



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2001

No. 33

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

BICYCLE RIDING IS EFFICIENT MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION AND PROMOTES WELLNESS

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress dedicated to making the Federal Government a better partner in helping our communities to be livable, for our families to be safe, healthy and economically secure. One important way of advancing that mission is through the intelligent use of the bicycle. As a person who cares about cycling and the world environment and energy supply, it was, to say

the very least, unnerving to read the story about cycling in China in Monday's Washington Post.

China is a huge country with an old and venerated tradition that is having trouble modernizing. It has experienced a century-long love affair with the bicycle since it was first introduced to China by American missionaries. They have more bicycles in China than any place in the world, but it is ironic that this country is seeking to ban bicycles in some areas. It is especially ironic to ban them from the central cities where they can have the greatest impact.

The bicycle is the most efficient means of transportation that has ever been devised. Unlike the horse or automobile, there is no pollution generated from cycling. It leaves the cyclist healthier, and the cyclist takes up a fraction of the roadway. As somebody who brought a bicycle to Washington, D.C. instead of a car when I was elected 5 years ago, I can testify that for the vast majority of my meetings around Washington, D.C., I will beat my colleagues who take cabs or their cars.

The movement from bicycles to cars has serious and wide-spread side effects and is a prescription for disaster. It is frightening to consider the 1.3 billion Chinese each with their own car living further from where they work.

The increased demand for concrete in the cities and impact on the environment resulting from more automobiles in China than any place in the world is not going to help our efforts to address global climate change.

The bicycle is not the only answer to problems of livability and it is not for everyone; but the facts remain at a time when our roads are too congested, the fitness of our children, the skyrocketing levels of morbid obesity, an important part of every community's equation for being safer, healthier and more economically secure is probably stored in the garage or parked in the basement. Over 100 million Americans

have access to bicycles, but what should Congress do to help people use them?

First, and foremost, Congress should lead by example and provide more adequate bike parking, more showers and changing facilities in order to encourage bike commuting here in Washington, D.C. Surveys show that if offices are so equipped, 45 percent of the employees who live within 5 miles would choose to bike commute to work.

Federal employees are allowed, in many cases, free parking or free transit. They can be reimbursed for cab fair or auto mileage, but cyclists are on their own; and that is rather foolish. Benefits should be expanded to include bicycle commuters the same way we treat other Federal employees.

We need to provide funding for safe transportation for our children. Over the course of the last 20 years, the number of children who are independently able to get to school on their own has decreased substantially, in some communities by 70 percent or more.

Regular cycling can help deal with that access. It can help with the epidemic of childhood obesity and promote the wellness of our children. Indeed children that ride to school in cars in slow-moving traffic experience worse air pollution than those who are walking or cycling.

I hope that Congress will consider more ways to encourage the implementation of the Safe Routes to School program to help provide the routes and to teach children about bicycle safety and promoting biking as a viable means of transportation.

Last but not least, Members of Congress should join the Congressional Bike Caucus. This is a group of Members of Congress who periodically host rides around Washington, D.C. for Members, their families and staff, but there is also a serious component to what we do.

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.

H833

We have worked to help promote sound Federal bicycle policies and encourage the construction of thousands of miles of bicycle paths. Our rides have served to raise the awareness of the cycling climate here in Washington, D.C. and to work with groups in the community to improve the cycling conditions in the District.

At the end of the month of March, there will be hundreds of cycling advocates from around the United States here on Capitol Hill to deal with the first annual Bicycle Summit. It will be a time to concentrate on those areas where the Federal Government can be a better partner in providing greater transportation choices so that our communities can be safer and our families can be healthier and economically secure.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S TAX RELIEF PLAN

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this body last week passed President's Bush's tax relief plan, the first step towards a broad tax reduction for our generation. The timing, Mr. Speaker, could not be better for all of us. We have to tighten our belts and prepare for a possible change in our economy.

In fact, the NASDAQ stock exchange closed below 2000 points yesterday, the first time the index closed so low since December, 1998.

President Bush's tax relief plan is a vital means of ensuring the economic engine that we have today continues to move forward, continues running; and of course, we do not want the economy to stall. By returning Americans' hard-earned dollars back to their wallets through tax relief, we will be saving Americans their checking accounts and, of course, and this is my point this afternoon, from Congress spending their money. For, if we fail to return money back to all those hard-working Americans, men and women, the Federal Government will just keep writing checks to spend their money. It is important we give it back to them, with the economy starting to slow.

How much money would Congress spend? Well, due to previous threats of a government shutdown by former President Clinton, and now a practically evenly divided Congress, the Federal Government has been on a spending spree of record proportions since the budgets emerged in 1998.

I believe President Bush has proposed holding spending at roughly 4 percent, a 4 percent increase. He has also offered to pay down the debt while reducing the record tax burden shouldered by all Americans, furthermore removing from Congress the temptation to spend the tax overpayment Americans are presently paying to the U.S. Treasury.

Even Chairman Alan Greenspan agrees with this plan. When the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, came out with its most recent budget estimates, one number, Mr. Speaker, stood out: \$5.6 trillion. That is the size of the projected surplus over the next 10 years. It is enough, of course, to pay down the debt, reduce the tax burden through broad tax relief, and target spending at some of the important programs that President Bush just talked about: health care, defense, and education.

But within that budget analysis, there was another number that garnered less attention. That number was \$561 billion. That is the amount of new spending Congress added during last fall's spending spree, discretionary, mandatory, and additional interest expense, \$561 billion. That amount represents fully one-third the size of the proposed Bush tax relief plan.

It also represents the iceberg's proverbial tip. Since the surplus emerged in 1998, Congress has accelerated spending increases three-fold. In the 3 years prior to 1998, discretionary budget authority grew at a reasonable approximately 2 percent a year. Since 1998, discretionary budget authority has grown at a galloping 6 percent a year.

How much has this increase in discretionary spending reduced the projected surplus? It is \$1.4 trillion. Again, that is just the discretionary spending. According to the CBO, the mandatory spending adopted by Congress last fall reduced the available surplus by \$70 billion.

Mr. Speaker, in 3 years we have already reduced the projected surplus by almost the equivalent of President Bush's tax relief plan. Moreover, the Office of Management and Budget estimates that if discretionary spending continues to grow at its current rate, the 10-year surplus would be \$1.4 trillion less over the next 10 years; again, almost equal to the Bush tax relief. So if we do not give it back to the people today, Congress will spend this money beyond inflation's cost of living.

An analysis of spending since the budget surpluses first emerged showed that if Congress had avoided this simple temptation to increase spending above the budget baseline caps, today we could offer American families a tax relief program equivalent to the Bush plan, and still we would be able to have a \$5.6 trillion surplus left over to pay down the debt, increase funding for education, health care, and defense, and still cut taxes even further.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by urging the other body, the Chamber in the Senate, and other Americans to support the President's broad-based tax relief for American families, and of course, hold spending to 4 percent.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will be reminded to refrain from

urging the other body to take certain action.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FOR PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently faced with great challenges and at the same time great opportunities. The balanced Federal budget and projected surplus provide economic alternatives that some years ago were not available. However, the indications of an economic slowdown have helped generate calls from the President and Congress to create economic stimulus through a variety of proposals.

Last week the House voted in favor of generous individual income tax reductions. Debate continues on the size and scope of tax cuts and what should be done to spur real economic growth. As the Representative of Puerto Rico before Congress, I will work hard and in a bipartisan fashion to develop and pass the necessary and deserved economic stimulus package that will benefit the 4 million U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico.

We have before us a unique opportunity to use current budgetary circumstances as a tool for economic development through the creation of jobs and investment in businesses in Puerto Rico.

During the period of 1993 to 1996, Congress took the necessary steps to balance the budget and eliminate the deficit. Many Members may already appreciate how Puerto Rico paid substantially during this process. In 1993, Congress passed the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, which included a provision that substantially curtailed the tax incentives provided by section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code to U.S. companies doing business in Puerto Rico.

In 1996, Congress enacted another set of amendments that eliminated all incentives for new or expanded business operation and investment in Puerto Rico. As of today, Puerto Rico has no Federal incentive to create new jobs, and those that apply to companies already doing business on the island are set to expire in the year 2005.

The negative consequences of the decisions taken in 1993 and 1996 are clear. The phase-out of these incentives is having disastrous effects on Puerto Rico's economy. In the last 4 years, more than 18,000 jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector as a direct result of the phase-out, and Puerto Rico has not been able to attract significant new economic investment.

The vast majority of these jobs are moving out of the U.S. jurisdiction to countries like Malaysia and Singapore. Employment and wages from American companies are a critical part of Puerto

Rico's manufacturing sector, the most important sector of Puerto Rico's economy.

The results of the phase-out are clear. Today we enjoy a balanced budget and a rather large surplus, but my people in Puerto Rico do not have the jobs. While the taxpayers in the U.S. have earned tax relief, so, too, have Puerto Ricans, who sacrificed during efforts to balance the budget and grow the Federal budget surplus. It is time to provide my constituents with tax relief through incentives for further investment and job creation in the Tax Code.

The challenge is to develop a sustainable stimulus for employment-generating investment in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican economy operates under U.S. standards that are far above those of our main competitors in the global marketplace. Our workers are well trained and educated, are very productive; but we need new tools to continue to grow our economy and be competitive again. Well-designed, sustainable tax incentives will level the playing field and permit us to compete.

Congress has been there for Puerto Rico in the past. In 1976, Congress enacted the special tax exemption under section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code. This was part of an effort to attract U.S. companies to Puerto Rico to create jobs for island residents.

I am here today to ask my colleagues to support a new economic stimulus package for Puerto Rico. Since the phase-out of the 936, economic growth in Puerto Rico has averaged 20 percent less than that of the United States. There has been an unprecedented loss of high-paying manufacturing jobs. No other U.S. jurisdiction has lost manufacturing jobs at such an alarming rate.

Recently layoffs are hurting workers and families in Puerto Rico. During the first 2 months of this year, leading U.S. companies like Intel, Coach, Sara Lee, and Phillips Petroleum have cut production and in some cases closed plants in Puerto Rico. These reductions alone will cost over 5,000 jobs, in addition to the 18,000 we have already lost. Today over 10 percent of the labor force in Puerto Rico is unemployed.

Some cities in Puerto Rico have been particularly hard hit by lost jobs. The average annual pay in Puerto Rican cities ranges from \$16,000 to \$19,000, while the national average is over \$34,000 per year. More than half of the population of Puerto Rico falls below the U.S. poverty threshold.

As I stated earlier, one of the reasons Congress eliminated the tax incentives for the U.S. companies in Puerto Rico was to balance the budget. Now we are faced with a surplus. I ask for your support in efforts to provide necessary and deserved relief for Puerto Rican workers and families.

ON THE BIRTHDAY OF A GREAT AMERICAN, TRUETT CATHY

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 14 we will celebrate the 80th birthday of a great American, Mr. Truett Cathy, founder and chairman of the Chick-fil-A restaurant chain.

In his book, *It is Easier to Succeed Than to Fail*, Mr. Cathy says and I quote, "The longest journey begins with the first step. Ahead of each person is a pilgrimage to success, a journey characterized by challenge and adventure. So here's to the winners, for they give each task their effort and find in the end it's easier to succeed than fail."

Mr. Cathy has lived out his own words. He started his business in 1946 when he and his brother, Ben, opened an Atlanta diner known as the Dwarf Grill, later renamed the Dwarf House. That restaurant prospered over the years.

In 1967, Mr. Cathy founded and opened the first Chick-fil-A restaurant in Atlanta's Greenbriar Shopping Center. Today Chick-fil-A is the third largest quick-service chicken restaurant company in sales in the United States. Today there are more than 963 restaurants in 34 States and South Africa.

Remarkably, Mr. Cathy has led Chick-fil-A on an unparalleled record of 33 consecutive years of sales increases. Most recently, in 1996, he has led the company into international expansion into South Africa.

Mr. Cathy's approach is largely driven by personal satisfaction and his sense of obligation to the community and its young people. His WinShape Centre Foundation, founded in 1984, grew from his desire to shape winners by helping young people succeed in life through scholarships and other youth programs.

The foundation annually awards 20 to 30 students wishing to attend Berry College with \$24,000 scholarships that are jointly funded by the Rome, Georgia, institution. In addition, through its Leadership Scholarship Program the Chick-fil-A chain has given over \$15.6 million in \$1,000 scholarships to Chick-fil-A restaurant employees since 1973.

As part of his WinShape Homes Program, there is a long-term care program for foster children. Eleven foster-care homes have been started in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Brazil that are operated by Mr. Cathy and the WinShape Foundation. These homes, accommodating up to 12 children with two full-time foster parents, provide long-term care for foster children with a positive family environment.

To add benefits to his WinShape Homes program, Mr. Cathy committed to Chick-fil-A's first major sports sponsorship, the Chick-fil-A Charity Championship, hosted by Nancy Lopez. In

1995, the LPGA-sanctioned tournament at Eagles Landing Country Club in Stockbridge, Georgia, raised \$170,000 for WinShape homes. Having completed its 6th year, the Chick-fil-A championship hosted by Nancy Lopez has contributed more than \$2.1 million to WinShape homes.

In 1996, Chick-fil-A became the title sponsor of the Chick-fil-A Peach Bowl, the annual college football match-up between the top teams for the Atlantic Coast Conference team and the Southeastern Conference. As with the LPGA tournament, a portion of the proceeds from the Chick-fil-A Peach Bowl is donated to WinShape. To date, the Chick-fil-A Peach Bowl has raised more than \$400,000 for the WinShape cause.

The third core component distinguishing WinShape programs is Camp WinShape. It was founded in 1985 as a series of 2-week summer camps at Berry College to help boys and girls build self-esteem through physical and spiritual activities. More than 1,500 campers from 20 States attend WinShape sessions annually.

Mr. Cathy is a devoutly religious man who built his life and business on hard work, humanity, and Biblical principles. Based on these principles, Mr. Speaker, all of Chick-fil-A restaurants, both domestically and internationally, operate with a closed-on-Sunday policy without exception.

When not managing his company, Mr. Cathy performs community service and teaches a Sunday school class of 13-year-old boys, as he has done for the past 45 years.

In addition to presiding over one of the fastest-growing restaurant chains in America, Mr. Cathy is a dedicated husband, father, and grandfather. His two sons, Dan and Don, known as Bubba, have both followed their father's footsteps in learning the business from the ground up.

Dan is executive vice president of Chick-fil-A and president of Chick-fil-A International, and Bubba is senior vice president and president of Chick-fil-A Dwarf House Division.

Mr. Cathy's daughter, Trudy, is the youngest of three children. She and her husband, John, have returned to the United States from Brazil, where they served as missionaries. Mr. Cathy and his wife, Jeannette, have 12 grandchildren.

Thank you, Mr. Truett Cathy, for all you have done for our country, our community, and for your fellow man. Happy birthday, Mr. Truett Cathy.

THE ROLE OF CIVILIANS IN OBSERVING MILITARY ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to express my deep sorrow regarding the training accident on the Kuwaiti bombing range

and extend my condolences to the families of those who were killed or injured. I know full well how the crew and the air wing on the U.S.S. *Harry S Truman* must feel regarding this tragic occurrence.

This accident underscores the risks that American service members take in order to master and to maintain the skills they need to keep our Nation safe and to protect our security around the world. The military is a dangerous profession, and we cannot take for granted the hazards that our men and women in uniform face on a daily basis, in times of war as well as in times of peace.

Mr. Speaker, last month I visited some of America's troops overseas, particularly in Kosovo, Bosnia, and Germany. With me were two other Members of the House, both of whom are on the Committee on Armed Services with me. We were astonished by what we saw: the dedication, the sacrifice, and above all, the intense level of activity, even in peacetime. It of course was an eye-opener, and it does give one a new sense of appreciation of the military.

It is the kind of education that I believe more Americans should have. As the population grows and fewer and fewer households have a picture on the mantle of a son or daughter in uniform, we do not have as many parents asking us to look after their Johnnie or their Janie who is in the service. We do not have as many Members of Congress with military experience.

That, of course, concerns me, because I don't believe it is good for America to have its military services become separate from the society that supports them and that they in turn defend.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is an unfortunate gap between civilian America and military America. Many civilians simply do not understand the role of people in uniform. It is an arduous profession, it is a dangerous profession, as I mentioned a moment ago, and the more civilians that can see our military, the better they can understand just how important a job they do.

One way the military has traditionally tried to maintain a bond with the people in our country is to involve civilians in military activities. That takes many forms, from public airshows to allowing citizens to observe military operations up close.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, the issue of how civilians should be involved in military activities is now subject to no small debate. I hasten to say, this is not a trivial matter. It is important for civilians to see how the military works, what they get for their money, and most of all, just what excellent men and women wear the uniform of the United States today.

I can certainly understand why, following the terribly sad situation involving the U.S.S. *Greenville*, some might believe that civilians should not be allowed aboard ships or aircraft, or to visit active military facilities. Without addressing the role of civilian ob-

servers in that particular case, let me say that I believe closing the doors of military facilities to civilian observers would be counterproductive.

To be clear, they should remain just that, observers. They should not be in control of any military hardware. Keeping hands off is no reason to keep eyes out. The Constitution provides for civilian control of the military, and that requires an informed public. Allowing responsible citizens access to the operating military is the most basic way of keeping the public aware of what the military life is all about, and what part the armed services should play in our society.

Even more basically, the more civilians see the military, the more word gets around that our men and women in uniform deserve our support. It works the other way, too. Military personnel are glad to know that their work is being seen and appreciated by the people back home.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the military is on its way to becoming just another special interest group, an organization that sees its own interests as separate from the rest of society. But the military is an integral part of our society. Indeed, it is woven by tradition and constitutional design into the very fabric of America itself.

To separate the military from civilian observation would be no less significant than separating our flag from the stars and stripes.

STATEMENT OF MARITZA LUGO ACCUSING THE CUBAN GOVERNMENT AND STATE SECURITY OF VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, despite the visitors, some from this body, who are going down to meet with the Cuban dictator and come back thrilled, having drooled with the privilege of meeting with him and having a banquet in his palace, the reality of Cuba today is quite different. The leaders of the Cuba of tomorrow, of the inevitably democratic Cuba of tomorrow, are in many instances in the political prisons of the totalitarian state today.

One such young woman, the mother of two, is Maritza Lugo, a Cuban political prisoner of conscience. A few days ago she managed to sneak out. She knows she is risking her life. But if she had the courage to sneak this out for the world to know, I think that I have the obligation to read it for my colleagues and those interested to know what she says.

Statement by Maritza Lugo, March 5, 2001, addressed to all people of good will who defend human rights.

She states:

From this horrible place I come before you, the international organizations who defend

human rights, the organizations defenders of democracy, justice, and peace, the religious organizations who promote liberty; the whole world and its people, to denounce the government of Cuba.

I accuse the dictatorial government imposed on Cuba and its repressive arm, the State Security, of all the injustices and abuses they commit against the Cuban people, the penal population, and especially against the political prisoners of conscience. I accuse those miserable and cowardly men and women who, through the use of force, commit all types of human rights violations, while nothing stops them as they attempt to defend a false revolution built and maintained upon a foundation of lies and infamies.

As a physically defenseless woman in ill health, as a mother of two unfortunate daughters currently without a mother's care and armed with my religious faith as my only weapon, I accuse.

I accuse them of publicly blaming every day a foreign country to give a false impression to the Cuban people that they have nothing to be guilty of. And this is why we, the repressed ones, demand that the criminals be sanctioned in the name of all victims that have suffered and continue to suffer in our homeland.

Stop the continuous wanton detention of innocent people whose only crime is disagreeing with the Castro regime. Stop taking them to inhumane prison cells where they are physically as well as psychologically tortured, as are their family members. They are kept in these prisons for an arbitrary and undetermined amount of time, living among dangerous common criminals and exposed to all kinds of risks. They are kept incarcerated for months without an expeditious trial, serving an unjust sentence while waiting to be charged or tried, as others are tried and unjustly condemned.

