support for that resolution. I was glad to join in. A number of people voted present, 20 or so. Some others who voted for it voted for it with misgivings.

I think much of the difficulty came not from people who disagreed with what the resolution said, but who disagreed with what it was not allowed to say; that is, I think many of us believed, as I did, that Israel, given the history of that part of the world, had the right to defend itself and was by and large doing the best it could to exercise that right in a reasonable way, but we also felt that it ought to be reiterated, particularly in that context, that our hope would be for an ultimate solution of a 2-state solution.

Now, again, I do not think anybody should say that the Israelis have to come to that deal. It may not be possible. Making a deal with Yasser Arafat has to be one of the least attractive propositions put before any important group of people, and he is under a great deal of attack from people, Hamas and others, Jihad, Islamic Jihad, who are still as viciously opposed to Israel's existence, who want to drive the Jews into the sea. These are societies that have perpetuated vicious anti-Semitic slurs.

So it is important to make this distinction: It is not essential for Israel to

reach a deal that will lead to a 2-state solution to maintain support in America, but I think it is essential that Israel be seen to be willing to try. I do not think support for Israel was ever stronger in the United States than when Ehud Barak took some real risks for peace.

So my view is that we made a mistake, and I voted against this, so I should not say we, they made a mistake, Mr. Speaker, those in control of the House, by bringing forward that resolution in an up-or-down fashion. Yes, it got support because so many of us agreed with Israel's right of self-defense, but I think some people in Israel may have misinterpreted it, misinterpreted the silence on a 2-state solution, and that may have contributed to what I think was a mistaken decision by Likud to say, "We are not going to have any support for a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza."

Israel is not under any obligation to accept an unreasonable and unfair deal, but if it wishes to maintain maximum support in America, precisely because its democratic internal rule was an important part of this and for other reasons, then I think it is important that it be seen to be willing to try.

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

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to second not only everything the gentleman has said so far, but perhaps go one step further. I voted, as the gentleman did, for the bill last week. I was concerned that it came unamendable, and it came around our committee of jurisdiction. It never had an opportunity, even in the Committee on International Relations, where we deal on a day-to-day basis with the good, the bad, and the ugly of the situation in the Middle East.

I also would add that whenever we do these resolutions, we have to remember that we are giving confidence to one side, but we cannot allow ourselves to take away hope from the other side. As the gentleman so aptly said, when we did not talk about the desire and the conviction of this country to keep working toward a lasting and sustainable peace, we took away some of the hope of the very people whose adverse behavior we wanted to dissuade.

Mr. FRANK. And not just the hope, but no society is monolithic. They may pretend they are in North Korea, but we know they are not even there. Israel is obviously not monolithic, it is democratic. It is fractious to, I think, a wonderful degree.

Palestinian society is not monolithic. It is in our interest to discourage the rejectionists in Palestinian society. It is in our interest to find responsible Palestinians who understand that the tactics I think they have followed so far have had the major negative impact on Palestinians, and who will not continue to insist on an

unachievable goal, but will think about an achievable one.

But when we pass a resolution that does not mention that as well, I think we make a mistake. I think it was inaccurately perceived in both places.

Again, I want to be clear. Yes, the people in Israel should understand that America supports its right of self-defense, and the resolution accurately reflected that. I also believe that that support could be endangered. And, you know, the easiest thing to do with a friend is to say, yes, everything is wonderful. A true friend will tell the other friend when things may be reaching a danger point.

Anyone who encourages the Israeli people to believe that if that Likud resolution became official policy there would be no erosion of support for Israel is doing Israel a great disservice.

