

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF
HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to note that during the debate on the Nadler amendment to H.R. 3010, which would have restored funding to Arts in Education programs, a procedural error occurred.

The RECORD will reflect that at the end of the debate, as a result of the agreement by Chairman REGULA to work to maintain funds for Arts in Education programs in conference, I stated that I would not seek a vote on my amendment. Immediately following the debate, however, in his haste to keep the proceedings moving, the Chair called a vote, contradicting my intention to withdraw my amendment. With nobody apparently listening, or realizing there was a vote in progress—no “aye” or “nay” vote was heard—the Chair declared the voice vote in the negative.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that it was my intention to withdraw my amendment, because of Chairman REGULA's commitment to the Arts in Education program. I trust that commitment will not be affected by the procedural error.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF
HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to Mr. PAUL's amendment that would bar Federal funds from being used for mental health screening programs. This amendment misunderstands the recommenda-

tions offered by President Bush's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health, minimizes the importance of mental health to the well-being of Americans, and threatens vital efforts to promote access to mental health services.

Mental health is one of the greatest problems facing our Nation. During any one-year period, up to 50 million Americans—more than 22 percent—suffer from a clearly diagnosable mental disorder involving a degree of incapacity that interferes with employment, attendance at school or daily life. Among other things, mental health affects whether one gets involved in substance abuse, commits violence, follows through on medical advice, cares for a child, performs his work, and engages in healthy behaviors. In short, one's mental health affects almost every aspect of life.

I believe strongly in the need to support children's physical and mental health, while respecting parental rights. Recognizing that early childhood is a critical period for the onset of emotional and behavioral problems, the President's Commission encouraged organizations that work with children to improve early identification of children with mental health needs. Research shows that early detection, assessment, and connection to treatment and support helps prevent mental health problems from worsening. Because more than 52 million students attend schools in the U.S., the Commission recognized that schools are in a key position to identify mental health problems early and help link children to appropriate services. The Commission in no way recommends mandatory legislation or any effort to circumvent parental consent to screening. Quite the opposite, in fact. It repeatedly recommends that child-serving organizations work with parents to support identification and treatment efforts.

Like so many disorders, mental illness does not discriminate and affects every age, ethnic, and socioeconomic group. Given its widespread effect on individuals and society, we need to put more emphasis on mental health, not less. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Paul amendment.

DAVID MUELLER OF WESTFIELD,
INDIANA

HON. MIKE PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 2005

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, for many years we in this body have been discussing the issue of the use of methyl bromide and the impact of the elimination of this chemical as stated in the Montreal Protocol. We must look at how this will affect our diverse economy as well as lay the groundwork for new alternatives to replace methyl bromide. As signatories to the Montreal Protocol, the United States negotiators have a responsibility to Congress and the Administration to seek an

acceptable balance as they travel to Montreal in a few days to attend the Twenty-fifth Open-Ended Working Group Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, Second Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties, and associated meetings 26 June–2 July 2005.

I am proud to say that the answer to this international problem is found right in the State of Indiana and is being promoted by a Hoosier with a vision to create a safer environment while at the same time stimulating growth in the Hoosier economy.

This person is David Mueller of Westfield, Indiana. He is a fumigator and the son of a flour miller and has been fumigating since he was a teenager. His privately owned family business was founded in 1981 and has 25 employees.

Methyl bromide is a product that his company Fumigation Service & Supply, Inc. began using in the 1980s for fumigating flourmills, food processing structures, and post harvest commodities throughout the United States. At one point Mr. Mueller and his company used or sold over 300,000 lbs of methyl bromide per year in the early 1990s. This represented about 55 percent of their total fumigation business.

As of January 1, 2005, this Indiana company no longer uses methyl bromide. How did they phase out of this biocide?

In 1995 they heard that methyl bromide was going to be phased out under the Montreal Protocol. Dave understood that the loss of methyl bromide would have a dramatic effect on his business. He attended several domestic and international meetings to determine if this was a true story. After determining that alternatives would, in fact, be required under the U.S. Clean Air Act and the international treaty signed by President Reagan called the Montreal Protocol, his company began to search for credible alternatives.

As a stored product entomologist, Mr. Mueller started this search process by looking at methyl bromide and how it affects the insects and other pests. It is a biocide that kills like napalm. When it touches something, it kills it: egg, larva, pupa and adult. Other fumigants needed more time or a higher dosage rate to work. However, he understood that the respiration of the insects could be increased substantially by increasing the temperature in the flourmills and food factories or choosing the warmest time of the year to plan the scheduled fumigations.

By increasing the temperature of the insects they were observed to become stressed, dehydrated, and would die faster. The dosage rates for conventional fumigants and insecticides like phosphine, dichlorvos, and sulfuryl fluoride worked better, faster, and at lower dosage rates when temperatures of 90–100° F (30–40° C) were created.

He also added carbon dioxide (3–5 percent) to the mix to allow for better mortality and shorter shutdown times for these post harvest fumigations. The carbon dioxide makes the insects and rodents breathe harder and faster allowing the fumigants to kill better and faster.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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