To the dictatorial government, I say, stop denying that you torture people. Stop denying international organizations access to our prisons with the pretext that you do not accept others meddling in internal affairs or that you do not compromise your sovereignty. To promote your agenda, you conveniently allow bribery and deception to prevent the inspection of these prisons according to international law.

Maritza Lugo continues:

I denounce that political prisoners are treated differently from other prison inmates. We are more rigorously repressed, even though the behavior of some common prisoners may be undesirable. Political prisoners, "counterrevolutionaries," as they call us, are constantly watched by guards and common prisoners trained for this sole purpose. We are searched more often and more demands are placed on us to follow their stringent so-called rules. The women's prisons are practically uninhabitable due to the putrid water that leaks from the floors above. The sinks are clogged and the prisoners have to do their wash on the floor. We are neither given supplies nor detergents to clean, leaving us to our own resources to solve our problems, using our own pieces of clothing. But this doesn't stop them from making demands on us and passing inspection to check our cleanliness. If they fail you, they submit a report that may carry the possibility of punishment. Medical attention is atrocious and there's hardly any medicine, while the Communist government affords the luxury of exporting doctors and medicine to other countries. This is not done because government officials are kind and generous people. This is done for propaganda purposes only, taking advantage of the misery other nations suffer to sell them their

propaganda of solidarity and unselfish interest.

Stop showing the exterior walls of prisons as well-kept and elegant facades while incarcerated human beings are degraded in extreme dearth.

I denounce that the prison food is vile.

Families arrive weary and emaciated bringing bags of food to supply the needs of the prisoners, only to be turned away because authorities fail to notify them that visiting hours have been changed. That is why they don't want international inspectors. They do not want the world to know these internal matters so well known to the innocent political prisoners.

I denounce that, in the majority of cases, we leave these prisons physically ill, thus history continues to repeat itself as so many of us are imprisoned so many times. That is why the Castro government represses us, implementing laws that penalize any group of two or more people whose ideas resist and oppose the so-called revolutionary government of Castro.

I accuse the Cuban government of separating the Cuban family, who, in desperation flee Cuba for political reasons.

I accuse the so-called "revolutionary government" of the political and democratic ignorance our people suffer, as they deceive the unwary people of the world with their propaganda of mass and cultural opinion education. They accomplish this by creating public opinion created by the state using Nazi-style techniques copied from Bolshevik Russia where Cubans pay a high price, acting hypocritically as they pretend to go along in public in order to subsist.

We ask the addressees of these lines, soon to convene in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Human Rights Commission, to discuss Cuba, to consider the ill-treatment of the Cuban people by its own government. I know that no delegation, not even those who defend Castro, will be permitted to come to visit me so they can corroborate this raw truth.

If any justice exists in the world for Maritza Lugo and her denunciation, this government, the government of Castro, should be sanctioned for this and so many other violations that they are constantly inflicting upon the Cuban population as they deceive and laugh at the whole world.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the reality of Cuba today, from Maritza Lugo, President of the 30th of November Democratic Party, from the women's prison popularly known as Black Cloak.

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 1 o'clock and 5 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. GILLMOR) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord God, source of creation and well-spring of revelation, Your word re-

verberates an awareness of how our behavior affects others. Your spirit penetrates our indifference to the consequences of our actions or to the suffering of others. Once illusion sets in or the infectious sin begins in any of us the whole human system can be measured by its fever.

As Isaias says: "The whole head is sick, the whole heart is faint."

One continent will not contain the epidemic. One system of any organization cannot localize the dysfunction. One group will not absorb the injustice without infecting us all.

By Your Spirit, give us a clear diagnosis of the evils within us that we may be on our way to discovering a remedy to our Nation's weakness and a lasting cure for our problems both here and abroad both 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 gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CAPPs 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 5(a) of the James Madison Commemoration Commission Act (P.L. 106-550), I hereby appoint the following Members to the James Madison Commemoration Commission:

Mr. Rick Boucher, VA.
Mr. Jim Moran, VA.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 5(b) of the James Madison Commemoration Commission Act (P.L. 106-550), I hereby appoint the following individuals to the James Madison Commemoration Advisory Committee:

Dr. James Billington, VA.
The Honorable Theodore A. McKee, PA.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this House, indeed, this Congress has a lot to celebrate and a lot to be proud of.

After decades of wasteful spending and rising Federal deficits, our fiscal house is in order. Since 1997, we have paid down \$363 billion of the Federal debt, and we are on course to paying off the complete \$2 trillion of the Federal public debt over the next 10 years.

This Republican Congress has set aside nearly \$3 trillion for the protection of Social Security, Medicare and further debt relief. Mr. Speaker, the nonpartisan CBO estimates that we will have a \$5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. Our fiscal house is not only in order, it is in the best possible shape in generations, and now we are going to give Americans what they need, want and deserve, real tax relief.

No one doubts that if the surplus money stays in Washington, it will be spent on bigger, more wasteful Federal bureaucracy. We need to put America's families first. The surplus belongs to them, not the wasteful spenders in Washington. The right thing to do is return the surplus to the people who earned it, the American taxpayers.

MILITARY BERETS SHOULD BE MANUFACTURED IN UNITED STATES

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, the Army is preparing to outfit every soldier with a new black beret. Some people oppose this policy, but whether or not it is a good idea, one thing we can all agree on is that these berets should be made in the United States.

So why is the Pentagon acquiring 2.5 million berets from companies who make these berets in countries like China, Romania and Sri Lanka? This is very troubling.

The Pentagon has waived the law which requires domestic production of military uniforms. This decision is costing American companies millions

of dollars; and even worse, the overseas berets may actually be more expensive so U.S. taxpayers will get stuck with a bigger bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am circulating a letter to President Bush urging him to review this shortsighted decision. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join with me.

DEBT REDUCTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in order to be a leader, one has to have credibility. If you do not have a record of accomplishment on an issue, people simply will not listen.

It is worth pointing out that for almost four consecutive decades, Congress was run by our Democratic friends, and never, not once, did they ever balance the Federal budget. Never once did they pay back a dime on the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am not pointing this out to be partisan. I am pointing it out because now it is those same Democrats who are claiming President Bush's tax relief package will keep us from paying down the debt.

Look at the Republican record: Almost immediately after taking control of Congress, Republicans started balancing the budget, paying down our public debt. Four years in a row, we balanced the budget. Four years in a row, we paid down on the public debt.

We already paid near half a trillion dollars. We are paying down the public debt; and in 10 years, we will have paid off every dime available to be paid.

If we stick with the President's plan, there will be enough for tax relief, Social Security, education and paying off our public debt.

BERETS SHOULD ONLY BE MADE IN AMERICA AND WORN BY THE ELITE ARMY RANGER FORCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. First, the Air Force bought Chinese boots. Now, the Pentagon is buying berets made in China. The Pentagon said China is cheaper. Unbelievable. What is next? At 17 cents an hour, will the Pentagon hire Chinese soldiers?

Unbelievable. Think about it. The beret once signified our elite ranger force. Now it is about to become a product of communism.

Beam me up. What has happened to the common sense of America? I say it is time to tell the Pentagon we can hire generals and admirals a lot cheaper from China, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the fact that the berets should only be made in America and should only be worn by the elite Army ranger force.

BAD DECISION-MAKING REGARDING BLACK BERETS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the decision to give black berets to all Army troops rather than just to rangers who earned them was a bad decision.

Far worse was the decision to order these berets from a Chinese firm rather than an American firm which could have done them for far less costs.

This was apparently done so the berets could be delivered by the Army's birthday in June.

It would really have made no difference at all to have them given out on some later historic day and have saved millions for our taxpayers.

This decision shows once again that bureaucrats can rationalize and justify almost anything and will almost never admit a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I say bureaucrat because, by this decision, General Shinseki has acted more like an arrogant bureaucrat than a soldier. Also, by giving this work to Chinese rather than American workers, especially in a slow economy and especially when Americans could have done it at millions less in cost, was both unwise and harmful to this Nation and its workers.

We seem at times, Mr. Speaker, to be giving our own country away.

PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT IS PARTISAN ISSUE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House voted for the President's signature proposal, a cut in income taxes heavily tilted towards millionaires and billionaires.

Republican National Committee Chairman Jim Gilmore highlighted my no vote as evidence, he says, that I do not want to see lower taxes for my constituents.

My district in Northeast Ohio is not heavily tilted towards the millionaires and billionaires whom President Bush and the Republican Party Chair Gilmore want to help. Most of the people I represent are middle-income people or lower-income working families working their way up.

The right kind of tax cut would mean something to them. Unfortunately, that is not what the President delivered.

Medicare means something to the people in my district. The President's plan uses an accounting trick to siphon funds for the Medicare trust fund. Medicare cannot afford that. The elderly people in my district cannot afford that.

Mr. Speaker, tax cuts are not a partisan issue, but this tax cut is. If the President would work with us on a tax cut that would benefit all Americans,

we could easily pass one in this body, but I could not support a bill which gives tax cuts to the wealthiest people, robs Medicare and fails to pay down the national debt.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

STABILIZATION AND PACIFICATION OF SOUTHERN SERBIA ACT

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member today is introducing legislation entitled the Stabilization and Pacification of Southern Serbia Act. This bill is a response to the ongoing violence in southern Serbia and in Macedonia that has been fomented by Albanian extremists seeking to create a greater Kosovo by annexing areas of Macedonia and southern Serbia that also contain large concentrations of Albanians.

This legislation would terminate U.S. economic assistance for Kosovo on June 30, 2001, unless the President certifies that citizens or residents of Kosovo are no longer providing assistance to the extremists that are responsible for the worsening situation in both southern Serbia and Macedonia and that leaders of the three main ethnic Albanian political parties of Kosovo are taking positive measures to halt the ethnically motivated violence against non-Albanians residing in Kosovo.

It does contain a waiver for the President to continue U.S. assistance if he deems it in the national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

CONDEMNING HEINOUS ATROCITIES THAT OCCURRED AT SANTANA HIGH SCHOOL, SANTEE, CALIFORNIA

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 57)

condemning the heinous atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, at Santana High School in Santee, California, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 57

Whereas on March 5, 2001, a gunman opened fire at Santana High School in Santee, California, killing 2 students and wounding 13 others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, at Santana High School in Santee, California;

(2) offers its deepest condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those killed in the shooting;

(3) expresses hope for the rapid and complete recovery of those wounded in the shooting;

(4) applauds the hard work and dedication exhibited by local and State law enforcement officials and by others who offered support and assistance;

(5) commends the rapid response by the faculty and staff of Santana High School in evacuating its students to safety in an efficient and effective manner;

(6) encourages communities to implement a wide range of violence prevention services for the Nation's youth; and

(7) encourages the people of the United States to engage in a national dialogue on preventing school violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 57, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 57 offered by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), to express my profound sorrow for the loss endured by the students, teachers and families of the southern California community of Santee.

Today, you are foremost in the thoughts and prayers of all Americans as you struggle to rebuild your community and the sense of safety and security that a school building is supposed to embody.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I join this body in its continuing search for answers, but it was not so long ago that I stood in this place hoping and praying that April 1999 events at Columbine High School would not be repeated, and taking refuge in the facts offered by various agencies which claim that school-associated violent deaths were still rare.

While I do believe that schools are one of the safest places for our chil-

dren, it is equally clear that no school is immune from this type of tragedy. For this reason, it will take all of us working together to make our society safer and smarter and to prevent any further reoccurrences.

While we cannot reclaim the lives of those lost and we cannot make whole those who have suffered as a result of this latest school shooting, we can honor them by resisting the temptation to execute a quick fix, issue the press release, and absolve ourselves from further responsibility. We must accept the fact that we have a society-wide problem that will only be solved by a society-based solution, and it will take time.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education Reform, I will work to ensure that no child, regardless of background or family income, will be forced to risk his or her life in order to learn. Often it is easy to forget, but we have a Federal program that is specifically designed to help stem the tide of school violence.

I hope to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure that this money is a sufficient amount to allow schools to implement the types of programming and take the types of measures that will really make a difference in the school environment. Then we will make information about the use of this money widely available to parents and the communities to assure them that we are spending Federal money to best ensure their children's safety.

Yet, violence is not a problem that we can expect our schools to solve alone. In the days that follow, I hope that every American remembers how they felt the day they learned of the shooting and said with a heavy heart "not again." We must rededicate ourselves. From friends and classmates who hear about bullying in the school yard to families who have difficulty communicating with each other, from businesses that market violence, to every level of government, we must do our part. By now we all know what that is, to be a friend, to be a parent, and to be responsible for those who have entrusted their most valuable possession, their child, to our care.

All that said, first things are first. I want to offer my heartfelt sympathy to the families and friends of the two students who were killed and the 13 who were injured. Today we are united by our sorrow. Tomorrow, I hope we still will be united, not by grief or fear, but by our collective resolve to prevent another tragedy from turning our schools into a place of violence, teaching our children a lesson that no one should ever have to learn.

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

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

We are here today to mourn a tragedy. In many ways, we mourn a double tragedy today at Santana High School

on March 5, 2001, because, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues as we grieve the loss of two bright young students, Bryan Zuckor and Randy Gordon.

But we also are heartbroken that no one heard Charles Williams, "Andy's" cries for help and saddened that he did not find another way to express his anger and his pain.

We pray for the families of the injured students and the school staff. We also recognize that, when we are faced with such a high-profile tragedy, that we must also grieve for the thousands of children and their families that die every day because of violence and accidents in our community.

I want to commend law enforcement, the school staff, and students at Santana High School, and say how grateful I am and I know how grateful my colleagues and those in our community are with the San Diego Sheriff's Department, and particularly the officers Ali Perez and Jack Smith. We also want to recognize off-duty San Diego police officer Robert Clark. These three men responded with precision, with valor, and courage, and in doing so saved the lives of countless others.

Our deepest gratitude also extends to the Santana High School personnel, particularly Principal Karen Degischer and all the teachers, the counselors, the school security, and their support staff, for their professionalism, for their courage.

We know that they had previously practiced drills and procedures for such emergencies, and they did well during this horrible crisis.

We must also commend the student body of Santana High School for their resilience, their solidarity, and courage and their decision now to move on.

When anything like this happens, we all look for reasons. It has been stated too many guns and not enough adults. There is an allegation: not enough real listening going on in our community.

We know as well that the teenage years are just some of the most difficult years in a person's life. Young people's bodies are changing, the social dynamics of school are difficult for all kids and the insecurities abound.

Too many kids may maintain a cover of anonymity in a school; and unfortunately, we know that there are lots of ways that they can do that quite easily in a large high school. So now we are looking for answers. It is not the time to blame, but rather the time to fight, to fight for our kids.

So we think about going back to the basics and back to the golden rule. But if we talk about teaching our kids the golden rule, we have got to understand and recognize that adults are not always modeling the golden rule. I think that we do not have enough exposure to positive parenting in our community.

Sheriff Bill Colander, who used to head up the youth agency in our State, reminds us that, when they began to teach kids about parenting in the security situation that they had, they recognized that, in fact, that was not the

parenting that they had experienced; and in fact, in many cases, that is often true.

We need to encourage mentoring. Kids need to have mentors, and kids need to be mentors. We might think, whether Andy had been tapped to help out a young person in his school, to work with a second grader on reading, whatever it may be, that tapped and valued the person that he was, and perhaps that might make a difference. We have good models in our schools of kids who are mentors.

Teachers as well need more time and resources to spend with their students. We know that our classes are too big, and that is another reason why kids can live in anonymity in our school. Large classes and large schools do not create an atmosphere conducive to getting to know kids as much as we should. We need to create an atmosphere at school so kids feel both physically and mentally safe; that they can talk about their prejudices, their feelings, and their opinions. Everyone has had adverse experiences, and so everyone needs to feel supported and listened to, valued in who they are and what they have to contribute.

As legislators and community leaders, we need to be researching the best practices in other communities and disseminate this information in neighborhoods.

Ironically, Santana had programs. They had taken some good first steps, not final solutions. They had developed peace programs. They had participated in minitowns, a very popular and well-thought-out program in our community.

But all programs need to be backed up with an evaluation. What works? What does not? Why? We need to look at that information. We need to solicit those opinions from young people.

In the State Assembly, I created the Adolescent Task Force; and in that, we brought young people to the table. We enlisted their ideas. We broadened the circle so kids who often felt that they were not included perhaps in associated student body or other clubs would be included in that forum. Really listening as opposed to telling them what they need is important for all of us.

We have a challenge for change. One thing that we know is many of our young people, in fact most of our young people, are very resilient. Let us learn from them. How can they teach us about that resiliency? Our challenge is to support them.

It has been said that we in America are pretty good at grieving, and yet we wait for a crisis to change. We have to ask, Why are there not more programs to teach kids inclusion? Why are there not more public service announcements on the impacts of bullying developed by students around issues of guns of getting together and finding ways of solving their problems?

We need to enlist the media in that, but we need to allow young people to have the input to create these mes-

sages because they really know what it is that people and young people will relate to; that through listening, through mentoring, and modeling, kind, caring behavior, we can stop some of these devastating tragedies.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in our deepest condolences to the families and friends of Bryan Zuckor and Randy Gordon. Let us bring students to the center of our discussions and work together to ensure that these tragedies do not continue to be repeated in any community.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished sponsor of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I salute and thank my colleague for putting this resolution together and allowing us to be here today.

Mr. Speaker, all of San Diego, California, all of San Diego County California, all of California, all of America was impacted on March 5 when a senseless shooting at Santana High School took the lives of Bryan Zuckor and Randy Gordon and wounded 13 others.

Do my colleagues know what? This time the feeling in this capital, when an event like this occurs is usually one of helplessness, because there is no legislation, there is no resolution, there is no law that can reverse what happened.

But in San Diego, California, I want to let my colleagues know hope is reviving, with students and parents and teachers coming together to rebuild this community.

There is one small thing that we can do here, and that is that we can condemn in the strongest possible terms the atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, in Santana High School.

We can offer from this House our deepest condolences to the families, to the friends, and to the loved ones of those who were killed and wounded in this shooting. We can express hope for the rapid and complete recovery of those wounded in the shooting.

And we can, Mr. Speaker, very importantly applaud the hard work and dedication exhibited by our local and State law enforcement officials and by all the others who offered support and assistance. They numbered, Mr. Speaker, in the thousands in this community.

We can commend the rapid response by the faculty and staff of Santana High School in evacuating its students to safety and efficient and effective manner. And we can encourage communities to implement a wide range of violence-prevention services for the Nation's youth. Mr. Speaker, we can encourage the people of the United States to engage in a national dialogue on preventing school violence such as this.

Mr. Speaker, God bless our community, God bless the students at Santana High School; and I look forward to working with all of my colleagues and all of our citizens to see to it that events like this never occur again.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to condemn the shooting at the high school in San Diego, California, last week that added to the long list of tragedies at our Nation's schools. This measure also extends condolence appropriately to the families of the victims, applauds the State and local law enforcement officials, commends the staff and faculty of Santana High School for their rapid response to the shooting, and encourage the American people to engage in a national dialogue on this issue of school violence.

I am concerned also with the young man who performed this dangerous and fatal act of violence. We have a problem, Mr. Speaker. Our concerns are young people are killing each other; and we parents, school officials, State legislators, Members of Congress have been stuck in partisan political posturing and fail to take the decisive action that may stop the violence. We must act now, before more children are killed.

□ 1430

Our children are the leaders of the future. They are our most cherished natural resource. They look to us for guidance, for leadership, and for protection; and for too long we have let them down by our failure to act. We must restore, perhaps in ourselves and most certainly in our youth, respect for life. We also must offer our children more mental health counseling and other services, structured adult-supervised after-school programs, and we must pass reasonable gun-safety measures.

How many more lives must be lost, Mr. Speaker, before we elevate the sanctity of life above the political pressure of a gun lobby? How many more families and communities must be devastated by the senseless tragic loss of life of some of our young people in a school yard, some in homes and on the streets, before this Congress will say enough already? Who will be next, Mr. Speaker? Must we wait before acting until the child of a Member of Congress is shot and killed? I hope not. I pray not.