□ 2215

And I regret the fact that that resolution was sent forward. Frankly, I think political calculations were involved. People said, well, let us put people on the spot. Make them vote yes or no. Well, if we are playing with a local domestic issue, that is one thing; but we should not send a partial answer, and that was a partial answer. And I think it is not unrelated that shortly after we passed the resolution; and I saw an earlier draft of the resolution, and from the earlier draft I saw, some of the Israel's strongest supporters acknowledged that part of the ultimate solution ideally would be a Palestinian state if that could be agreed to. If I knew it, everyone knew it. It was not a secret. When that disappeared from the resolution, I think that may have encouraged people who took what I think was a position which would ultimately be damaging to Israel's abilities to maintain the kind of support it should have to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman again.

Mr. ISSA. I would like to second what the gentleman said and go one step further. We did some good with that resolution, but we could have done more. There was no question that had we encouraged the Palestinians to get their house in order, what is now kind of a whisper the idea that there needs to be a shifting of Chairman Arafat's position to more symbolic and the strengthening of the support of real leaders who do not have to be on both sides of issues, especially on security. That whisper could be a roar if we had included that kind of support there. And I hope that with the gentleman and I speaking tonight we are going that direction of encouraging the Saudi Crown Prince to continue his agenda, but also speaking to the Palestinians and letting them know that this body, I am sure to a person, still believes that solution that includes two separate people able to determine their own future.

Mr. FRANK. I agree and I have to say, again, I think people need to un-

derstand as they contemplate what Israel has been doing that for a very long time there was not a willingness to have a two-state solution in the Arab world. The rejection of a two-state solution came from the Arab world. I had hoped we had reached a period where there was now a willingness in the Arab nation to have a two-state solution. We know there was for a while, very actively in the Israeli government. Prime Minister Sharon to his credit has said he is still ultimately for that. It in effect invoked that favorite Nixon-going-to-China metaphor. And Prime Minister Sharon has said, given my background I could get the Israeli people to accept some things that maybe other people do not. We should be clear that includes, it has to include, telling people who live in settlements in Gaza and in much of the West Bank that they cannot continue to live under Israeli rule.

We talk about the dismantlement of the settlements. Settlements do not have to be dismantled, but people who live there have to be told that they are now going to be Palestinian citizens. And it was Menachem Begin who did that. Menachem Begin who dismantled the settlement. I was at the settlement that was dismantled in Yamit in the Sinai and met with people there. So that can be painful. It has to be done. It does not mean every inch. It does not mean that you do not count security. But it is important for us to do both.

I do fear the temptation of Israel is a wonderful success story. It is properly the repository of a great deal of admiration, and it invokes a great deal of emotion. Israel is entitled to be taken seriously as a country, not a political tool. It is entitled to be given a great deal of support, which I think it has earned; and it is entitled to realism in the political advice it gets. It should not be manipulated.

Let me speak now anticipatorily. We are about to get a supplemental appropriations bill that will have a number of things in it that I think will be bad public policy. I can predict now we will be told that because it includes some money for Israel and some money to aid Palestinians, although not through the Palestinian Authority, that if you support Israel you must vote for the appropriation. I resent the notion that Israel exists to shine up the sneaker. I resent the notion that you can put public policy that I find very wrong into a bill and then put in money for Israel and expect people to vote for that.

I just want to make this one statement that I have been here 22 years. Over the years I have often been told that I had to vote for an appropriations bill that included money I did not want for this program or that money because it also included money for Israel; and on several occasions when I voted no because I would not be extorted that way, the appropriation was defeated. What happened? A new appropriation came up and guess what was in the new appropriation? The money for Israel.

The notion that because there is money for Israel in the appropriation you have to vote for it or you will hurt the cause of Israel is simply flatly historically nonsensical because the money for Israel will be there. That is an example. Bringing that resolution up unamended, trying to use Israel as kind of a cat's paw to get an appropriations bill through, those are wrong.

I want to support Israel as I have all my life. I want to continue to see Israel get the kind of support it deserves from America. Part of that support is in honest assessment. And that honest assessment says Israel has a right to self-defense. It has a right to say no deal for a second state unless we have a reliable partner who means it, unless we will get secure boundaries, unless we will get other things we need. But to not let Israel understand that the policy recently adopted by Likud will in the long term cause them, maybe not in such a long term, the same kind of problems they encountered under Prime Minister Shamir and President Bush, I think that is doing them a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think that tonight two friends of Israel, two people who in fact do support and will continue to support all the legitimate needs of Israel coming to the floor, and I know the gentleman does not come to the floor very often. This is a very unusual appearance. I think what the gentleman is doing is he is sending the message that has to be sent, not just to the men and women of Israel who may hear or read about this, but also to the American Jewish community who does not always understand that it is not Israel right or wrong. It is Israel's survival protected, while at the same time our money has to have some suggestions to it.

Mr. FRANK. Let me say as a member myself of the American Jewish community, I understand there are people who may think that I am Jewish. I represent a significant number of Jewish people. I believe that people in the American Jewish community do understand that.

Yes, those of us who are Jewish are emotionally attached to Israel. I was 5 years old when World War II ended, so I was not conscious myself of the Holocaust as it was happening; but obviously I was raised by parents who lived through it and uncles and aunts and others. And the horror of the Holocaust and then the shock of living through this and knowing what was happening to people just because they shared that with you, that is deeply searing. So we have this emotional commitment.

Over and above that, I believe that the American Jewish community is proud of Israel, proud of its democracy, proud of its economic achievement. We are proud of the Israel that is, not of the Israel that becomes the tool of other people's domestic politics.

So I really believe in speaking out this way I am speaking a position that I think is largely supported by Israel's truest defenders, both Jewish and non-Jewish.

We are for an Israel that represents the best in the Jewish traditions as we see it. We support Israel as Americans which carries out those values that America expresses support for in the world and that has been cooperative. I come here tonight very much because I am afraid that maybe from some good motives, maybe from some partisan motives, some people are giving Israel bad advice. And the worst thing you can do is sit by quietly and let a good friend get bad advice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ISSA. Once again, I want to thank the gentleman for giving that good advice.

The gentleman and I often vote differently, but we discuss that there are at least two ways to look at every single bill that comes to the floor. And I think that this is a good example that rather than the way we did it with the vote from Israel where it came to the floor as though there was only one opinion, the gentleman has said let us look at some additional ideas.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for making that point. Obviously, we all cannot take an hour. But it seems clear how much better it would have been for the United States, for Israel, for the cause of an ultimate peace in the Middle East if the discussion that we are having now could have been had a couple weeks ago.

I would plead with the leadership of the House do not put us again in the position where we have this inadequate up or down vote on these complicated subjects. We are not all that busy. This is our main job. We could have taken a few more hours. I think if we had the kind of discussion on the floor of the House that we are able to have today, there would be a better understanding everywhere of what America's position is.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and May 21 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FLAKE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, May 21.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 21, 2002, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6901. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Revision to Container and Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV02-925-2 IFR] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6902. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Increased Assessment Rates [Docket No. FV02-930-2 FR] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6903. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV02-932-1 FR] received April 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6904. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2002-2003 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV-02-985-1 FR] received April 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6905. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities; Community Economic Development Program (CEDP) Projects Funded During Fiscal Year 1997; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6906. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Clinical Preventive Services for Older Americans"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6907. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Interior Trunk Release [Docket No. NHTSA-01-10381] (RIN: 2127-A169) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6908. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Holly Springs, Mississippi) [MM Docket No. 01-211 RM-10221]; (McBain, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 01-213 RM-10226] received April 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6909. A letter from the Legal Advisor to Chief, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Streamlining of Cable Television Services Part 76 Public File and Notice Requirements [CS Docket No. 98-132] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 18-02 which informs the intent to sign a Project Arrangement concerning Phases II and III of the Joint Anti-Armor Weapon System (JAAWS) Project between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

6911. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6912. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Con-

gress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peace-keeping efforts in Kosovo; (H. Doc. No. 107-217); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

6913. A letter from the Director, Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual financial audit; to the Committee on International Relations.