Now is the time for us, Republicans and Democrats, to act. We must affirm the sanctity of life, offer more mental health services and after-school programs, and pass reasonable gun safety measures. Our children are counting on us and deserve that.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Delaware for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, it has come to this again; another school tragedy. In another American town, several

families now mourn a lost child. Other families are faced with the certain knowledge that one of their children will never be the same after surviving a tragic attack.

The town of Santee, California, is left to heal after an awful incident that made no sense at all and shattered hundreds of young lives. That is the reality, and we cannot shrink from it. We send them our prayers and our sincere hope that no city or town will again suffer the senseless trauma and tragedy inflicted upon Santana High School.

That is our hope, but it would be the height of folly to suggest that we will prevent similar tragedies by simply erecting even more barriers to behavior and imposing ever more restrictions on our constitutional freedoms. This line of thought is flawed for both practical and abstract reasons. Fixating upon the blunt instruments of crime places the symptom before the cause.

America confronts horrible tragedies, like the awful 8 minutes at Santana High School, not because the capacity to harm others exists within a free society. Rather, we face these demons because of our human condition. Human beings must inevitably struggle to triumph over evil. And make no mistake about it, this latest attack was certainly evil.

We do not like to admit that evil still exists, but as the unmistakable lesson of the 20th century instructs us, we cannot remake human nature. Indeed, attempts to do so, like the policies perpetrated on its people by the Soviet Union have been themselves responsible for immense suffering.

No, we cannot remake man, but we can, through negligence and indifference, tolerate a climate that is a more fertile breeding ground for senseless violence. I believe that our tolerance for a culture of death only serves to exacerbate those strains of evil present within persons who are predisposed to consider violent acts a viable statement.

Because once we begin differentiating between shades of life, we truly open a Pandora's box in which some lives will be callously discounted and dispensed with. We need to treat all life as a sacred gift from our creator, not a sliding scale that society grades by its utility.

I believe that we will only find a lasting solution by rediscovering our core and founding principles. I believe this rediscovery will demand that we boldly move to rebuild the three key elements of our Nation's success: The strength of the American family, the moral authority of American government, and the fundamental virtue of American culture.

All of these things flow from a common philosophy, a coherent world view. It is a philosophy built on values that are moral, universal and, yes, I believe, the source of America's greatness. Faith in God, the sanctity of human life, the existence of right and wrong,

and the certain knowledge that we are all ultimately accountable for our actions.

This is not the world view that predominates our culture today, and until it does we will confront more awful acts of violence.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, but I have to say I would certainly prefer to be standing here debating on what we can do to save these young children.

For close to 4½ years I have stood here, I do not know how many times, saying I am sorry to the families. For 4½ years, I have had to meet with some of these parents that have lost their children. How many times does this have to happen before this Congress will start to realize this is not going to go away?

We cannot stop ignoring this issue. While America's teachers and students search for solutions to the violence that threatens our school, Congress has failed to enact even modest proposals to reduce our children's access to firearms. I know that it is a very complex issue, and we should be all working together on every single issue to make sure that our children are safe.

I spent yesterday morning in one of my local schools, as I tend to do on every single Monday. The kids were 1 through 6, and every single question they asked me was, is somebody going to shoot me. Now, we know the majority of our schools are safe, but there is fear in the schools today. We must recognize the fear our children, our teachers, and our parents are facing. The American people are looking to us to come up with answers. We cannot have all the answers, but we certainly can do a better job than what we are doing right now.

It is time to stop the rhetoric of this talk. It is time to stop going around in circles. It is time that this Congress started working to do something to protect our children and our families, and I ask the American people to work with us.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and while many will speak of the importance of remembering this tragic episode and many will speak of solutions to be found in this body, I do not rise for that purpose. I believe that the solution to this problem is not found in this body and will not be.

Much like President Lincoln, more than 6 scores ago, when he came to Gettysburg and people expected him to talk only of the burial ground and the loss of life, I would hope that we would all commit ourselves here today and throughout the United States to use this resolution as a moment to think

and reflect on those ways in which all Americans could in fact, prevent this in the future, not by adding to the 1200 laws already on the books in California but on personal responsibility.

It is my fervent belief that if each of us evaluates how we could eliminate violence in our own home, the access of guns, of knives, and of anything else that is pervasive in our homes that could cause harm if poorly used, take responsibility for locking them up, and personally educate our children, then we could personally address the issues of hate, anger and the other menaces that have led to these types of disasters in the past, and most certainly, if not dealt with, will lead to them in the future.

It is the loss of life of the past and loss of life here today that all Americans should focus on and take internally the obligation to see that these lives, this tragic loss of life will not have occurred in vain.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for bringing us this resolution.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and all of us from San Diego County are here jointly to express the deep sorrow that has fallen upon our entire county and our entire country. And by condemning this act of violence, Congress is expressing the collective sorrow felt around the Nation not only for the victims but for another lost teen who chose to express his frustration with a gun. We especially pray for the families and the whole school family of the slain students, Randy Gordon and Brian Zuckor; and we hope that their lives can be put together again.

Since the tragedy at Columbine High School, and up through this tragedy in Santana High School, much has been written about the prevalence of guns in our community and violence in our media. But it seems to me from all these examples that we have had, one thing is clear, not just those who excel, not just those who are popular, not just those who have special needs as defined by law, have got to get our attention. Every child, all kids, we need to get each and every one of them involved in activities, in learning, in fun, especially the ones who sit quietly, who may not demand attention, who may not excel, who may not be popular, who may not be involved.

I guess I have to say to our distinguished majority whip, we are not talking about putting restrictions on people's behavior, we are talking about, as the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) said, our positive responsibility as human beings.

In a column that was written after Columbine, the noted journalist William Raspberry wrote,

The sad fact is that there are people who, for too many of us and often for themselves,

do not matter. There are people in our schools, in our offices, on our streets who know they don't matter to the rest of us, who exist, if at all, as objects of ridicule and derision: As nerds, as nobodies, as fatties, shorties, as crips, as dummies, as losers. Probably all of us spend some portion of our lives not mattering, though most of us have refuge in places like home, the workplace, church, or a social group where we do matter a great deal.

But some of us have no such refuge, apart from our fellow nonmatters. And of that sad group, some will make sure they matter in the time-tested way of mattering: Through violence. The tendency is for the rest of us to respond to the violence and think we have dealt with the problem. We institute new rules or new dress codes. We remind ourselves of the signs to be watched for and forget that there are still people who do not matter.

The hardest point to absorb, says Mr. Raspberry,

is the need to start paying attention to those who see themselves as outcasts, not just because it may prevent violence but because there simply should not be human beings who do not matter.

□ 1445

At Santana high school, at Colombine, in every community, it is our responsibility to let every child know that they do matter. In a society where kids are often latchkey kids, where kids and parents often watch different TVs even when they are in the same house, when we come and go in our neighborhoods without speaking, we have to find better ways to let people know that they do matter. Our hearts go out to all the Santana High School family as they put their community back together.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, my many thanks to my friend from Delaware, I thank him so much for putting this resolution on this morning. To my San Diego colleagues, I thank them for coming together with all of us and giving some real value to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would mention those students and others at Santee High who were in fact wounded. Barry Gibson, Heather Cruz, Scott Marshall, Travis Tate-Gallegos, Melissa McNulty, Trevor Edwards, Raymond Serrato, James Jackson, Trison Salladay, Matthew Heier, Karla Leyva, and campus supervisor Peter Ruiz and student teacher Timothy Estes have been in the thoughts and prayers of, of course, all of the Santee residents and all Americans who have heard about this tragedy. They will continue to be in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, there will be political discussions that arise out of this tragedy. That is going to happen. We are a political body. We respond to occurrences like this.

I would just ask all my colleagues over the next 3 or 4 weeks to observe a standard, maybe an arbitrary standard that I have set for myself, but I would hope we would all observe it and, that

is, this is a tragedy, this is a time for grieving, a time for mourning, a time for healing in Santee, California; and I would ask everyone to not attach a political agenda to this occurrence until a month has gone by. Maybe that is an arbitrary time, but I think that that respects the families and the students in Santee, California.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would hope if people who watch this resolution, that fathers and mothers and grandparents and uncles and aunts, as a result of watching us and contemplating these events, would resolve to spend a little more time this week, this month, this year, maybe starting today, with their children, then this resolution will have had value.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with sadness to speak on the gentleman's resolution of which I am a cosponsor. I commend the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services.

This tragedy was a horrible, horrible crime. We mourn with the families who lost children, and our thoughts are with the families of the injured students and staff.

But our duty goes beyond that. Our schools need to be safe places in order for learning to successfully take place.

I am a cosponsor of the Excellence in Education Act, a proposal for reauthorization of our Federal elementary and secondary education programs. Included in all of that would be a Safe and Drug Free Schools program based on proven results, alternative education programs that remove violent children from our classrooms, to help to streamline and make smaller schools so that teachers, principals and administrators can get to know the children and can monitor their emotional state, and also funds for school counselors and mental health professionals to spot the students who need help from us before they turn violent.

I join my colleagues in expressing our grief and sorrow, and I look forward to working with all the Members in this House to end school violence.

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

I want to join my colleagues and thank them for bringing this resolution forward. I want to send my condolences once again to the families of the slain students. We mourn their loss of life. But we also mourn a loss of innocence, a loss of innocence for a community but also for all the young people throughout our communities who yearn to grow up safe and they yearn to grow up loved.

It has been said that most of the communities that we live in would be in denial around an incident like this and say that it just can't happen here.

Well, it can happen, it does happen, it happens far too frequently. Where are the answers? The answers are most likely right in our backyards. I ask all of us here today and in our communities to value our kids, to talk to our kids, and to enlist their support as we work to create better communities.

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

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

I have listened attentively to the debate here today. As everybody has indicated, I, too, would like to repeat my condolences to the families, friends, schoolmates, everybody associated with these young people at Santee. This is a very difficult matter for them. No matter how we phrase it, it is always going to be a difficult matter for them, for those who were fortunate enough to live, for their lifetimes and for all of us something we will all remember our lifetimes.

For our friends here in the Congress who are from San Diego County, you, too, have endured a great deal of hardship as a result of this; and we understand that. We offer you our sympathy as well.

For all of us here in Congress, and I agree with the sponsor of the resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we do not want to react instantaneously to this, but I would also hope that in this country that we would take a holistic approach to what we are doing with respect to violence in our society, that we in Congress will look at whatever laws that we can pass that we can agree upon; and I hope we would make the effort to reach that agreement, to make sure that we have the best laws possible to control the use of weapons of violence.

We hope our State and local governments would do the same. We hope that our culture would do the same, that which we see in movies and television, read in books, see on the Internet, whatever it may be, would understand that what they write about or what they put into visual arts is something which indeed can affect the lives of young people out there.

Obviously, it has been stated so articulately by so many Members here today, the bottom line of looking after our young people, in families, in school, in every way we possibly can is something that we have to do. We need to stop this bloodshed as best we possibly can. We all have to do it together. We cannot blame and fault each other. We have to reach out and try to help each other. For that reason I am pleased to be able to encourage everyone to support this resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today sadly to support this legislation, which offers our condolences to the families and friends of those involved in the shooting last week at Santana High School in my home state of California. I want to personally express my deepest sympathies to the families of all the victims at Santee High School.

Regrettably, another incident of school violence has left one of our communities grieving

and looking for a way to prevent another terrible tragedy like the one that occurred in Santee.

The bill before us today encourages communities to implement a wide variety of violence prevention services for our Nation's youth. I feel that one of the best violence prevention services is ensuring that we have adequate counselors available in our schools for troubled youth.

While we may never know what causes some children to feel that violence is their only option to solve their problems, I believe that having a strong support system in place will show students that they have a safe place to go to when they are troubled. School counselors, psychologists, and social workers play a vital role in counseling students. As important as these counselors are, there are far too few of them in our schools.

In some States, the ratio of students to counselors is over 1100 to 1, although the National Academy of Sciences recommends that ratio to be no higher than 250 to 1.

In order to correct this situation, I will soon reintroduce my legislation to establish a grant program to allow states to hire additional school-based mental health and student service personnel—counselors, psychologists, and social workers. My bill will authorize \$100 million over five years for this purpose.

We must have these counselors in our schools so that students can turn to them at times of crisis in their lives. Counselors do make a difference, and hopefully if they are available to more students, we can try to prevent terrible tragedies such as that at Santee High.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the H. Con. Res. 57, a resolution condemning the Heinous atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, at Santana High School in Santee, California.

The shooting occurred early morning 9:45 a.m., Monday March 8, on the campus of Santana High School, in Santee, CA, where a 15-year old suspect, Charles Andrew "Andy" Williams, fired 30 gunshots in the school killing two people and injuring thirteen people including two adult supervisors. In the aftermath, 14-year-old Brian Zuckor died at the school. One of the wounded students, 17-year-old Randy Gordon, died later of his injuries at Grossmont Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, as founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and member of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Crime I find myself again taking to the House floor to reiterate the need for serious and effective legislation regarding gun safety and our children as well as effective children's mental health initiative on the local, state and national level.

I have continued my work into the 107th Congress on behalf of Child safety with the introduction of the "Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2001" (HR-70), and the "Give a Kid a Chance Omnibus Mental Health Services Act of 2001" (HR-75).

HR-70 would increase youth gun safety by raising the age of handgun eligibility and prohibiting youth from possessing semiautomatic assault weapons. The measure also purposes an enhanced penalty for youth possession of handguns and semiautomatic assault weapons, as well as the transfer of such weapons to youth.

HR-75 would amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health

and Human Services to support programs to promote mental health among all children and their families and to provide early intervention services to ameliorate identified mental health problems in children and adolescents.

Mr. Speaker, parents and supervising adults must be held responsible for their children when their household contains dangerous firearms." My bill would hold adults responsible for the death and injury caused by a child's access to firearms. These Acts, if passed, would help prevent tragedies like the one that occurred Monday morning in Santee, CA, by encouraging schools to provide or participate in a firearms safety program for students in kindergarten through Grade 12. Prevention is key.

In the 106th Congress I was an advocate for stronger and more enhanced gun laws and even introduced a motion in the U.S. House of Representatives that directed the members of the Juvenile Justice Conference Report to meet to discuss the current Juvenile Justice Bill. This motion also directed the committee report to include:

Measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of the conference; and

Common-sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns within the scope of conference.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again, coming to the House floor to mourn the deaths of more of our Nation's young. Here we come again, to the House floor to express the need for adequate and enhanced gun legislation.

According to Handgun Control, Inc. and the Texas Department of Public Health 5,285 children were killed by firearms in the United States; 260 in Texas; and 37 in Harris County, Texas. For every child killed with a gun, 4 are wounded. According to the Centers for Disease Control, the rate of firearm death of children 0-14 years old is nearly 12 times higher in the U.S. than in 25 other industrialized nations combined.

Mr. Speaker, many people say that guns do not kill people, people kill people. However, I believe that guns do kill people, especially when wielded by children. More than 800 Americans, young and old, die each year from guns shot by children under the age of 19.

The firearm injury epidemic, due largely to handgun injuries, is 10 times larger than the polio epidemic of the first half of this century.

More than 1300 children aged 10-19 committed suicide with firearms. Unlike suicide attempts using other methods, suicide attempts with guns are nearly always fatal, meaning a temporarily depressed teenager will never get a second chance at life. We must end this continual suffering that our nation is experiencing. People are tired of having to suffer through daily breaking news that another child was killed as a result of gun violence. I am concerned about children and their access to guns. I am concerned that guns are not regulated in the same way that toys are regulated.

I am concerned that we do not have safety standards for locking devices on guns. I am concerned that we do not prohibit children from attending gun shows unsupervised. I am concerned that we have not focused on the statistics on children and guns.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) strongly stresses that the most effective measure to prevent firearm-related injuries to chil-

dren and adolescent is to remove guns from homes and communities. According to the AAP statement:

The United States has the highest rates of firearm-related deaths among industrialized countries.

The overall rate of firearm-related deaths for children younger than 15 years of age is nearly 12 times greater than that found for 25 other industrialized nations.

The Academy even predicts that by the year 2003, firearm-related deaths may become the leading cause of injury-related death.

Already, among black males 10 through 34 years of age, injuries from firearms are the leading cause of deaths.

Even more tragic is the fact that most firearm-related deaths of children occur before their arrival at the hospital.

Thus, most of our children that injured by firearms do not even have a chance. This is the reality in our country that must not be denied.

Another important fact pointed out by the American Academy of Pediatrics is that: In 1994, the mean medical cost per gunshot injury was approximately \$17,000 producing 2.3 billion in lifetime medical costs, 1.1 billion of that was paid by US taxpayers.

Thus, it not only makes common sense, but economic sense to pass legislation that includes child safety measures so that we can prevent tragedies like the school shootings in Santana High School in Santee, California, Columbine and Littleton, Colorado from occurring again.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember the sad fact that 13 children die everyday from firearms. It would seem that in almost the year since the Littleton shootings, virtually nothing has been done to address these serious problems. That is why I introduced my own bill, the "Children Gun Safety and Adult Supervision Act in Congress this year," which would increase youth gun safety by raising the age of handgun eligibility and prohibiting youth from possessing semiautomatic assault weapons, but by enhancing the penalties for those adults who recklessly disregard the risk that a child is capable of gaining access to a firearm.

Child Safety legislation is not a novel concept. There are numerous laws on the books that create guidelines in order to protect the most impressionable people in our society—our children. Children under the age of 17 must be accompanied into an R rated movie at the theatres, yet that same child can walk into a gun show where he/she is surrounded by assault weapons.

A child, and I stress the word child, under the age of 18 cannot walk into a store and purchase cigarettes, yet that same child can walk into a gun show where he/she is surrounded by assault weapons.

There is Dram Shop law that hold liquor seller's liable for their part in the wrongful death of a person who left their establishment intoxicated, yet none for people who recklessly leave firearms in the presence of children. There is definitely a problem in this society if we allow special interest groups to prevent us from protecting our precious children.

Furthermore, our children's schools should be safe and secure places for all students, teachers and staff members. All children should be able to go to and from school without fearing for their safety. However, there are

signs that we should all pay attention to in order to prevent such acts of violence.

For example, according to news reports from the heartbreak at past school shootings, the young assailants were outcasts in the school community. During the shooting, the children reportedly said that they were "out for revenge" for having been made fun of last year. This is truly a cry for help that was not heard in time.

This incident underscores the urgent need for mental health services to address the needs of young people like the suspects from yesterday. Without concerted efforts to address the mental health disorders that affect our children, we may witness more terrifying violence in our schools.

I am dismayed by the string of violent incidents that have occurred in our schools within the past 24 months. In the past months my office has received many calls and letters from constituents who believe that we support legislation that will take away their guns.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about children and their access to guns. I am concerned that guns are not regulated in the same way that toys are regulated. I am concerned that we do not have safety standards for locking devices on guns. I am concerned that we do not prohibit children from attending gun shows unsupervised. I am concerned that we have not focused on the statistics on children and guns.

By now, we are familiar with the statistics on gun violence among young people. In 1996, male high school seniors were about three times as likely to carry a weapon to school. According to the most recent data compiled in 1997 by the National Center for Health Statistics, 630 children 14 years and under died; 3,593 children ages 15–19 died. In total, 4,223 children died in this Nation due to the scourge of gun violence in our communities. The most troubling statistic is that today, 13 children die from gun violence.

The United States is leading the country even among Brazil and Mexico, countries we often think of having extreme incidences of gun violence. And, the statistics indicate that youth violence is a growing percentage among the total number of homicides occurring per year.

How long must we wait until legislation is passed that will begin to adequately address this growing phenomenon. We as a nation, cannot sit idly by as our children are inundated by firearm violence on television, at the movies, on the streets and now in the classroom.

If I have not stressed the urgency of this matter, let me further bring to your attention the result of inadequate firearm safety legislation. August 10, 1999, Buford O. Furrow, Jr. in Los Angeles, California used an Uzi semiautomatic, Glock 9mm handgun in a Jewish community center and wounded three children, a teenager, a 68-year-old receptionist and killed a postal worker.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to act and pass enhanced gun legislation and Children's mental health legislation to address the proliferation of school shootings and gun violence in general. I urge my colleagues to join me in committing to addressing this problem today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again, we must lower our Nation's flag in one solemn accord, to mourn two young children who were stolen in their prime. Randy Gordon and Bryan Zuckor are cherished by all who

love them. We all extend our prayers and thoughts to the families of the victims and to the community Santee, where they are struggling to find answers to a dreaded and unfortunate situation.

The horror of the shootings at Santana High School, and the proliferation of teenage shootings across the country has forced us to confront an increasing problem that leave the doorsteps of every school in every community vulnerable. As we scramble ardently to attack the problem, we realize that children are falling through the cracks. Misguided youth are taking unhealthy measures to cope with growing pains of adolescence—open communication is now transformed into acts of violence.

We must never rest until we inoculate the epidemic of teenage violence that afflicts our communities. On this sad occasion, we must forge ahead and continue our attempts to resolve random acts of youth violence.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 57, condemning the recent school shooting that occurred in Santee, California, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. HUNTER, for bringing this issue to the House floor.

With the passing of this resolution, we will show our support for the families and friends of the victims of this school shooting at Santana High School. This act of violence by a fifteen-year-old boy has not only disrupted the lives of those in Santee, but has shaken and disturbed our entire Nation. We join in recognizing and commending the rapid, efficient response of the law enforcement professionals and school officials in handling this situation. Without their immediate and professional response, we could have been faced with even more greater fatalities.

Condemning this action is only the first step in our struggle to end school violence. I ask you also to consider H.R. 255, the safer America for Everyone's Children Act. This act authorizes the Attorney General to provide grants to local governments with gun buyback programs, school violence initiatives, and activities which meet child care needs of parents during non-school hours. With this act, we encourage communities to implement these programs and help to strengthen the already existing programs.

The gun buyback program will remove unwanted guns from American homes by paying one hundred dollars for semiautomatic weapons and fifty dollars for all other firearms.

The school violence initiatives will help to implement comprehensive strategies to ensure that our schools are safe and drug-free. The majority of juvenile crimes occur between the hours of 3 and 7 pm, when children are without any supervision. To combat this surge of crime, activities during non-school hours will be designed to focus on the social, physical, emotional, moral, or cognitive well-being of students. Those activities may include leadership development, character training, delinquency prevention, sports and recreation, arts, tutoring, or academic enrichment. By taking these pro-active measures to ensure the safety and well being of students, we will help reduce the risks of school violence for our future.

Now is the time to act to protect our children. We must ensure the safety of our children and our faculties in schools across the Nation. We cannot continue to merely react to school shootings. We must be pro-active and

take action to prevent school violence from occurring. With this legislation we encourage our Nation to bring forth solutions to prevent school violence and to work together to help ensure the safety of students, faculty and staff in our schools.

Two students lost their lives on March 5th in Santee, CA. Many before them have died. If we ignore this problem, many more may lose their lives. School violence will not diminish without concerned action on local and national levels.

I thank Mr. HUNTER for bringing to our attention this issue of immense importance and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I sadly join my colleagues in mourning the loss of two young lives in the tragic and senseless act of violence that occurred in San Diego County last week, and in expressing our deepest sympathy to their family and friends of the students who were killed. I also join my colleagues in condemning such acts of violence, and in urging all Americans to search for ways to reach out to our young people in an effort to prevent future tragedies of this nature.

All too often in recent years, we've been coming to the floor for resolutions of this nature. While the result remains shocking, unfortunately, the story is no longer new; a child gets his hands on a gun, and in fit of rage, uses it on his classmates and teachers.

We all want to find blame. We all want to know why. The questions are endless, but the answers are few.

What we know is that no one is immune from these tragedies. They have occurred in big cities, suburbs and small towns. What is obvious is that some of our children feel alienated and estranged from their peers and community, and choose to express their anger and frustration through increasingly violent acts of aggression. And what is perhaps most frightening in this case, is the fact that some students and perhaps adults may have been able to foresee this tragedy, but for a variety of reasons, chose not to believe it possible, not to act, or not to do more to stop it.

It is imperative that we, as Americans, do more to communicate with our young people, and know what is going on in their lives. We must, as communities, act to give all children a sense of belonging; in their families, their schools, and their neighborhoods. We must offer young people our friendship and earn their trust, so that they will come forward for help when feeling outcast, or when sensing a friend is slipping into despair or rage.

Today, we, as representatives of individuals and families across the Nation, mourn with individuals and families in Santee, California. But we cannot simply express our shock and horror today; we must, each of us, take action in our communities, to connect with our young people, and try with all our might, to prevent tragedy in our hometowns.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 57 introduced by Congressman HUNTER expressing sense that Congress condemns the heinous atrocities that occurred on March 5 at Santana High School in Santee, California. Congress offers its deepest condolences to the families and friends of those killed in the shooting.

Last July, I had the opportunity to meet with a group of high school students from Colorado to discuss gun safety legislation. In response to school shootings across the Nation, these

students formed an organization to call on Congress to approve reasonable, common-sense gun control measures. Without question, these students, some from Columbine High School, are the best authorities on the terrible effects of gun violence. Childhood is supposed to be a time of shelter and learning. Instead, our Nation and our youth are facing an epidemic of gun violence. I believe that there are more steps that we can take to help restore innocence, a sense of security, and safety to childhood.

Unfortunately, it has taken another shooting at one of our schools, in this case, the Santana High School in Santee, California, to remind us of our duty.

The plague of gun violence too often attacks the most innocent members of our society. Every day in our Nation, 13 young people are senselessly killed in homicides, suicides, and unintentional shootings. We lose the equivalent of a classroom of students every two days. According to a study by the Centers for Disease Control, the rate of firearm death of children in the United States is nearly twelve times higher than in 25 other industrialized countries combined. It is clear that we must have an increased commitment to responsibility, education, and safety.

As a Nation, as a community, we have the responsibility to protect our children from the horrors of gun violence. Limiting their access to firearms and ending the violence should be a common goal for the Nation.

I want to thank the leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor and I wish to extend my condolences to the families of the victims and commend the staff and faculty of Santana High School for their rapid response to the situation. It is my hope that we, in Congress, can prevent a tragedy of this nature from ever happening again.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. A little over a week ago, a troubled young man committed an act of unspeakable evil, which changed the lives of all San Diegans forever.

Today we consider a resolution to condemn the heinous atrocities that occurred on March 5, 2001, at Santana High School in Santee, California. I rise to support the resolution offered by my good friend and colleague from California.

Tragically, today nearly 1,900 students will return to Santana High School without many of their classmates, one teacher, and one security guard.

Among these students who will never return to Santana High School are Randy Gordon, a 17 year old who talked about going into the Navy after he graduated and Brian Zuckor, a 14 year old who thought someday he might become a stuntman. They went to school last week, figuring it would be just another day. Tragically, it was their last.

Other students injured in this terrible incident include: Heather Cruz, Trevor Edwards, Travis Gallegos-Tate, Barry Gibson, Matthew Heier, James Jackson, Karla Leyva, Scott Marshall, Melissa McNulty, Triston Salladay, and Raymond Serrato. Also among the wounded was Tim Estes, a student teacher, and Peter Ruiz Jr., a campus security guard.

This tragedy has caused us all to reevaluate and reflect on our own moral and social values and to reexamine the role that we play as parents, relatives, and family members in the lives of our country's children. This tragedy

has driven many of us to work to bring not only healing, but also a reformation of our way of life. Every America felt what happened to those students. The phrase, "it can't happen in my backyard" is now gone for the residents of Santee.

I ask that my colleagues in the United States Congress and my fellow citizens, pray for the students of Santana High School. Pray that carefree feelings that come with youth return to these students. Pray that we have the power and commitment to do our part to ensure that this horrible violation of innocence is never repeated again.

Mr. Speaker, we should all hope that this never happens again, we should all work to see that it doesn't.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 57, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM WILLING SELLER ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 834) to amend the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers for the majority of the trails in the System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 834

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 "National Trails System Willing Seller Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In spite of commendable efforts by State and local governments and private volunteer trail groups to develop, operate, and maintain the national scenic and national historic trails designated by Act of Congress in section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)), the rate of progress towards developing and completing the trails is slower than anticipated.

(2) Nine of the twelve national scenic and historic trails designated between 1978 and 1986 are subject to restrictions totally excluding Federal authority for land acquisition outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area.

(3) To complete these nine trails as intended by Congress, acquisition authority to secure necessary rights-of-way and historic sites and segments, limited to acquisition from willing sellers only, and specifically excluding the use of condemnation, should be extended to the Secretary of the Federal department administering these trails.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING MULTIJURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY OVER THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM.

It is the sense of the Congress that in order to address the problems involving multi-jurisdictional authority over the National Trails System, the Secretary of the Federal department with jurisdiction over a national scenic or historic trail should—

(1) cooperate with appropriate officials of each State and political subdivisions of each State in which the trail is located and private persons with an interest in the trail to pursue the development of the trail; and

(2) be granted sufficient authority to purchase lands and interests in lands from willing sellers that are critical to the completion of the trail.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LANDS FROM WILLING SELLERS FOR CERTAIN TRAILS OF THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM ACT.

(a) INTENT.—It is the intent of Congress that lands and interests in lands for the nine components of the National Trails System affected by the amendments made by subsection (b) shall only be acquired by the Federal Government from willing sellers.

(b) LIMITED ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—

(1) OREGON NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (3) of section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(2) MORMON PIONEER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(3) CONTINENTAL DIVIDE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (5) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(4) LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (6) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(5) IDITAROD NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (7) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(6) NORTH COUNTRY NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (8) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(7) ICE AGE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (10) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No lands or interests therein outside the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area may be acquired by the Federal Government for the trail except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(8) POTOMAC HERITAGE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (11) of such section is

amended in the fourth sentence by inserting before the period the following: "except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(9) NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—Paragraph (14) of such section is amended in the fourth sentence by inserting before the period the following: "except with the consent of the owner thereof."

(c) PROTECTION FOR WILLING SELLERS.—Section 7 of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1246) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(1) PROTECTION FOR WILLING SELLERS.—If the Federal Government fails to make payment in accordance with a contract for the sale of land or an interest in land for one of the national scenic or historic trails designated by section 5(a), the seller may utilize any of the remedies available to the seller under all applicable law, including electing to void the sale."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 10(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1249(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by striking "(2) Except" and inserting "Except".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

H.R. 834, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), amends the National Trails System Act to clarify Federal authority relating to land acquisition from willing sellers. The gentleman from Colorado is to be commended for correcting a longstanding problem with the National Trails System Act.

Mr. Speaker, under existing law, nine of the 20 National Scenic and Historic Trails have restrictions preventing the Federal Government from acquiring land for the trails outside of the exterior boundaries of any federally administered area. This has created problems even when there are willing sellers of desired property. This bill corrects the situation by allowing lands to be purchased by the Federal Government. However, H.R. 834 specifically provides that such purchase can only be made with the consent of the owner of the land or interest.

This bill greatly improves our trails system. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 834.

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

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

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as currently written, the National Trails System Act authorizes the Federal Government to acquire property for use as part of a national trail in some cases and not in others. In still other instances, Federal authority regarding land purchases under the Act is simply unclear. The development of a system of trails that is truly national in scope

has been slower than supporters of the program had hoped, and we fear that this inconsistency regarding Federal land acquisition may be a contributing factor.

H.R. 834 will amend the Act to specify that, as long as there is a willing seller, the Federal Government may acquire land under the Trails Act. We support such a change in the hope that clarity on this issue will allow the development of a national trails system to progress more quickly.

We urge our colleagues to support H.R. 834.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

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

I do rise in strong support of H.R. 834, the Willing Seller amendments act.

I would like to begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for his introduction of this legislation; and I also commend the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) the subcommittee chairman, and the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) the chairman, for their assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the House Trails Caucus this Member is keenly aware of the many benefits which the trails provide. Sections of the National Trails System cross nearly every congressional district throughout the country.

The willing seller legislation being considered today will help to correct a shortcoming in the National Trails System that has developed over a period of time. Currently, the managers of nine National Scenic and Historic Trails are prohibited from using Federal funds to acquire land from willing sellers. The other 13 National Scenic and Historic Trails do not have such restrictions placed upon them. This bill would correct the inequity by placing all of the Scenic and National Historic Trails in the system on an equal footing when it comes to the acquisition of land from willing sellers.

Quite simply, H.R. 834 will provide more alternatives for protecting irreplaceable national resources. The current prohibition often prevents the protection of historic sites and trails corridors. It also limits the options of landowners who may want to sell to the Federal Government; and, of course, that is the restriction. It is a willing seller arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support it in order to help ensure that future generations can enjoy all the benefits of our National Trails System.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to start by thanking the Resources Committee for the prompt attention to this important legislation that aims to correct a serious disparity in the National Trails System. Currently, the federal government is authorized to buy land from willing sellers along 11 of the 20 National Scenic and Historic Trails, but is excluded from doing so on the remaining 9, including the Continental Divide Trail. H.R. 834 intends to remove the current statutory prohibition on the federal government's ability to acquire lands or interest in lands from willing-sellers for these nine trails. Under this legislation, owners of private tracts that interrupt the continuity of these trails could sell their property to the government for inclusion in the National Trail System, clearing the way for the completion of a system of trails as Congress intended through the National Trails System Act. H.R. 834 is a private property rights bill that restores the right of the landowner to sell his or her land. The willing-seller language in my legislation reiterates the basics of contract law—in order to have a valid contract, there must be an exchange. In the case of H.R. 834, no contract is valid unless the landowner receives compensation for his or her land. I worked extensively in the last Congress with the gentleman from California, Representative POMBO, a long-time champion of private property rights, to ensure that the property rights aspects of the legislation were both comprehensive and concise. This much anticipated legislation is essential in protecting valuable resources and rights-of-way critical to the integrity and continuity of these trails. In enacting the National Trails System Act, congress provided for a national system of trails rather than just a national designation for trails. H.R. 834 enables the federal agencies administering these trails to respond to conservation, recreation and historic education opportunities afforded by willing landowners in an effort to create and manage a consistent national system of trails. I would like to extend special recognition to several individuals in Colorado, Bruce and Paula Ward, who have given deep devotion to the Continental Divide Trail. In addition, I'd like to recognize Gary Werner of the Partnership for the National Trails System. Without their efforts our progress on this legislation would not have been the success it is today. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'd like to again thank Chairman HANSEN and Chairman HEFLEY and the staff of the Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, and urge passage of H.R. 834.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise in its support. I also want to commend my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, for his initiative and persistence in connection with this legislation.

The bill makes a modest but very important improvement in the laws that govern the National Trails system. It would relax the current restrictions that now limit the ability of the federal government to acquire lands needed for proper management of some trails.

Under the bill, the federal government would be authorized to acquire appropriate lands from willing sellers. The bill would not authorize use of condemnation to acquire any lands.

Among the trails covered by the bill is the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, which runs from Canada to Mexico along the spine of the continent—the Continental Divide that separates the drainages of the Pacific Ocean and Gulf of California from that of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

That trail runs through the heart of Colorado, from our border with Wyoming to the New Mexico state line. Over the years, the Forest Service, assisted by thousands of volunteers organized by the Continental Trail Alliance, has worked to complete it and to make it available to all who would travel along it through some of America's most remarkable wild country.

This bill will greatly assist in that effort by allowing private landowners who wish to do so to provide easements or other interests in lands for the purposes of this and the other trails covered by the bill. I urge its adoption.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our National Trails System promotes wilderness appreciation, historic preservation and a healthy lifestyle, which are all key components of livable communities. H.R. 834, the National Trails System Willing Seller Act, is an important bill that restores parity to the National Trails System and provides authority to protect critical resources along the nation's treasured scenic and historic trails. Passage of this bill will ensure that the federal government can be a better partner with trails advocates and private property owners across the nation.

Acquiring land from willing sellers to complete nine national scenic and historic trails, including the Oregon and Lewis and Clark trails, is of vital interest to my constituents in Oregon. As the nation begins its focus on the bicentennial of Lewis & Clark's Corps of Discovery trip to the Pacific Ocean, purchasing and preserving historic sites along their journey will serve generations to come.

Without willing seller authority, federal trail managers' hands are tied when development threatens important links in the wild landscapes of the trails or in the sites that tell the stories of the historic trails. With willing seller authority, sections of trails can be moved from roads where trail users are potentially unsafe, and critical historic sites can be preserved for future generations to experience. Ensuring safety and access for the many families and individuals who enjoy our national trails is certainly an important effort and one that this Congress should support.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 834.

Mr. HANSEN. 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 834.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1500

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 880) to provide for the acquisition of property in Washington County, Utah, for implementation of a desert tortoise habitat conservation plan.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 880

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

SECTION 1. ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, all right, title, and interest in and to, and the right to immediate possession of, the 1,516 acres of real property owned by Environmental Land Technology, Ltd. (ELT), within the Red Cliffs Reserve in Washington County, Utah, and the 34 acres of real property owned by ELT which is adjacent to the land within the Reserve but is landlocked as a result of the creation of the Reserve, is hereby vested in the United States.

(b) COMPENSATION FOR PROPERTY.—Subject to section 309(f) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), the United States shall pay just compensation to the owner of any real property taken pursuant to this section, determined as of the date of the enactment of this Act. An initial payment of \$15,000,000 shall be made to the owner of such real property not later than 30 days after the date of taking. The full faith and credit of the United States is hereby pledged to the payment of any judgment entered against the United States with respect to the taking of such property. Payment shall be in the amount of—

(1) the appraised value of such real property as agreed to by the land owner and the United States, plus interest from the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the valuation of such real property awarded by judgment, plus interest from the date of the enactment of this Act, reasonable costs and expenses of holding such property from February 1990 to the date of final payment, including damages, if any, and reasonable costs and attorneys fees, as determined by the court. Payment shall be made from the permanent judgment appropriation established pursuant to section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or from another appropriate Federal Government fund.

Interest under this subsection shall be compounded in the same manner as provided for in section 1(b)(2)(B) of the Act entitled "An Act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Virginia, the most important properties relating to the battle of Manassas, and for other purposes", approved April 17, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 429b(b)(2)(B)), except that the reference in that provision to "the date of the enactment of the Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988" shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DETERMINATION BY COURT IN LIEU OF NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT.—In the absence of a negotiated settlement, or an action by the owner, the Secretary of the Interior shall initiate within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section a proceeding in the United States Federal District Court for the District of Utah, seeking a determination, subject to section 309(f) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333), of the value of the real property, reasonable costs and expenses of holding such property from February 1990 to the date of final payment, including damages, if any, and reasonable costs and attorneys fees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to the rule, the

gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 880 is a voluntary legislative taking of approximately 1,550 acres of land in Washington County, Utah. The land is located in the Red Cliffs Preserve, which is the designated habitat conservation area set aside in Utah to protect the endangered desert tortoise.

The Red Cliffs Reserve also happens to be located in Washington County, the fastest growing county in Utah. The owner of this property has been unable to sell, trade or develop this property for years because of the actions of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management's inability to exchange this owner out of the preserve. In fact, \$15 million was appropriated by the 105th Congress to buy this land, but the former administration unwisely chose to spend the money in other areas, rather than protecting habitat for this endangered species.

This disagreement goes back to 1983 when Environmental Land Technology, Ltd. acquired 2,440 acres of school trust lands located just north of St. George, Utah, intended for residential and recreational development. Environmental Land Technology began to develop the property by purchasing water rights while conducting the requisite series of appraisals, cost estimates, and surveys.

Unfortunately, shortly thereafter, the desert tortoise was designated as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Following years of negotiations, in 1996, a Habitat Conservation Plan and Implementation Agreement for the desert tortoise was reached between the BLM, Fish and Wildlife, Washington County, and the State of Utah. As part of that agreement, the Bureau of Land Management assumed the obligation to acquire from willing sellers approximately 12,600 acres of non-Federal land to create the Red Cliffs Reserve for the protection of the desert tortoise. The lands described in this legislation are part of that original obligation.

Since that time, the BLM has been able to acquire most of the property in the area, except for the property owned by ELT. After a series of extensive land exchanges, BLM now has insufficient land available for an interstate transfer with ELT. For the past 10 years, ELT has paid taxes and interest on its property without the ability to sell or develop that land or even set foot on it.