6914. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Performance Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6915. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6916. A letter from the Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the FY 2001 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6917. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report required by the Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1300i-11; to the Committee on Resources.

6918. 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 Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for New York [Docket No. 010208032-1109-02; I.D. 112601D] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6919. 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 Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Period 2 [Docket No. 010319071-1103-02; I.D. 111401C] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6920. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Winter II Period [Docket No. 001121328-1041-02; I.D. 110801E] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6921. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 102201D] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6922. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 101501B] received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6923. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Waters adjacent to Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Avila Beach, California [COTP Los Angeles—Long Beach 02-006] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received April 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6924. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Jennifer Heyman's Wedding Fireworks Display, Greens Farm, CT [CGD01-02-014] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received April 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6925. A letter from the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (RIN: 2700-AC45, 3209-AA15) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

6926. A letter from the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Standards of Conduct (RIN: 2700-AC37) received April 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

6927. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Safety permanency Well-Being, Child Welfare Outcomes 1999: Annual Report," pursuant to Public Law 105-89, section 203(a) (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6928. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fourth annual report on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS ON 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:

[Omitted from the Record of May 16, 2002]

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 3929. A bill to provide for the establishment of a cooperative Federal research, development, and demonstration program to ensure the integrity of pipeline facilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-475 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted May 20, 2002]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1448. A bill to clarify the tax treatment of bonds and other obligations issued by the Government of American Samoa; with an amendment (Rept. 107-417 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4015. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3375. A bill to provide compensation for the United States citizens who were victims of the bombings of United States embassies in East Africa on August 7, 1998, on the same basis as compensation is provided to victims of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes on September 11, 2001 (Rept. 107-477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3180. A bill to consent to certain amendments to the New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact (Rept. 107-478). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2068. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to public buildings, property, and works, as title 40, United States Code, "Public Buildings, Property, and Works"; with an amendment (Rept. 107-479). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4775. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of May 16, 2002]

H.R. 3929. Referral to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than July 1, 2002.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend the Act of June 1, 1948, to enhance homeland security and the public property protection capabilities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4771. A bill to amend the Act popularly known as the Declaration of Taking Act to require that all condemnations of property by the Government proceed under that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 4772. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Cerium Sulfide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 4773. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,8 Dichloroanthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4774. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States to establish antibullying programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 4775. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 4776. A bill to prohibit the President and the spouse of the President from accepting certain gifts for personal use; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FORD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois,

Mr. FILNER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SABO, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 4777. A bill to establish the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, International Relations, and 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. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTNECHT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4778. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for more effective enforcement by the Department of Labor of the requirements of such title relating to participation, vesting, benefit accrual, and funding; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H. Con. Res. 406. Concurrent resolution honoring and commending the Lao Veterans of America, Laotian and Hmong veterans of the Vietnam War, and their families, for their historic contributions to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

253. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5014 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact revisions to the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow interstate shipment and marketing of meat products by state inspected meat processing facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

254. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1681 Joint Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to either provide 40% of the national average per pupil expenditure to assist states and local education agencies with the excess costs of educating children with disabilities or amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to allow the states more flexibility in implementing its mandates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

255. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 115 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to amend 42 CFR Section 435.1009 to permit the use of Federal Medicaid funds for prison mental health and mental retardation treatment programs and drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs and thereby afford states throughout the nation the ability to reduce recidivism and lower crime through Prison-administered treatment and rehabilitation programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

256. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 143 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide a convenient means for consumers to choose not to receive unsolicited telemarketing calls; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

257. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relative to Joint House Resolution 219 memorializing the Congress of the United States that the General assembly condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the most outrageous and brutal attack against the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

258. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1701 Joint Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to encourage all of the United States of America to observe Patriots' Day on April 15, 2002 in remembrance of the founding of this nation and the patriotism shown by Americans after September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform.

259. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1722 Joint Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to support the repeal of the government pension offset and the windfall elimination provision from the federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

260. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution 6013 memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to provide federal funding for the placement of ultrasound equipment in crisis pregnancy centers and not-for-profit health care centers providing services to pregnant women and to require operation of such equipment by qualified persons who possess any required certification or licensure to operate such equipment; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

261. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 147 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would coordinate Federal and regional actions to prevent and control biological pollution, particularly through management of ballast water discharges, elimination of unintentional introductions of nonnative invasive species and reduction of the dispersal of nonnative species within Pennsylvania's ecosystems through the development of timely, effective, scientifically based, environmentally sound and economically viable management programs; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Resources.

262. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, relative to House Resolution 12EX2 memorializing the Congress of the United States to support the proposed study of southern rural poverty and assist the Southern Black Belt in meeting its educational, economic, and health challenges; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 488: Mr. MENENDEZ and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 658: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 765: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1091: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1110: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 1212: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1701: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 1808: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2322: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 2357: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2521: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 2570: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 2612: Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 2629: Mr. HOFFFEL and Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 2670: Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 2874: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MOORE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 2908: Mr. HINCHAY and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2953: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3130: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 3131: Mrs. CLAYTON and Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 3252: Mr. SCHAFFER.
 H.R. 3321: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 3363: Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 3382: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3424: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3478: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3616: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 3710: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 3719: Mr. FOLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 3770: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
 H.R. 3781: Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. OLVER, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 3884: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3897: Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 3915: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 3917: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 3929: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 3973: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SHOWS.
 H.R. 4015: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4017: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 4018: Mr. DINGELL.
 H.R. 4058: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 4066: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4100: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 4113: Mr. WEXLER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. WU, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 4114: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4134: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4169: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 4187: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 4561: Mr. STUMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4592: Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HORN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BACA, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 4600: Mrs. BIGGERT and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 4611: Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr.

MORAN of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 4633: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 4642: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 4645: Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4669: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 4687: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 4691: Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 4699: Mr. PAUL and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4719: Mr. PAUL and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.J. Res. 93: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. REYNOLDS.
 H. Con. Res. 213: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PITTS.
 H. Con. Res. 314: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SAWYER.
 H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. POMBO.
 H. Con. Res. 345: Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. MIGA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. KERNS.
 H. Con. Res. 382: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 394: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Con. Res. 400: Mr. PHELPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FROST, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BAKER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. PICKERING.
 H. Con. Res. 405: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 259: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H. Res. 393: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H. Res. 416: Mr. KINGSTON.

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. 4187: Mr. SHAYS.

DISCHARGE PETITION—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM on House Resolution 271: Gerald D. Kleczka.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3994

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS
 AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 14, line 2, insert before the semicolon the following: “, with

particular emphasis on health care for children who are orphans”.

Page 14, line 17, insert before the semicolon the following: “, with particular emphasis on basic education for children who are orphans”.

H.R. 3994

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 14, line 17, insert before the semicolon the following: “, with particular emphasis on basic education for children”.

H.R. 3994

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 26, line 3, insert before the semicolon the following: “and prohibits the use of children as soldiers or combatants”.

H.R. 3994

OFFERED BY: Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 29, line 9, strike “Assistance” and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), assistance

Page 29, after line 11, insert the following:

(2) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available to carry out this title for a fiscal year may be made available for assistance to the Government of Afghanistan only if the President first determines and certifies to Congress that the Government of Afghanistan prohibits the use of children as soldiers or combatants.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT No. 1: In section 307 (relating to Department of Defense assistance to Colombia), strike “to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and”.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT No. 2: In section 307 (relating to Department of Defense assistance to Colombia), strike “to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and”.

In section 601 (relating to Department of State assistance to Colombia), strike “to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and”.

H.R. 4775

OFFERED BY: MR. MCGOVERN

AMENDMENT No. 3: In section 601 (relating to Department of State assistance to Colombia), strike “to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and”.