This legislation-taking would include the 1,516 acres located within the reserve, and 34 acres adjacent to the reserve, all of which is owned by ELT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 880 authorizes the United States to acquire the title of this property, which would then eliminate the last private inholding within the Red Cliff Reserve.

I want to emphasize to Members on both sides of the aisle that this is a voluntary taking and is fully supported by the owner and is supported by BLM.

Mr. Speaker, we held hearings on this legislation last year. At that time, several concerns were raised by the administration and by the minority regarding the issue of valuation. The discussion centered around what was the true value of the property and whether either the Federal Government or the property owner was being treated fairly.

That very issue is what has held up the completion of the HCP itself for years. What this legislation does is provides initial compensation well below the estimated value of the property to the property owner, preventing the property from reverting to creditors. After the initial settlement, absent any action by the property owner or the Secretary of the Interior, the valuation issue is then moved into Federal court where the remaining unsettled value of the property will then be determined. The court, not Congress, not BLM, not the property owner, will make this determination. While all of the parties involved would have liked to avoid going to court, unfortunately, this is the best way to resolve this issue.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 880 is identical to the legislation passed under suspension of the rules in the last Congress. We have incorporated the same amendments that were made to this legislation last year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill; and I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 880 and get this thing over with.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 880, introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), is a legislative-taking. The bill mandates that 30 days after enactment, all right, title, and interest to 1,550 acres of private land in Utah will vest in the United States. This legislation is identical to a measure, H.R. 4721, which passed the House on October 3, 2000, but which the Senate did not act upon prior to adjournment.

A legislative-taking is an extraordinary procedure used by the Congress only a few times in the past 25 years. Further, the language of this particular taking is substantially different from that used in other rare cases.

There has been an ongoing controversy associated with the land identified by the legislation. Title to the property had been clouded for years; and the land has been the subject of significant litigation, as outlined by the Chair. While everyone agrees that the land in question should be acquired, there are still differences re-

garding how it should be done. Negotiations to acquire the property have been hampered by the landowner's insistence on using appraisal assumptions that are inconsistent with Federal acquisition standards.

The previous administration testified in opposition to this measure last year, stating its concern that the bill provides preferential treatment to one landowner and provides compensation above and beyond that received by other landowners. We do not have the views of the new administration, but I can guess what they might be.

Mr. Speaker, while there is still some question on certain provisions of H.R. 880, we do not object to consideration of the measure by the House today. However, we hope that some of these matters can be addressed before the bill is finalized and presented to the President.

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

Mr. HANSEN. 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 880.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUAM WAR CLAIMS REVIEW COMMISSION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 308) to establish the Guam War Claims Review Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 308

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 "Guam War Claims Review Commission Act".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Guam War Claims Review Commission" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of five members who by virtue of their background and experience are particularly suited to contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the Commission. The members shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior not later than 60 days after funds are made available for this Act. Two of the members shall be selected as follows:

(1) One member appointed from a list of three names submitted by the Governor of Guam.

(2) One member appointed from a list of three names submitted by the Guam Delegate to the United States House of Representatives.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall select a Chairman from among its members. The term of office shall be for the life of the Commission.

(d) COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding section 3, members of the Commission shall not be paid for their service as members, but in the performance of their duties, shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) VACANCY.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. EMPLOYEES.

The Commission may appoint an executive director and other employees as it may require. The executive director and other employees of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. Section 3161 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the executive director and other employees of the Commission.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE.

The Secretary of the Interior shall provide the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 5. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) review the facts and circumstances surrounding the implementation and administration of the Guam Meritorious Claims Act and the effectiveness of such Act in addressing the war claims of American nationals residing in Guam between December 8, 1941, and July 21, 1944;

(2) review all relevant Federal and Guam territorial laws, records of oral testimony previously taken, and documents in Guam and the Archives of the Federal Government regarding Federal payments of war claims in Guam;

(3) receive oral testimony of persons who personally experienced the taking and occupation of Guam by Japanese military forces, noting especially the effects of infliction of death, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, and internment;

(4) determine whether there was parity of war claims paid to the residents of Guam under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act as compared with awards made to other similarly affected United States citizens or nationals in territory occupied by the Imperial Japanese military forces during World War II;

(5) advise on any additional compensation that may be necessary to compensate the people of Guam for death, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, and internment; and

(6) not later than 9 months after the Commission is established submit a report, including any comments or recommendations for action, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Committee on Resources and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) AUTHORITY OF CHAIRMAN.—Subject to general policies that the Commission may adopt, the Chairman of the Commission—

(1) shall exercise the executive and administrative powers of the Commission; and

(2) may delegate such powers to the staff of the Commission.

(b) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out its duties under section 5, the Commission may hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title

5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay for GS-15 of the General Schedule. The services of an expert or consultant may be procured without compensation if the expert or consultant agrees to such an arrangement, in writing, in advance.

(d) SUPPORT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may provide support to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under section 5.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submission of its report under section 5(6).

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

I rise in support of H.R. 308, the Guam War Restitution Act. This act will establish a temporary commission to review an important matter that has been unresolved since World War II.

Just 4 hours after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor located in the territory of Hawaii, Japan invaded the American territory of Guam. The invasion and occupation caused immense suffering to the U.S. citizens and nationals living in Guam because of their intense loyalty to the United States. We cannot forget the sacrifices these men, women, and children made to keep our Nation and people free.

Although there was an intention to provide restitution to U.S. nationals of Guam, like other U.S. citizens, for loss of lives and property due to the war, postwar restitution acts by Congress mistakenly excluded them. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 308 would begin to correct this oversight by creating a temporary Federal commission that would determine the right amount to compensate the people of Guam for their deaths, permanent injury, forced labor, forced marches, and internment during World War II. This commission will last no more than 10 months and cost no more than half a million dollars.

Last year, the House unanimously passed the Guam War Restitution Act, and I ask my colleagues to again vote in favor of this good piece of legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 2001, I reintroduced H.R. 308, the Guam War Claims Review Commission Act. This bill is virtually identical to H.R. 755, which passed the House on September

12, 2000. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to act on the bill before sine die adjournment of the 106th Congress.

Today marks a momentous occasion for the people of Guam. The early consideration and passage of H.R. 308 is a significant step toward the healing of the people who experienced the brutalities of enemy occupation during World War II, and for that I also would like to express my personal gratitude to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for their consideration and speedy action on this particular piece of legislation.

Legislation regarding Guam war restitution has been introduced by every Guam delegate to Congress beginning with Guam's first delegate, Antonio Won Pat, and including my predecessor, General Ben Blaz. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 308 is a careful compromise that incorporates many congressional and Department of Interior recommendations that have been made over the years during which this issue has been considered. The measure before us today creates a process by establishing a Federal commission to review relevant historical facts and circumstances surrounding the war claims of Guamanians who suffered as a result of the Japanese occupation of the island during World War II. This process will determine eligible claimants, eligibility requirements, and the total amount necessary for compensation for the people of Guam who experienced death, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, and internment.

Today, I come before this distinguished body of individuals who represent a great Nation and a great people to tell a little story about their fellow Americans from across the Pacific who endured the atrocities of war to keep the spirit of America alive. I will once again tell of the experiences of the people of Guam during World War II and the many efforts to bring closure to this horrible chapter in their lives. I will tell this story in hopes that inside knowledge and understanding will be gained and the process to restore equity will move forward, and that the people of Guam, the World War II generation of the people of Guam, will be finally made whole.

Pursuant to the Treaty of Paris in 1898, which ended the war between Spain and the United States, the United States acquired sovereignty over Guam and Guam has remained an American territory since that time. On December 8, 1941, Japanese armed forces invaded Guam and seized control of the island from the United States.

From this moment on, Guam's place in American history was tragically etched. Guam was the only U.S. territory or possession or State with civilians present which was occupied by enemy forces during World War II. The island, with its population of approximately 22,000 civilians, was subjected to death, personal injury, forced labor,

forced march, and internment by Japanese soldiers. Many were executed by firing squads or beheadings; and the entire island was an internment camp, and families whose lives were once consumed with farming and subsistence living were now forced to labor for the needs of their occupiers.

But the will of the people of Guam was much stronger than the infliction cast upon them by the Japanese military. They concealed the presence of U.S. servicemen who remained on the island by moving them from house to house; they composed American patriotic songs and made makeshift American flags from tattered rags as a reminder, as a boost to their spirits, that America would soon return. Some even organized small militia units, often only teenaged boys to bedevil Japanese soldiers, hoping to ease the path for the return of U.S. military forces.

On July 21, 1944, American forces liberated Guam. Emerging from the hills en masse were a loyal and grateful people for the return of their American countrymen from across the Pacific. In response to this, on June 9, 1945, in a letter from the Honorable Strive Hansel, Acting Secretary of the Navy, to then Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, Mr. Hansel transmitted proposed legislation to provide relief to the residents of Guam through the settlement of what was called "meritorious claims." On November 15, 1945, the Guam Meritorious Claims Act authorized the Secretary of the Navy to adjudicate and settle claims for a period of only 1 year for property damage only occurring on Guam during the Japanese occupation. Certification of claims in excess of \$5,000 or any claims of personal injury or death were to be forwarded to Congress.

On June 8, 1947, Navy Secretary Forrestal appointed a civilian commission labeled the Hopkins Commission to study and make recommendations on the Naval administration of Guam. One of their strongest recommendations was that the war claims of the people of Guam should be addressed, and especially claims on personal injury and death, and that immediate steps should be taken to hasten this process. The report also stated that while many claimants were advised that the local Navy Claims Commission had the power to settle and make immediate payment of claims not in excess of \$5,000, that claims above that amount must go to Washington, which, of course, resulted in absolutely no action.

The report recommended that the Guam Meritorious Claims Act be amended to authorize naval officials to provide immediate, on-the-spot settlements.

□ 1515

In response to this particular circumstance, and in fact to the circumstance involving all American nationals and citizens who experienced occupation, the 1948 War Claims Act

was enacted by Congress to address all of American victims of World War II. The War Claims Act of 1948 authorized the creation of a commission to make inquiries and settle the claims of American citizens and nationals and military personnel imprisoned during World War II.

Despite recommendations from the Hopkins Commission, the War Claims Act of 1948 excluded Guam. This led to the anomaly that many people from Guam who happened to be in the Philippines at the time were eligible for war claims, whereas their families who remained on Guam under enemy occupation were ineligible.

In 1950, Congress passed the Organic Act of Guam which made the people U.S. citizens. In 1951, the United States signed a peace treaty with Japan, which meant that no further claims by the people of Guam could be addressed directly to the Japanese. The people of Guam were left in this anomalous position of being unable to settle their claims directly with Japan.

In 1962, the War Claims Act of 1948 was further amended, and again Guam was not included. As a consequence, and despite the study and recommendations of the Hopkins Commission, which concluded that reparations for Guam that were provided by the Guam Meritorious Claims Act fell short of rehabilitating the island and redressing damages suffered by its people from the occupation of Guam, Congress still failed to address the recommendations. Today we are left with this situation.

For more than 2 decades, the issue has been aggressively pursued by the leaders of Guam. On December 30, 1980, the Government of Guam created a Guam Reparations Commission which compiled war damage claims for death, forced labor, forced march, internment, or injury for survivors or descendants who did not receive any reparations under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act. On the Federal level, as I have indicated, each of my predecessors introduced legislation to address this issue.

These combined efforts have brought us to this point today, and I am hopeful once the work of the commission is completed, we can finally heal this very painful memory in Guam's history.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 308 is simple. It establishes a Federal process to review the relevant historical facts, determine the eligible claimants, the eligibility requirements and the total amount necessary for compensation arising from the Japanese occupation of Guam.

Last year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the cost of this would be minimal and would not affect direct spending or receipts. Moreover, considering that the island of Guam had a very small population during the nearly 3 years of occupation during the war and given the available Federal and territorial records on this matter, I anticipate that any Federal commission which is established under this bill would be able to complete its work ex-

peditionally and provide Congress with the necessary recommendations to resolve this long-standing issue in a timely and fair fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), chairman of the Committee on Resources, for his assistance in bringing this matter to the floor, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), our ranking Democrat member. It has been with their help that we have been able to address past concerns on this issue and move a step closer to justice in an expeditious fashion in the 107th Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend our good chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), for his support, and our ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for his endorsement of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as has been so eloquently stated by the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), the commission to review reparations for the people of Guam, who were subjected to death, forced labor, forced marches and internment during World War II is long overdue.

Guam was the only land under the jurisdiction of the United States to be occupied by Japanese forces during World War II. The people of Guam could have, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, greeted Japanese military forces with open arms and perhaps spared themselves some of the misery they suffered during 3 years of brutal occupation by Japanese forces, but they did not. These native Guamanians were proud Americans since the annexation of Guam by America in 1898 after the Spanish-American War.

In response to their loyalty, 56 years after the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to adjudicate these claims, we are still debating whether we should establish a commission to study whether the people of Guam who suffered during this occupation should receive reparations.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 56 years. Even the Department of the Navy supported reparations decades ago. Direct action on the part of this Congress is long, long overdue. This legislation has been introduced in every Congress since Guam has had a delegate in the U.S. House of Representatives to address the war, the subject of the World War II atrocities committed by Japanese soldiers against these loyal Americans. This is my seventh term now in this Chamber. I can personally attest that the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) has been trying to get this issue addressed since he has been here, and our former colleague, Mr. Ben Blaz, did the same before him, and be-

fore Mr. Blaz, Mr. Tony Won Pat in the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I also feel compelled to speak out that we should be doing more. A similar bill passed the House late last year, and I appreciate the leadership agreeing to take up this bill early in this Congress so the Senate will have more time to act on it.

Mr. Speaker, the territory of Guam stands today as one of our most important strategic centers throughout the Asian Pacific region. Our Nation has established well over a \$10 billion military presence in Guam, a first-class Air Force base that has proved so crucial in bombing operations during the Vietnam War, and a naval installation that is critical to provide resources and support for our armed forces throughout the Asian-Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce these points to my colleagues in the House as to why this legislation is so important and why it needs the support of this body. One, some 22,000 native Guamanians were the only Americans living in the land area under the sovereignty of the United States that was occupied for some 3 years by Japanese military forces during World War II. Two, I am not going to ask why it was the policy of our government to evacuate only U.S. citizens living in Guam, but leave the native Guamanians, who were all U.S. nationals, subject to the control and sovereignty of our own government, they were left to fend for themselves for these 3 years while the Japanese occupied the island of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, for 3 years, these United States nationals were subject to some of the worst atrocities committed by Japanese military forces during their occupation of Guam from 1941 to 1944.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a pleasant story to share with my colleagues today, but we need to put ourselves in the shoes of some of the descendants of these families who suffered so much. It is not a pleasant story to hear when the head of one's father has been decapitated by a Japanese soldier, or if one's mother or sister or wife was being raped by these Japanese forces.

I only say just a fraction, from talking to some of the descendants who are still living today, of the atrocities; and just the forced marches. The way that these people were treated, I say it even borders on genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with my colleagues today, let this bill pass. We owe it to these proud Americans.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask for favorable consideration of this bill. I thank all involved.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 308, the Guam Claims Review Commission Act. This legislation takes essential steps toward identifying all

relevant facts and circumstances of the implementation and effectiveness of the Guam Meritorious Claims Act. Everyone needs to be fairly compensated.

From December 8, 1941, until July 21, 1944 Japanese armed forces occupied the U.S. territory of Guam. During that period, residents of Guam were subjected to injury, forced labor, internment, and, in some cases, death. In 1945, Congress passed the Guam Meritorious Claims Act (PL 79-224), which, for a period of one year, authorized the Navy to settle claims for property damage on Guam resulting from the Japanese occupation. Claims for property damage exceeding \$5,000 and claim for personal injury or death, however, had to be forwarded to Congress. A report issued in 1947 by a civilian commission appointed by the secretary found, among other things, that some claimants offered to reduce their claim below \$5,000 to expedite their claims.

H.R. 308 would establish Guam War Claims Review Commission, composed of five uncompensated members appointed by the Interior secretary with input from Guam's governor and House delegate. The commission would have nine months to submit a report containing comments and recommendations to Congress and the executive branch.

As part of that process, the commission would review all relevant Federal and Guam territorial law, Guam and U.S. archives regarding Federal payments for war claims in Guam; receive testimony of individuals who personally experienced the occupations; determine whether there was parity of war claims paid to the residents of Guam as compared with awards made similarly affected U.S. citizens or nations in other occupied territories; and advise whether additional compensation may be necessary to compensate the people of Guam for death, personal injury, forced labor, and internment.

The commission should have been created before long ago. We can, however, take appropriate action today to ensure that claimants are justly compensated by the United States of America. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 308.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 308, 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CLEAR CREEK COUNTY, COLORADO, TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 223) to amend the Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993 to provide additional time for Clear Creek County to dispose of certain lands transferred to the county under the Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(c)(2) of the Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-253; 108 Stat. 677) is amended by striking "the date 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act" and by inserting "May 19, 2015".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 223, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), amends section 5 of the Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993.

The act clarified Federal land ownership questions in Clear Creek County, Colorado, and provided Clear Creek County time to dispose of transferred property. This amendment extends the time needed for Clear Creek County to sell certain lands that it received from the Federal government under the 1993 act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 223 is a non-controversial and bipartisan bill that is nearly identical to a bill that was passed by the House during the 106th session of Congress. The only difference is that this bill would extend the time for the county to sell the lands in question for 1 year longer than the time period contained in the bill that passed the House last year.

This additional 1-year time period is necessary to allow for the additional time that has elapsed while the Congress has had this matter under consideration before the bill was enacted into law.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as its author, I obviously support passage of this bill. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, and our ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for making it possible for the House to consider it today.

I introduced the bill last year at the request of the commissioners of Clear Creek County. It was passed by the House last fall, but time ran out before the Senate could complete action on it prior to the end of the 106th Congress.

The bill amends section 5 of the Clear Creek County, Colorado, Public Lands Transfer Act of 1993. The effect of the amendment would be to allow Clear

Creek County additional time to determine the future disposition of some former Federal land that was transferred to the county under that section of the 1993 act.

The 1993 act was originally proposed by my predecessor, Congressman David Skaggs. Its purpose was to clarify Federal land ownership questions in Clear Creek County while helping to consolidate the Bureau of Land Management administration in eastern Colorado, and assisting with protecting open space and preserving historic sites.

As part of its plan to merge its eastern Colorado operations into one administrative office, the BLM has determined that it would be best to dispose of most of its surface lands in north-eastern Colorado.

The 1993 act helped achieve that goal by transferring some 14,000 acres of land from the Bureau of Land Management to the U.S. Forest Service, to the State of Colorado, to Clear Creek County, and to the towns of Georgetown and Silver Plume. Of course, the BLM would have sold all these lands, and the local governments could have applied for parcels under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

Under current law, however, BLM would have first had to have completed detailed boundary surveys. Since the land in question included many odd-shaped parcels, including some measured literally in inches, the BLM estimated these surveys could have taken another 15 years to complete and could have cost as much as \$18 million.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, but the estimated value of these lands was only \$3 million. Because these administrative costs were expected to be so much higher than the value of these lands, their disposal under existing law could never have been completed, and this would have been the worst of all outcomes. Because, after reaching the conclusion that these lands should be transferred, BLM would in effect stop managing them, to the extent that they could be managed at all.

In short, until some means could be found to enable their transfer, these 14,000 acres were effectively abandoned property, potentially attracting all the problems that befall property left uncared for and ignored.

The 1993 Act responded to that situation. Under it, about 3,500 acres of BLM land in Clear Creek County were transferred to the Arapaho National Forest. Another 3,200 acres of land were transferred to the State of Colorado, the county, and the towns of Georgetown and Silver Plume. Finally, about 7,300 acres were transferred to the county.

The bill before us deals today only with those 7,300 acres that were transferred to the county. The 1993 Act provides that after it prepares a comprehensive land use plan, the county may resell some of the land. Other parcels will be transferred to local governments, including the county, to be retained for recreation and public purposes.

With regard to the lands that the county has authority to sell, the 1993 Act in effect authorizes the county to act as the BLM's sales agent, and it provides that the Federal Government will receive any of the net receipts from the sale of these lands by the county.

Under the 1993 Act, the county has until May 19, 2004, to resolve questions related to rights-of-way, mining claims and trespass situations on the lands covered by the Act.

While the county has completed the conveyance of some of these lands, there are still about 6,000 acres to dispose of, and they are working to complete the job. For example, the county is seeking to have some 2,000 acres transferred to the Colorado Division of Wildlife for the management of Bighorn Sheep habitat. However, the commissioners have found the process is taking longer than they anticipated and that an extension of time would be helpful to a successful conclusion.

The bill we are considering today responds to their request by providing that extension; and it set May 19, 2015, as the new deadline for the county to either transfer or retain these lands.

The county commissioners have indicated to me that they are confident that there will be sufficient time for them to resolve the matter under this new piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, there is no controversy associated with the legislation; and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 223.

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. HANSEN. 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. HANSEN. 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. 880, H.R. 834, H.R. 308, as amended, and H.R. 223.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-50)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 2001.

CONTINUATION OF IRAN EMERGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-51)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to Iran is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2001, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on March 14, 2000.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including its support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine Middle East peace, and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and threaten vital interests of the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that I

must continue the declaration of national emergency with respect to Iran necessary to maintain comprehensive sanctions against Iran to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 2001.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY) at 6 p.m.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COORDINATING COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 206 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5616) the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

Mr. Michael J. Maloney of Chicago, Illinois, to a 1-year term.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM PAYROLL COUNSELOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jack Katz, Payroll Counselor, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2001.

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 records issued by the Calvert County Department of Social Services.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena is material and relevant and that compliance is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JACK KATZ,
Payroll Counselor.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to paragraph 8 of Section 801(b) of Public Law 100-696, I hereby appoint the following Member to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission:

Mr. Moran, VA
Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 834, by the yeas and nays; and
- H.R. 223, by the yeas and nays.

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

NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM WILLING SELLER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 834.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Hansen) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 834, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 3, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]
YEAS—409

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

Combest	Horn	Nethercutt
Condit	Hostettler	Ney
Conyers	Houghton	Northup
Cooksey	Hoyer	Norwood
Costello	Hulshof	Nussle
Coyne	Hunter	Oberstar
Cramer	Hutchinson	Obey
Crane	Hyde	Olver
Crenshaw	Inslee	Ortiz
Crowley	Isakson	Osborne
Cubin	Israel	Ose
Culberson	Issa	Otter
Cummings	Istook	Owens
Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Davis (FL)	(TX)	Pascrell
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Pastor
Davis, Tom	Jenkins	Payne
Deal	John	Pence
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Petri
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Phelps
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Pickering
DeMint	Jones (OH)	Pitts
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Platts
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pombo
Dicks	Kelly	Portman
Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Price (NC)
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pryce (OH)
Dooley	Kerns	Putnam
Doolittle	Kildee	Quinn
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Radanovich
Dreier	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Duncan	King (NY)	Ramstad
Dunn	Kingston	Rangel
Edwards	Klecza	Regula
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Ehrlich	Kolbe	Reyes
Emerson	Kucinich	Reynolds
Engel	LaFalce	Riley
English	LaHood	Rivers
Eshoo	Lampson	Rodriguez
Etheridge	Langevin	Roemer
Evans	Lantos	Rogers (KY)
Everett	Largent	Rogers (MI)
Farr	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher
Fattah	Larson (CT)	Ross
Ferguson	Latham	Rothman
Filner	LaTourette	Roukema
Fletcher	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Foley	Lee	Royce
Ford	Levin	Rush
Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Frank	Lewis (GA)	Ryun (KS)
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)	Sabo
Frost	Linder	Sanchez
Gallegly	Lipinski	Sanders
Ganske	LoBiondo	Sandlin
Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
Gibbons	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Gilchrest	Luther	Scarborough
Gillmor	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
Gilman	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Gonzalez	Manzullo	Schiff
Goode	Markey	Schrock
Goodlatte	Mascara	Scott
Gordon	Matsui	Sensenbrenner
Goss	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano
Graham	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Granger	McCollum	Shadegg
Green (TX)	McCrery	Shaw
Green (WI)	McDermott	Shays
Greenwood	McGovern	Sherman
Grucci	McHugh	Sherwood
Gutierrez	McInnis	Shimkus
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shows
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Simmons
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Simpson
Hansen	McNulty	Sisisky
Harman	Meehan	Skeen
Hart	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Slaughter
Hayes	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hayworth	Millender-	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Herger	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hill	Miller, Gary	Snyder
Hilleary	Miller, George	Solis
Hilliard	Mink	Souder
Hincheley	Mollohan	Spence
Hinojosa	Moore	Spratt
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Stark
Hoeffel	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Hoekstra	Morella	Stenholm
Holden	Murtha	Strickland
Holt	Myrick	Stump
Honda	Nadler	Stupak
Hooley	Napolitano	Sununu

Sweeney	Tierney	Watts (OK)
Tancred	Toomey	Waxman
Tanner	Trafficant	Weiner
Tauscher	Turner	Weldon (FL)
Tauzin	Udall (CO)	Weldon (PA)
Taylor (MS)	Udall (NM)	Weller
Taylor (NC)	Upton	Wexler
Terry	Velazquez	Whitfield
Thomas	Visclosky	Wicker
Thompson (CA)	Vitter	Wilson
Thompson (MS)	Walden	Wolf
Thornberry	Walsh	Woolsey
Thune	Wamp	Wu
Thurman	Waters	Wynn
Tiahrt	Watkins	Young (AK)
Tiberi	Watt (NC)	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Davis, Jo Ann	Flake	Paul
---------------	-------	------

NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Moakley
Barr	Keller	Neal
Becerra	Kirk	Pelosi
Cannon	Lofgren	Pomeroy
Cox	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Gephardt	Matheson	Towns
Graves	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1827

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 46 I stuck my voting card in the machine and pressed "aye." The machine apparently malfunctioned. It should have reflected my "yea" vote.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL TIME FOR CLEAR CREEK COUNTY, COLORADO, TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN LANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 223.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 223, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]
YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Bachus	Barr
Aderholt	Baird	Barrett
Akin	Baker	Bartlett
Allen	Baldacci	Barton
Andrews	Baldwin	Bass
Armey	Ballenger	Bentsen
Baca	Barcia	Bereuter

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

(Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE BEGINNING OF THE END OF FIAT MONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the golden new era of the 1990s has been welcomed and praised by many observers, but I am afraid a different type of new era is arriving, a dangerous one, heralding the end of 30 years of fiat money. If so, it is a serious matter that deserves close attention by Congress.

There is nothing to fear from globalism, free trade and a single worldwide currency, but a globalism where free trade is competitively subsidized by each nation, a continuous trade war is dictated by the WTO, and the single currency is pure fiat, fear is justified. That type of globalism is destined to collapse into economic despair, inflationism and protectionism and managed by resurgent militant nationalism.

Efforts to achieve globalist goals are quickly abandoned when the standard of living drops, unemployment rises, stock markets crash and artificially high wages are challenged by markets forces.

When tight budgets threaten spending cuts, cries for expanding the welfare state drown out any expression of concern for rising deficits.

The effort in recent decades to unify government surveillance over all world trade and international financial transaction through the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, the ICC, the OECD and the Bank of International Settlements can never substitute for a peaceful world based on true free trade, freedom of movement, a single but sound market currency and voluntary contracts with property private rights.

Mr. Speaker, great emphasis in the last 6 years has been placed on so-called productivity increases that gave us the new-era economy. Its defenders proclaimed that a new paradigm had arrived. Though productivity increases have surely helped our economy, many astute observers have challenged the extent to which improvements in productivity have actually given us a distinctly new era. A case can be made that the great surge in new technology of the 1920s far surpassed the current age of fast computers, and we all know what happened in spite of it, after 1929.

A truly new era may well be upon us, but one quite different than what is generally accepted today. The biggest era in interrupting today's events is the totally ignoring of how monetary policy in a fiat system affects the entire economy.

Politicians and economists are very familiar with business cycles with

NOT VOTING—19

Hastings (FL)	Moakley
Keller	Neal
Lewis (CA)	Pomeroy
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Lowey	Towns
Matheson	
Meeks (NY)	

□ 1836

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 47 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MAKING IN ORDER CERTAIN MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2001

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 14, 2001, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures:

H.R. 725, H.R. 809, H.R. 860, H.R. 861, S.320, H.R. 802, H.R. 741, H.R. 821 and H.R. 364.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia

most assuming that slumps erupt as a natural consequence of capitalism, an act of God, or as a result of Fed-driven high interest rates. That is to say the Fed did not engage in enough monetary debasement becomes the most common complaint by Wall Street pundits and politicians.

But today's economy is unlike anything the world has ever known. The world economy is more integrated than ever before. Indeed, the effort by international agencies to expand world trade has had results, some good. Labor costs have been held in check, industrial producers have moved to less regulated low costs, low tax countries while world mobility has aided these trends with all being helped with advances in computer technology.

But the artificial nature of today's world trade and finance being systematically managed by the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO and driven by a worldwide fiat monetary system has produced imbalances that have already prompted many sudden adjustments.

There have been eight major crises in the last 6 years requiring a worldwide effort, led by the Fed, to keep the system afloat, all being done with more monetary inflation and bailouts.

The linchpin to the outstanding growth of the 1990s has been the U.S. dollar. Although it, too, is totally fiat, its special status has permitted a bigger bonus to the United States while it has been used to prop up other world economies.

The gift bequeathed to us by owning the world reserve currency allows us to create dollars at will.

□ 1845

Alan Greenspan has not hesitated to accommodate everyone, despite his reputation as an inflation fighter. This has dramatically raised our standard of living and significantly contributed to the new-era psychology that has been welcomed by so many naive enough to believe that perpetual prosperity had arrived and the bills would never have to be paid.

One day it will become known that technological advances and improvements in productivity also have a downside. This technology hid the ill effects of the monetary mischief the Fed had enthusiastically engaged in the past decades. Technological improvements while keeping the CPI and the PPI prices in check, led many, including Greenspan, to victoriously declare that no inflation existed and that a new era had, indeed, arrived. Finally it is declared that the day has arrived that printing money is equivalent to producing wealth, and without a downside. Counterfeit works.

But the excess credit created by the Fed found its way into the stock market, especially the NASDAQ, and was ignored. This set the stage for the stock market collapse now ongoing. Likewise ignored has been the excess capacity, mal-investment and debt that permeates the world economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BLACK BERETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I was honored to have two former Army Rangers visit my Washington office. Sergeant David Nielsen was just finishing a grueling 750-mile march from Fort Benning, Georgia, to Washington, D.C. For much of the march, he was accompanied by Sergeant Bill Round, a fellow Ranger, a Vietnam veteran and a constituent of mine.

The purpose behind this march was simple. They wanted to protest a recent directive issued by the Army Chief of Staff that makes the black beret, the long-standing symbol of the Rangers, standard issue for all Army soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, our Rangers are unique. They volunteer to undergo intense training and endure great sacrifices in the name of freedom. At the end of their training, they are presented with the black beret. The beret has a long history beginning with Rogers Rangers who fought during the French and Indian War.

In 1951, Ranger units at Fort Benning, Georgia, began wearing the black beret; and in 1975, the Department of Army officially authorized Rangers, and only Rangers, to wear the black beret.

No matter where we have called our Rangers to serve, Korea, Vietnam, the Gulf War, Somalia, they have done so with honor and distinction.

As we sat in my office, Sergeant Nielsen told me about another Ranger, a silent marcher who also accompanied him on this journey. His name was PFC James Markwell. PFC Markwell and Sergeant Nielsen had just recently completed their Ranger training when our country called upon them to participate in the invasions of Panama. They both answered the call knowing that the mission could cost them their lives, which was, indeed, the case for PFC Markwell.

After Markwell was killed in action, it was Sergeant Nielsen who was assigned to recover his body and accompany his fallen comrade home on his final journey.

As Sergeant Nielsen marched to Washington, he carried in his cargo pocket the very essence of every Ranger, the black beret of his fallen brother.

The black beret is more than a symbol of an elite fighting unit. It is an outward symbol of those who have gone before, those Rangers who fell in

combat, and those who have returned to their families.

It is also about the commitment of today's Rangers who sacrifice much, who leave the comforts of their families, and place themselves in harm's way when duty calls.

On June 14 of the year 2001, by directive of the United States Army Chief of Staff, all U.S. Army soldiers will be issued a black beret as standard issue.

The Special Forces will still wear their green berets. Our Airborne troops will still wear their maroon berets. But after a quarter century of being the only soldiers authorized to wear the black beret, the Rangers will be without the beret that has stood as their symbol of pride and tradition.

As if all of this were not enough, it has recently come to light that the Pentagon has bypassed the "Buy American" law and purchased the bulk of the 3 million berets from Communist China. In my opinion, this only adds insult to injury. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Pentagon wants our soldiers to wear headgear produced in a communist country and at a cost of \$35 million.

I do not think a potential adversary should be producing a beret that has come to symbolize honor and valor. This is one more example of political correctness gone wrong.

Social engineering within the armed forces of the United States is a policy Bill Clinton started. It has been divisive and distracting to the morale of our forces; and it needs to end, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to, again, thank Sergeant Nielsen and Sergeant Round for their efforts to bring attention to this most important issue. They are two men who served our Nation honorably and who do not want to see the black beret sacrificed in the name of political correctness.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying God bless the men and women in uniform and God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SCANT ATTENTION PAID TO THE GREAT BRAVERY OF THOSE WHO SERVE IN UNIFORM

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, one of the great privileges and pleasures we have as Members of Congress is to appoint our fine young people to our service academies, be it Air Force, West Point,

Annapolis, Merchant Marine, or Coast Guard. It always impresses me when I hear from some of them who have either told me about their experiences or, in fact, have written on issues that may concern them relative to our country.

I had a great opportunity last week to receive over my fax, obviously, a letter from a proud father, George Liedel, who is a doctor in Sebring, Florida, at Highlands Regional Medical Center. He sent this from Jennifer, Jennifer Liedel, his daughter who is at West Point. I nominated her in 1997. She sent this Friday, February 23, from her computer to her mom and dad. The subject: "I think this puts things in perspective as to where our priorities really are as a nation."

On 18 February 2001, while racing for fame and fortune, Dale Earnhardt died in the last lap of the Daytona 500. It was surely a tragedy for his family, friends and fans. He was 49 years old with grown children, one who was in the race with him. I am new to the NASCAR culture, so much of what I know has come from the newspaper and TV. He was a winner and earned everything he had. This included more than "\$41 million in winnings and 10 times that from endorsements and souvenir sales." He had a beautiful home and a private jet. He drove the most sophisticated cars allowed, and every part was inspected and replaced as soon as there was any evidence of wear. This is normally fully funded by the car and team sponsors. Today, there is no TV station that does not constantly remind us of his tragic end, and the radio already has a song of tribute to this winning driver. Nothing should be taken away from this man. He was a professional and the best in his profession. He was in a very dangerous business, but the rewards were great.

Two weeks ago, seven U.S. Army soldiers died in a training accident when two UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters collided during night maneuvers in Hawaii. The soldiers were all in their twenties, pilots, crew chiefs and infantrymen. Most of them lived in substandard housing. If you add their actual duty hours, in the field, deployed, they probably earn something close to minimum wage. The aircraft they were in was between 15 and 20 years old. Many times parts were not available to keep them in good shape due to funding. They were involved in the extremely dangerous business of flying in the Kuhuku Mountains at night. It only gets worse when the weather moves in as it did that night. Most times no one is there with the yellow or red flag to slow thing down when it gets critical. Their children are mostly toddlers who will lose all memory of who 'Daddy' was as they grow up. They died training to defend our freedom.

I take nothing away from Dale Earnhardt but ask you to perform this simple test. Ask any of your friends if they know who was the NASCAR driver killed 18 February 2001. Then ask them if they can name one of the seven soldiers who died in Hawaii 2 weeks ago.

18 February 2001, Dale Earnhardt died driving for fame and glory at the Daytona 500. The Nation mourns. Seven soldiers died training to protect our freedom. No one can remember their names, and most do not even remember the incident.

For the record, the six identified casualties were Major Robert L. Olson of Minnesota; Chief Warrant Officer George P. Perry and Chief Warrant Officer Gregory I. Montgomery, both of California; Sergeant Thomas E. Barber of Champlin, Minnesota; Specialist Bob D. MacDonald of Alta Loma, California; and Specialist Rafael Olvera-Rodriguez of El Paso, Texas.

She hits pretty much the nail on the head, as they say. We are completely smitten by personalities and successful stars, rock stars, TV actors, and others; and we give scant appreciation to those who serve in the military.

Those men who just were mentioned, who died training for this country, deserve more than my speech on the floor or her memo. I hope it brings us to call to mind that the great bravery exhibited by our men and women in uniform, those on the police departments, our schoolteachers, our firefighters, you name the profession who works for the public, deserve more than thinking their life's work does not deserve headlines or certainly does not deserve the appreciation of our country.

I salute Jennifer for bringing this memo to my attention. I salute her for her service to West Point, and I praise our country for those young people who choose to serve our country in uniform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INDIA EARTHQUAKE RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to speak about the continued relief efforts in India after the massive 7.9 earthquake that rocked the nation in January. After the earthquake, I came to the floor to request USAID to double the amount of assistance it was sending to India, from \$5 million to \$10 million.

Today, more than \$13 million has been sent. This is a good start; but clearly, the \$13 million is not enough to address the continued struggles India, particularly Gujarat, is facing at this time.

The havoc on the ground in terms of human suffering must be understood. Our friends in India will be facing monsoons very soon. We must move fast to ensure all support possible to prevent epidemic and further tragedies in the earthquake's aftermath.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address five strong areas where I think we could continue to help. Several of these ideas were discussed at a subcommittee hearing of the Committee on International Relations by several of my colleagues who visited the region after the earthquake.

First, I ask the World Bank and the Asian Development Fund to move quickly to approve India's petition for soft-window or low-interest loans funding. The ADF recently finished its appraisal of the Gujarat disaster and increased its earlier estimate of aid loans from \$350 million to \$500 million. This increase in the appraisal by the ADF clearly demonstrates the terrible need on the ground.

The President of the Asian Development Bank has pledged his support, and I laud him for that; but currently this proposal is held up before their board. The board is meeting late March to decide the \$500 million funding for ADF's Gujarat Earthquake Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Project.

Now normally the Asian Development Fund does not offer concessional loans to India due to India's size, but clearly Gujarat is in the midst of a great human and fiscal disaster and definitely merits these loans. We as a donor country can and must ask the ADF to make this exception.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Office of Management and Budget to improve 416(b) disaster mitigation funding. This proposal sent by nongovernmental organizations in India to the U.S. Department of Agriculture allocates estimated relief at 60,000 metric tons of vegetable oil and other commodities, valued at over \$32 million for this year. This proposal, originally designed for aid to the entire country, is now being focused on Gujarat in light of the earthquake.

We must understand that this region suffered a horrible drought in the last 2 years, so this is an emergency within an emergency. The proposal has gone through technical reviews, has received positive endorsements from USAID, State Department, and the Department of Agriculture, but is still stalled at OMB. I encourage OMB to release this funding for India immediately.

Third, Mr. Speaker, we must focus on detailed talks between the Indian National Government and FEMA to help create a FEMA-type model for India. Currently, there is an active debate in India about creating an agency like FEMA, and the Indian Government has shown great interest in collaborating with the U.S. Government. The FEMA talks are currently in the how-to stage. We must move quickly so we can implement the plans expeditiously as possible.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, we must also work with local governments in India to help create a local response system similar to ones we have in the United States, in Fairfax, Virginia, and Miami, Florida. This would certainly improve rescue operations and help minimize loss of life in the crucial hours after disaster has struck.

In addition, we should have technical experts from the earthquake-prone

areas such as California work together with the Indian officials to create appropriate public-warning procedures, routine earthquake drills, civilian protection mechanisms, and earthquake-safe foundation structures. We must share the lessons we learned from the devastating Northridge earthquake in California in 1992 to help Gujarat rebuild itself, as well as prepare for such future disasters.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we must focus on creation of a better U.S. rescue response system around the world. The current system, while successful in rebuilding procedures, needs revamping of its international rescue response procedures in the immediate hours after an emergency. Switzerland, the UK, and Israel were on the ground in India within 48 hours to start rescue operations while it took the U.S. Government more than 72 hours to get our first official relief efforts there.

USAID is considering repositioning resources by setting up ground offices in disaster-prone regions of the world to expedite aid disbursement during calamities. I support setting up such an office in India.

□ 1900

An important thing for us to understand is how vital a strong India is for U.S. interests. With India increasingly showing signs of political strength and stability, and stronger restraint in the resolution of the Kashmir dispute, we must demonstrate that we stand by our friend in their hour of need. Indians are not looking for handouts. They are very strong, resilient people who can and will rebuild Gujarat back. However, we must not leave them alone in coping with this devastating earthquake.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask my fellow colleagues to stand strong with me in pushing these recommendations immediately for long-lasting support to India.

MASSIVE IMMIGRATION INTO
UNITED STATES MUST BE
STOPPED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) was up here a moment ago, and while I was waiting to speak to the House tonight, I listened to his concerns with regard to the black beret issue, and I want to add my voice to his in expressing that concern; and to add one other point that I do not believe he made, and I just recalled it as I was sitting here.

To add insult to injury, the berets are being purchased, being made in China, being purchased from the communist regime in China, and being imposed as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) said, for political

correctness. I want to add my voice to his in expressing deep concern about this particular proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to bring to the attention of the House a tragic accident that occurred in Colorado just yesterday. It took the lives of 6 Mexican nationals and injured 13 others.

All of these people were in a van. The van was hit by a truck on the highway which hit a patch of ice. The van was transporting these people, Mexican nationals, to jobs in the United States and they were crossing Colorado. This has become an all too common event. We have had 8 or more people killed in Colorado, I know the numbers are expanded by events in other States. Always the same thing. People being transported, people being exploited by others, having money taken from them for the purpose of bringing them to jobs in the United States, transporting them illegally into this country. They are abused many times. They are certainly exploited, and oftentimes they are exploited when they get here, working under conditions that we would not tolerate in any other situation, oftentimes at lower pay. All of this because, of course, some employers, unscrupulous employers, know that they can do that because the employee, being here illegally, is afraid to go and report it for fear of what would happen to them.

The problem that this raises is not just the problem of the tragic toll of human life that occurred in Colorado yesterday, and that is our primary concern this evening. But I think it is important for us to understand that this underscores a much more significant problem that we face as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation cannot absorb the number of people that are coming across our borders, both legally and illegally. The immigration into this country over the last 10 years has been extraordinary. Now we are, of course, a Nation of immigrants. I understand that very well. My own grandparents, like everyone else's here in this room, with the exception of Native Americans who might have claim to some other way of being here, the fact is that most of us are here as a result of our grandparents coming in the recent past.

I do not blame for a moment the people who are seeking a better life, the people trying to come here for the purpose of getting a better life for themselves and their families. I do not blame them; I blame the system.

We must begin the debate, although it is a difficult one, we must begin the debate on exactly what this country will look like. How many people are we going to let in here, both legally and illegally. The fact is we are letting them in and I say that, letting them in because essentially there is no border. It is a porous border. People come across almost at will, millions annually. Several million, it is estimated between 1 and 4 million people, no one knows ex-

actly how many end up here, we have a net increase every year of immigration through illegal immigrants of that number.

Mr. Speaker, massive immigration into the United States must be stopped. We must begin at least to debate the costs of this immigration. There are extraordinary financial costs, both for infrastructure development, for schooling, housing, social services, for the incarceration of aliens here who have violated State or local laws. We have to look and see exactly what American businesses may need in terms of both skilled and unskilled workers, and then come up with a plan to deal with it. We must begin the debate.

EDUCATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use most of my time to talk about education, but I think it is important to begin by setting the discussion on education in the proper context, within the proper context of what is developing here in Washington and in the House of Representatives.

Last week we voted, the majority voted, to begin the massive tax cut proposed by the President. This is a massive amount of money to be spent on tax refunds. A tax cut is a kind of expenditure. That is an important item to understand, put in place, because it is part of setting the parameters for any kind of action on education or any other program of the government. All other programs will have to respond to the fact that there is less money available if we have a huge tax cut.

We have tried to set different parameters. Instead of a huge tax cut, the Congressional Black Caucus and the progressive caucus have proposed that at least 10 percent of the surplus be used for education. If we used 10 percent of the surplus for education, we would still have 90 percent left to use for other programs. So we propose that we use another 10 percent for housing, for social programs, for other kinds of programs that are important for human resource development. In other words, invest at least 20 percent in education and human resource development. There would still be 80 percent left of the surplus after that investment was made. So that additional 80 percent, we propose, should be used to pay down the debt and to give a tax cut.

Tax cuts make a lot of sense. I am in favor of a tax cut, but the tax cut should be targeted, the tax cut should not be extravagant, and the tax cut should not jeopardize our budgeting process for the next 10 years. It should not throw us into a deficit. It should not throw us into a situation where, in

order to balance the budget, we are forced to cut more and more programs. Education would be one of the programs that we would be forced to cut.

Let me just start by saying also that it is an early hour. It is only 10 after 7, and I assume that large numbers of elementary school students and high school students are awake. I hope a few are listening, because on past occasions when I have had the opportunity to address the House early, I always send a special message to the children of America, to the students of America.

All students out there, whether they go to public school or private school, although the great majority, more than 53 million children go to public schools, it is important for all young people to understand the kind of America we are going to live in; the kind of Nation that they are going to grow up in and provide the leadership in and begin their families in. That Nation will be determined mostly by the degree to which we address the problems related to education.

It is not new. I think H. G. Wells said something, I am not sure I am quoting correctly, but Civilization is a race between education and chaos, or something similar to that. I would certainly endorse that idea. We live in a world where things are more and more complicated. And we want it that way, because as things get more complicated, we increase productivity. An individual worker can do so much more and groups can do so much more when we have highly automated systems. When we apply the digital science related to computers or mass communication, all of that creates the kind of better world that we want to make and are already in the process of making.

It is what I call a cyber-civilization; a civilization that is going to be far more productive, and we can contemplate being able to actually meet the needs of all of the 6 billion people in the world. The capacity to do that is there if we fully develop the resources and educate all the people who can be educated. It is important we begin to apply the benefits of our technology, the benefits of our cyber-civilization on a widespread basis, whether that means the more efficient production of drugs that allow people to get better health care or whether it means new methods in education, automated methods, or methods using distance learning, making it possible to teach more people faster in all parts of the world.

There is great possibility out there. It is a great new world that we are moving into. So it is important that the pupils, young people, students understand what we have at stake here. We are at a critical point where we have the resources now to do what is necessary to make a world-class education system, an education system which is fitted for the challenge that we face in this coming cyber-civilization.

We have an education system now which is still lagging and very much

mired in the old needs of an industrialized economy, when we did not have to educate everybody to the maximum degree because there was work available in the factories for people who did not know anything about computers or did not know math. Large numbers of people, in fact the vast majority 50 years ago, of the people who went to school, did not graduate from school. Most of them did not get past the 8th grade. But now we have a need for a highly educated population, and we need to think that way, we need to budget that way, we need more than the rhetoric of people who say they support education. We need to spend dollars the way we spend them on an activity like defense.

We recognize that modern defense units or the modern defense systems that we have decided we need cost far more money than the old cavalry with the rifles and the wagons or the cannons. Common sense says that these things cost much more money. But when it comes to education, we do not want to make the decision that we need to invest heavily in maximizing the kind of physical facilities we have; buildings, laboratories, and computers. We need to maximize that now. At this point where we have a huge budget surplus, now is the time to take those steps.

Young people have to wake up and communicate with all the people in decision-making positions that they want the resources available right now to be used to invest in education. We certainly do not want to stagnate. We certainly do not want to go backwards. Young people need to tell their mayors that; tell their legislators in the State legislatures, tell their city council people and their Congress people and their Senators and the people in the White House that they do not want to go backwards and they do not want to stagnate.

□ 1915

I apologize for even mentioning the word backwards, because that is what I am going to have to spend a little bit of time talking about. We are about to go backwards instead of going forward. We are about to go backward instead of stagnating. It is a terrible thing we stood still, but we are about to go backwards, and I want you to understand how serious that is. It is your world that is at stake. So take some action. As young people, take some action.

I remember standing here on the floor at about this time, when I was able to get a 7 o'clock hour, and I invited all of you to take a drink, a toast with me. I said, young people of America, students, come out there, get a glass of milk and drink a toast, because we have just made a basic breakthrough on getting Federal funds for construction. We made a basic breakthrough on getting Federal funds for construction.

It was not much, but we got agreement in the budget for \$1.2 billion to be

used for school renovations and building repairs. I wanted to celebrate that, so we drank a toast with a glass of milk, of fruit juice or whatever you have.

I also remember congratulating the students of America for coming to our aid when we rallied to stop the rollback and the destruction of the e-rate. Remember the e-rate?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. OWENS. Is the Speaker saying that I cannot talk to the students of America?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that and the gentleman must address his remarks to the Chair and not to persons outside the Chamber.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. OWENS. So for all who are listening, no matter where you are, it is important to note the fact that we celebrated. We celebrated the fact that students, teachers, librarians, all over the country came to the aid of those of us in Congress who were fighting to maintain and expand the e-rate.

What is the e-rate? The e-rate is a special fund created as a result of actions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. When we passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, a provision was put in the Act which called upon the telecommunications industry to provide free or very low-cost services to all schools and libraries in America. Private schools, public schools, all schools were to be included and have been included in the e-rate process—and libraries.

The development of the procedures and the standards for doing this under William Kennard were magnificent. They determined that, instead of providing it free, they could not go that far, there was a lot of pressure on them from industry, they did determine that funds could be made available not through the Treasury of the United States or any other government but through the industry itself. The funds could be made available to allow for a discount program where every school and library in America would at least get a 15 percent discount on their telecommunications services. They could apply and, as a result of the e-rate, the initial wiring of the library or the initial process of gearing up the schools, that could be funded and the cost of that could be covered up to 15 percent in any school.

However, for the schools that had the poorest populations, those schools could get a discount in proportion to the number of children who were poor, up to a 90 percent discount. We have a lot of our formulas in the Federal Government based on poverty, especially when it comes to education.

The biggest program that the Federal Government has is Title I, Title I for

elementary and secondary education. Title I is based, the distribution of it, is based primarily on poverty. Poverty is measured by the number of students in each school who qualify for the free lunch program. The forms and the investigations that are conducted at the time that they decide how many youngsters will get free lunches through the Department of Agriculture, that form is used again and again as a basis for deciding how many children are poor in the school.

So the e-rate is based on a sound formula, and the poorest schools could get up to 90 percent discounts. That means that for every \$1 they spent on their telecommunications services, or on the initial wiring of the school, they would only have to pay 10 cents. The other 90 cents would be paid out of the e-rate fund.

This caught on. It spread. Numerous, numerous schools and libraries are reaping the benefit of the e-rate. So we celebrated that.

Everybody who was listening at that time, especially young people, I invited to join me in celebrating the fact that the e-rate did go into effect, was beaten down, lawsuits were threatened, all kinds of things happened, but it went into effect because the outcry from the young people, the students and the teachers and the families out there, the working families was so great until they acquiesced and they supported chairman Kennard, the chairman of the FCC, and we instituted the e-rate. It has been highly successful.

But let me warn you tonight that we are about to go backwards. The e-rate is threatened, is jeopardized. We have a situation now where the e-rate may be folded into the regular budget. The President's budget, the President's education plan is proposing that we have the e-rate funded through the regular budget, that we combine that with some other programs. Now, that would be a great step backwards, because the e-rate now is funded through funds that come out of the telecommunications industry and any placing of it in the budget means you jeopardize the funds because you are competing with the other funds in the budget.

We did a lot to fight for the e-rate. It is time to rise up and let your legislators know, people who are in this room, Members of Congress listening, you must understand that it is jeopardized by this new move; and, therefore, we should take action to let it be known we will not sit still and allow the e-rate to be taken away.

The other item that is being jeopardized is the one we celebrated, the \$1.2 billion in construction funds. The Federal Government has not appropriated money for school construction in the last 50 years. The Federal Government, the Title I programs, all the Elementary and Secondary Education Assistance Act stayed away from school construction. It is most unfortunate because a study by the National Education Association showed that we

need about \$320 billion to bring the infrastructure of the schools, the laboratories, the physical infrastructure of public education in America, just to bring it up to a point where it can take care of the present students, would be about \$320 billion. They have suffered so greatly from neglect.

If you leave it all to the local governments, you leave it all to the State governments, they are not doing as much as they should do and could do, but certainly the Federal Government which has had large amounts of money coming from the local level. All money originates at the local level. All politics is local. All taxes is local. It comes from us. It is not a matter of Washington giving us back something that belongs to Washington. It is our money, and it should come back for the needs that are clearly articulated.

If ever there was a need that was clear, it is school construction. Yet we have not over the last 50 years appropriated any money for school construction.

We finally made a breakthrough. As a result of a tremendous effort we put forth, President Clinton insisted that there be some money for school construction in the last budget. During the negotiation they reached a compromise figure of \$1.2 billion. I had proposed \$10 billion per year for 10 years. So you can see there is a great difference between what is the need, which is \$320 billion over many years, and what I proposed, which was \$10 billion over 10 years, which would be \$100 billion, and the actual compromise. We start with \$1.2 billion.

But we celebrated. We celebrated because of the fact that it was a breakthrough. We had broken through the barrier. And now the Federal Government, according to the budget that we completed last December, and it is important to go over this education budget now because it was completed so late in the year. Most people do not know what we finally came out with, and I will talk about that a little bit later, but we did come out with \$1.2 billion. Now that is jeopardized.

That \$1.2 billion would provide new grants to make urgently needed repairs and renovations in the schools. We are talking about items which relate to the health and safety of young people. Now the new administration is saying they will not go forward and spend this money for the purposes for which it was negotiated last time. They are going to fold it into some other programs, and we will not have any school construction, any infrastructure initiative. That is a great step backwards, and it needs the help of everybody to cry out and let it be known, let it be known that this is an outrage. It is going backwards, it is counterproductive, and it runs counter to the vision that has been expressed by the new administration.

You cannot have improvements in education if the basic vessel, the basic structure, the infrastructure, the con-

crete, the bricks and the mortar, if that is crumbling around you, many of the other things that are being proposed begin to look ridiculous. And it certainly looks ridiculous through the eyes of young people. You tell young people you care about education and you are going to do everything to guarantee that they get the best opportunities available and they look out of their eyes and see that there is a crumbling building there, there is a coal-burning furnace in the school threatening their health, exacerbating asthma conditions, the roof leaks and all the rooms on the top floor of the school have crumbling walls because of the leaking roof, windows that needed replacement now have wood pasted over, there is plastic on the windows because you need to stop the draft from coming in. They can see how much is the value of education, how much value these adults who are making decisions are placing on education if they send us into these kinds of conditions.

There are trailers in the school yards that were temporary trailers 25 years ago. I remember the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) stating on the floor of the House that she had gone back to visit one of her old schools, junior high schools, and the same trailers that were there when she was there are still there in the school yard. However, when they were put there, they were supposed to be temporary, for 2 or 3 years.

The same thing is true in most of our big cities and in many rural communities. The trailers have become not a temporary emergency solution but they are there permanently because that is what adult decisionmakers—that is the value they have placed on education.

No amount of vision statements and no amount of rhetoric can get past the common sense of our young people who look and see with their eyes that there is something wrong with this commitment. There is a commitment to take us into the 21st century with the best possible opportunities for education, and yet there are only a handful of computers in the classroom, if it is lucky enough to be wired and have computers. The library has books that are 30 years old, some of them geography and history books.

I am not going to go through that litany. I have gone through it many times before. But the thing is, here we are with a new administration and we are looking forward to one area where there could be bipartisan cooperation, one area where both parties would respond to the overwhelming desire of the American people to see that there is some improvement in education. That is an overwhelming desire that has been expressed again and again in the polls. The polls for the last 5 years have consistently placed education as one of the top five priorities. In the last 2 years it has been the number one priority.

So why are we discussing a proposal to roll back progress and refuse to

spend the tiny \$1.2 billion that was appropriated on December 18 of last year for school repairs and renovations? Why are we contemplating that? What kind of madness is this? They were also going to reduce class sizes.

I have a summary of the December 18 budget, and I am going to take a few minutes to just go through it because it came out so late until very few people have had a chance to see it. Most citizens in the country do not know the difference between this year's budget and last year's budget because last year's budget came out so late.

□ 1930

However, we did make some progress last year. It is important to note and understand, all players, whether they are decision-makers here in Congress or students out there in school, and they have to understand that they made a big breakthrough last year with a \$6.5 billion increase. Education expenditures were increased last year by \$6.5 billion. That is quite an achievement. That is quite an achievement, as my colleagues know. It is not nearly as much as I think we should have had. We could spend that much on school construction alone using the surplus, but it is a great step forward using none of the surplus. This was in the regular budgeting process. Why is it the case? Because both Republicans and Democrats understand that the polls show that the American people want improvements in education, and they can read the polls and understand that they must show some movement forward.

Now we have had a movement forward in an area like reducing class sizes. We had the third installment in reducing class sizes in grades one to three. This is a nationwide program, trying to bring down the average in the classroom to 18 students in the first three grades.

We increased that program by \$323 million last year. There was a plus of \$323 million, and that increase added approximately 8,000 new highly qualified teachers to the already 29,000 that were there before. The total appropriation for reducing class sizes went from \$1.3 billion to \$1.6 billion in the December 18 budget. Mr. Speaker, 8,000 new qualified teachers will be added to the already 29,000 that have been hired under this program. The administration that went out previously, of course, as my colleagues know, was shooting for a goal of 100,000. 100,000 new teachers over 7 years to reduce class sizes in the early grades.

Now, we are being told that this program too, the Class Size Reduction Program, will be altered and phased out, combined with some other program; and that is a step backwards also.

We expanded after-school opportunities in this budget of December 18, last year's budget. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers that provide after school learning programs in drug-

free environments, and also some support for lifelong learning for the parents of the students who are involved, went from \$453,000 million to \$845 million. That was an increase of \$392 million. The program was almost doubled. It is now in a position to provide for 650,000 additional school-age youngsters as a result of the increase. So we have something like 1.3 million youngsters being served by the total program. Everybody has applauded the after-school programs, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers as being successful. Everybody has said, this is what we need: longer school days, some help for kids on the weekend and also summer school help. Unfortunately, this amount of money only serves a tiny percentage of the youngsters who are eligible and who need the help, but it is there. Now we have been told that that, too, may be altered.

So I do not want to belabor the point. The point is that we have heard that the new administration places education as a top priority, but the actions that have started already show that we are going to have to look very closely.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are looking for an opportunity to cooperate. We are looking for an opportunity to make bipartisanship a reality. The one place where there is a clear opportunity is in education; and, therefore, it is particularly disturbing that these proposed roll-backs of good programs, the wiping out of the construction program totally, these proposals are being made at this point because it is going to create a roadblock to any possible bipartisan cooperation for the benefit of the children of America.

The hiring and retaining of qualified teachers, we increased that by \$150 million; the total program is \$485 million. We are doing in that program one of the things that has been pinpointed as a major need. We need more qualified teachers; we need more certified teachers. That program would do it. The Eisenhower National Activities Program is a complement to that. Preparing teachers for use of technology, that program was increased from \$75 million to \$125 million.

Mr. Speaker, we have been on target in education leadership. Some of the leadership, or most of the leadership, came from the previous administration; and certainly, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for 18 years, I have seen these proposals introduced year after year, finally brought them to fruition; and we did make some real headway in the budget that passed last year. But the problem is, and the question is, are we really going to sincerely and seriously go forward and build on what exists already, like the e-rate and the school construction program, and the after-school program.

We had a program-funding increase for extra help in the basics, helping disadvantaged students learn the basics and achieve high studies. That is under

title I. That program was increased by \$569 million, and disadvantaged students can be helped as a result of that increase.

Now, that is in harmony with what President Bush has proposed. We have the President's proposals in outline form. We do not have a bill yet. We cannot talk about a budget with clear sections; but we do have an outline, and one of the things he stresses in his outline is that he wants to focus on the pupils who have the greatest needs. The first dollars should be focused on the pupils that have the greatest needs, and any increase in the budget should go in that direction. So I am glad to report that there is one area where I heartily agree with the administration. Let us do that. Let us focus where the greatest need is and target the Federal funds in that direction.

The unfortunate thing is that the administration will have to deal with the members on the Committee on Education and the Workforce who are on the majority. Their thinking in the past few years has gone in the opposite direction. The Republican majority of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Republican majority in the House as a whole, has consistently insisted that the existing funds be utilized in a broader way. They want greater flexibility. They want to take the dollars that do exist and spread them out to more schools, not the poorest schools; but some schools that have less poverty and some schools that have almost no poverty would be eligible for the funding if we had the flexibility that they talk about.

Going even further beyond just flexibility, the members of the President's party here in Congress are proposing block grants. Block grants mean that we take the dollars and we give them to the States with minimum guidelines and the States then proceed to do what they feel is best. The problem with giving States that kind of authority is that the States have a constitutional responsibility for education. Every State has in their constitution a clear statement of responsibility for the education of all of the children of the State. If they had done their job in accordance with their constitutions all of these years, the Federal Government would not need to be engaged in this problem of education at all. We would not have to be trying to catch up, trying to maintain high standards of education.

So, Mr. Speaker, because it was clearly demonstrated in World War II, if not before, that education is a matter of national security, we cannot afford to have an uneducated, ill-informed population and expect to be able to defend ourselves in war, even a less complicated war, such as World War II. Now, with high-tech weapons and an atmosphere which requires much more learning to deal with a much more complex peacetime economy and also to deal with any defense

efforts, we know we need an educated population; it is a matter of national security. It is not something we can afford to leave to the States, even though the Federal Government is only responsible at this point for a very tiny percentage.

Our expenditures, Federal expenditures for education, are still less than 8 percent of the total. States and localities are still spending 92 percent to 93 percent of the total education budget, higher education, elementary and secondary education, et cetera. We should be going toward 25 percent. We should understand that the number one item in terms of the defense of the country, in terms of competitiveness of our economy in a global economy, is our being able to compete. In terms of the greatness of the Nation, the future of the Nation, education is a number one priority. We ought to be spending at least 25 percent of the expenditure for education. The Federal expenditure should be 25 percent, not 8 percent or 7 percent.

We have other items that were in the budget last year that I just want to note. Gear-Up and TRIO are programs for helping poor students get ready for college. We understand that it is great to graduate from high school, and one of our first targets was getting everybody to graduate from high school, and we have improved greatly over the years in getting rid of a large percentage of high school dropouts. But beyond that, if one does not go to college, there is a limited future; there is a limited amount you are going to earn in terms of income; there is a limited amount of help one is going to be able to provide for the economy in general, and one's own family; there is a limited contribution that one is going to be able to make to society if one does not go on to college and fully develop one's capacities.

So Gear-Up and TRIO are very important. The TRIO program has been in existence for some years. It has proven itself, and I am happy to see they have an \$85 million increase. It has moved from \$645 million to \$730 million in the December 18 budget last year. What is going to happen this year I do not know, but I hope that the administration this year will have the good sense to follow the leadership of the Republican Congresses over the past few years who have increased the program and not cut it. TRIO would help 765,000 disadvantaged students, 40,000 more than they do now as a result of the increases that we provided last year. It is a magnificent program, and we certainly do not want to see an attempt to roll back the clock on that.

Pell grants we increased from \$3,300 to \$3,750 per student last year, a total increase overall from \$7.6 billion to \$8.7 billion, an increase of \$1.1 billion for Pell grants. That allowed a \$450 increase in the Pell grant over what it was before; but Pell grants are consistently behind inflation, way behind the cost of a college education, and Pell

grants to our poorest students need to be greatly increased. I hope that there will be no rollback on Pell grants in the coming development of the administration's education budget.

We do have some information which shows that there are problems. I said before that the present administration is proposing to zero-out school modernization, the construction program; they are going to do something else with that, put it into technology and special education. That is most unfortunate. About 1,000 schools that could be renovated will not be renovated.

The new budget eliminates the class-size reduction initiative; I mentioned that that is on the chopping block. The class-size initiative has already helped schools hire 37,000 teachers and provide smaller classes to 2 million children. That will be a great loss if it is rolled back. The Pell grant increase that we passed last year, it was a 14 percent increase in Pell grants. The increase that is being proposed by the present administration, not through its budget, because we do not have the full budget, but through its outlines and discussions, is about 4 percent. Instead of 14 percent, they talk about a 4 percent increase in Pell grants.

Minority-serving higher education institutions have certainly benefited greatly over the past 6 years. We have had bipartisan cooperation in the funding of the minority-serving institutions. There are three categories, Historically Black Colleges and Universities and the Hispanic-serving institutions, as well as the tribally controlled colleges. They have had increases over the last 6 years. We have gotten about a 25 percent annual increase over the last 3 years under the previous administration. They have been well served. We think that they have a key role to play in improving education in America. Minority-serving institutions will be producing most of the teachers. A large percentage of the qualified teachers that we need in our schools will come from Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribally controlled colleges.

□ 1945

As Members know, we have a controversy here over the fact that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has already chosen, in its structure and formatting for business in the next 2 years, they have structured the committee so that there is a Subcommittee for 21st Century Competitiveness.

That subcommittee is very much on target. They call it that, and that is a new concept where at the core of the Subcommittee of 21st Century Competitiveness are the programs that fund our higher education institutions. That is at the core. There are other programs that are related to technology, development and research, a number of things related to competitiveness. But certainly at the core is

the funding for higher education institutions.

For some reason that we are not clear on, the majority Republicans on the Committee on Education and the Workforce chose to take these minority-serving institutions, the historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and the tribally-controlled colleges, and put them in another committee; not in the subcommittee, but in another subcommittee. Instead of the Subcommittee for 21st Century Competitiveness being the committee where all higher education institutions are placed, they chose to put the minority institutions in a subcommittee called the Subcommittee on Special Education.

The Subcommittee on Special Education is a committee which has a large number of other programs related to higher education, and many not related to education. That is where we fund the programs for adoptions, programs for child abuse education and prevention, programs for domestic abuse and prevention, juvenile delinquency prevention. Why do we put the minority-serving higher education institutions in a subcommittee which mainly deals with social problems?

All of those social problems are important and they need to be confronted, but why do we take the minority-serving institutions out of the mainstream discussion of what it takes to remain competitive in the coming 21st century? They are not going to be there when we discuss new authorizations, new appropriations to meet the competitive world of the cyber civilization I talked about at the beginning of my discourse this evening.

If we are going to have a new approach to how we go into the 21st century, how we meet the competition of the 21st century, how we meet global competition, then we certainly do not want to leave out the minority-serving institutions when we are making those plans and having that discussion.

Members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce have decided that we protest. I offered an amendment to correct this oversight. We thought it was an oversight and that there was no malice involved, and that if we brought it to the attention of the majority, it would be corrected.

We spent about 3 hours debating the issue. It just so happens that on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, among the Democrats on the committee there are four people who are African Americans, there are three people who are Hispanic-Americans, there are two Asian-Americans, and there is one Native American. Probably few committees have that kind of concentration of minorities.

We all expressed outrage and fear, because we know what separation does. We have lived with separate but equal doctrines for too long to not know what eventually happens when we separate out things. They do not remain

equal. The weaker party in the separation is going to be neglected, abandoned, and in very subtle ways, probably, very subtle ways, the minority-serving institutions will find themselves outside the parameters of a full and moving discussion about what it takes to be competitive in the 21st century. They will be outside the parameters of a discussion about how higher education institutions must operate and relate to the crisis in elementary and secondary education. They will be outside of a serious discussion on the relationship between corporations, industry, and higher education institutions if they are out of the loop in terms of the way the committee is structured.

We have protested. All the Democratic members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce have refused to accept their assignments on subcommittees. There is an ongoing dialogue, and we hope that this will be resolved, but it is an example of a blunder that, when we add to the other kinds of proposals that are being made, the zeroing out of the construction appropriation, the rollback of the class size reductions, when we add all of these blunders and new backward moves, including the threat to the e-rate, danger signals must be sent forth. We must send up flares. We must get involved in reexamining what are the possibilities of bipartisan cooperation, what are the dangers to the progress that we have made.

Everybody has to get involved in making certain that their voices are heard and that education, which has clearly been indicated to be the top priority of the American voters, not be given a public relations job. We do not want a public relations program. Many speeches are made about improving education, but the substance of what has to be done in terms of the way legislation is set forth and the way the budget is developed, that substance is not there.

We do not want to fool the American people. We do not want a public relations gimmick instead of real improvements in education.

Democratic education proposals are proposals for making real investments in education. Whereas President Bush proposed \$1.6 billion for elementary and secondary budget programs increase, our program, as reflected in the Excellence and Accountability in Education Act, this is an act that is already been introduced. We have a piece of legislation already introduced. The Excellence and Accountability in Education Act, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and has all of the other Democratic members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce as cosponsors, proposes a \$9.7 billion increase. So \$1.6 billion increase is proposed by the President, we propose \$9.7 billion, and we lay out where the money should go.

The Excellence and Accountability in Education Act is H.R. 340, a comprehensive K through 12 education reform bill. It would hold schools accountable to high standards, and place particular emphasis on closing the achievement gap between different groups of children.

Schools that continue to fail after 3 years, under our act, and we are in harmony with the President on that one, would receive special help and be subject to changes in terms of their students being able to make choices and go to other public choice schools, or the schools might be closed and converted to charter schools.

Unlike the majority, we oppose any movement toward vouchers. This was a clear disagreement in the past and remains a clear disagreement between the two parties. We are not in favor of the wasteful, cumbersome approach to improving education through giving families vouchers.

We propose to double the Title I funds over a 5-year period. Do Members want to know where our great increase will go? We will double the Title I funds, and those are the funds that are targeted to the disadvantaged areas and the schools that need help the most, the failing schools.

We are in harmony with the President on that one. He wants to target additional resources to the schools that need it most. We are not in harmony with the amount. We propose to double the Title I funding in order to do that, and not to have the small increment that he proposes.

We propose to institute strong accountability for results and actions. The Title I schools will be held accountable. Administrations and local education agencies and the States will be held accountable. We are in agreement with the President on that. But each one of these schools must have the resources they need to provide the opportunity to learn. Opportunity-to-learn standards must be met.

These are the standards that Governors and bureaucrats do not like to talk about, but if we are going to judge schools and declare that they have failed, before we make a judgment that they have failed, provide them with the money they need to provide a decent physical infrastructure. Provide them the money they need for libraries, for gyms, for teachers, for certified teachers. They have to meet certain standards themselves before they hold the students and schools to standards. Both the State governments and the Federal government must not run away, as they have been, from opportunity-to-learn standards coming first.

Teacher quality must be strengthened. We all agree on that. We must understand that the context in which we go forward to improve our schools is greater than the programs that relate to education. I started by saying I want to set the discussion of education in the proper context. I talked about the tax bill and how, in the context of a

huge tax cut, we can look forward to only rhetoric for education because there will be no money for the kinds of increases that we need. In the context of a big tax cut, most social programs, most human investment programs, will suffer greatly. So the tax cut needs to be whittled down to size.

I am in favor of a tax cut. Generally the Democrats are in favor of tax cuts. They want smaller tax cuts. They want tax cuts targeted toward the middle class and the working families. They want tax cuts which reach down and even get people who supposedly do not pay taxes.

People who are working and pay Social Security, they have Social Security taken out and Medicare funding taken out, they are paying taxes. It is a payroll tax. Any time we are forced to give money to the government, it is a tax. It is not an option. We cannot voluntarily say, we will pay this fee, or not. It comes out of our paychecks. So Social Security funding means those people need help, too.

The greatest-percentage increases in taxing over the last 20 years have been an increase in the Social Security and related payroll taxes. They have gone up more than anything else. So we want the tax cut, one aimed at the middle class; we want a tax cut aimed at working class families; we want a tax cut to get to the people at the very bottom; but we do not want such a huge tax cut that there is no money for human investment, or that there is no money for education, in particular.

We want those parameters to be understood: Stop the reckless tax cut or there will be nothing left for education. Let that message go out: Stop the war on working-class families. Working-class families are the families that use the public school system.

When we talk about education, we are talking about the fact that the primary means for upward mobility in America has been the public school system, the primary means of upward mobility; public schools, public libraries. Check the biography or autobiography of any great American who rose from poverty to success and they will tell us about schools and libraries that were free to them and were quality schools in terms of the kinds of help they provided. That is a story that is repeated over and over again, so working families will suffer if we do not improve America's schools.

The majority party, the Republicans, should understand that they are declaring war on working families when they roll back the clock on the items related to improvement of education. They roll back the clock on e-rate, and that means that working families will not have access to computers, working families will not have access to the Internet that is provided at a great discount through the e-rate.

If we take away the school or class size reduction program, it means that working-class families will be crowded

into classrooms of up to 30 and 35 students, and will not have the kind of attention which students in the first to third grade need. Studies have shown over and over again that the attention children get at a very early age and the class size is very important. So they are attacking working families when they take away that benefit or zero out construction and do not provide decent schools for them.

The attack on working families continues in other ways. The context is important, because the way children go to school, the families they come from, the conditions in the home are all-important in terms of their ability to relate to their schooling. Whereas I do not believe in blaming the homes and parents for all the problems that children have in learning, as some people do often, but understand that the stability in the home, whether or not they have decent health care, are important in terms of the way the child comes to school and is able to take advantage of the opportunities there.

□ 2000

The minimum wage that we have ignored is not an attack on working families when we do not even allow it on the floor; we do not raise the minimum wage from \$5.15 an hour as we proposed in the last Congress to \$6.15 an hour; we are attacking working families.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest attack on working families probably is the refusal to recognize that the floor of wages in America ought to at least be \$6.15 an hour and not \$5.15 an hour, which is now more than 3 years old, that floor in terms of minimum wage.

The majority party would not even let it be discussed. Working families on minimum wage, a family of four, is in dire poverty even if you increase it to \$6.15. It is a tiny percentage of what they need in terms of survival, but the minimum that we could do is to accept the Democratic proposals of a 50 cent increase over a 2-year period which would raise the minimum wage. If we refuse to do that, that is an attack on working families, the families of the pupils who go to our public schools.

When we gut the health and safety rules to protect workers, as we did last week, in context, working families have to understand that what was done on the floor of this House last Wednesday, the vote to repeal the ergonomics standards was an attack on working families.

Ergonomics is a big word. People do not want to deal with it. They stop listening when you mention it. So I will just say, ergonomics is all about ending the pain, the pain that is related to doing something with your muscles and your fibers over and over again. Ergonomics is a matter of taking steps to prevent, to prevent injuries that often incapacitate people.

Ergonomics is not just about the guy who was out there lifting in the warehouse, lifting heavy loads and he gets his problem with his back. Ergonomics

is about the secretaries and the clerks who type all the time or the people who sit in front of computers and may get eyestrain.

There are ways to prevent carpal tunnel syndrome, another one of those big words. Carpal tunnel syndrome is simply you have repeated something so often and you use your fingers and your wrists in a certain way until it wears out and it is painful to do it. And beyond being painful, you reach the point where you cannot do it any more.

Mr. Speaker, a person who earns his or her living by typing the motion over and over again can find themselves at a point where they do not have a way to earn a living, because of the fact that they can no longer use their wrists and their hands and their arms. It is as incapacitating as if you were on a construction job and some big load fell on your head. They are very real.

Every Member of Congress has had exposure, I am sure, to people with carpal tunnel syndrome, because we have lots of people in that category who do that kind of work up here. Nothing new. Yet we voted last week to make war on the workers by removing a standard which required that employers take preventive measures to minimize the risk of people getting incapacitated as a result of repeated use, using certain muscles and fibers. We eliminated it with one stroke under what is called the Congressional Review Act.

One of the first achievements of the Gingrich Congress, and it is no more, we do not have the ergonomics standard. It took 10 years. It took 10 years to reach the point where we issued some standards which said you should do things a certain way to protect the health of people, their muscles and their fibers from this kind of strain. And in one day, it was voted out of existence and is no more.

We declared war on the working families of America in another way. The war comes from different directions. It is a war sometime of neglect and abandonment, but that is still war. It is sometimes a war of a denial, denying the minimum wage increase, but it is still war.

These are the families from which the children who go to our public schools come, and we cannot have improvements in education while the attacks are being made on their livelihood in a manner in which their homes are able to exist free of incapacitation, health problems and deprivation.

We think that what happened last week with the wiping out of the ergonomics standard through the Congressional Review Act is just a beginning, that the war on working families is going to continue in many ways.

We are going to be gutting overtime pay again for workers. That has come up in the previous Congress, of course, and it failed to get through because the President at that time threatened to veto it. There is no veto power to prevent excesses. There is no veto power

on extreme mix. We are waiting for the attack to go forward.

We warn everybody listening to begin to make decisions about how we are going to deal with an attempt to gut overtime pay for workers. We had a bill on the floor, as my colleagues recall, those of my colleagues who have been in Congress for some time, a bill on the floor which said that overtime pay should no longer have to be given in cash.

The Fair Labor Standards Act requires that after you reach a certain point, 40 hours, you must pay workers in cash for the overtime. Workers who are not in that category, there are exempt workers, as we all know, but those who are in that category must be paid in cash.

We had a bill which says the Fair Worker Labor Standards Act, that section would be repealed and employers could at their own discretion give workers time off, time off to compensate for your working overtime. The time off would come at the discretion of the employer.

The majority party would gut overtime pay by expanding exemptions to overtime requirements by excluding employee bonuses from overtime pay, and this latter provision creates huge loopholes for employers, allows them to exempt certain portions of employee pay as exempt from overtime coverage.

We can look forward to more of this kind of attack on working families. They are going to discourage all new health and safety laws. They are going to discourage the National Labor Relations Board from functioning in a fair and equitable way.

There will be bills to discourage union organizing. All of those bills fall within the parameter of my committee. We must understand how they all interrelate to the war on working families.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). 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, there are a number of different subjects that I would like to address tonight.

Let me begin, first of all, by thanking all of my colleagues for their support for the successful passing of the legislation, the willing seller, willing buyer legislation for our national trails.

The specific trail that I focus really on a lot in the State of Colorado is the Continental Divide Trail. It is kind of ironic that years ago a piece of legislation was amended to put in place that a property owner who wishes to sell their land, a private property owner who wishes to sell their land to a trails committee or to the government for a trail like the Continental Divide Trail was prohibited from doing so even though the seller wanted to sell.

It was an amendment that made no sense. Today a great trail like the Continental Divide Trail, and we all know a little bit about the history of that, that trail is being prevented in essence from being finished for its preservation, because willing sellers, not condemnation, condemnation has no place in putting a trail like this for a historic basis, but a willing seller does have a place.

That legislation that was almost unanimously approved this evening, I think we probably had three no votes off the entire floor, allows that now to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of people, my good friend, Steve Fossel out in Colorado out in Silverthorne, Colorado, very aggressive on his support of this.

He is a citizen. He is very active in conservation issues. He is also a private property owner. He is a rancher. He feels very strongly about private property rights. This is the kind of legislation as a private property advocate that he could support. He got way behind it. He has worked very hard.

Of course, we also have Bruce and Pamela Ward. Bruce and Pamela Ward are the directors of the Continental Divide Trail, and they have done a tremendous task over the years of putting together everything from voluntary maintenance crews to go out and work on the Continental Divide Trail to putting together records for the historical purposes, the paper trail on the Continental Divide Trail, no pun intended, and all the other numerous tasks that are involved to preserve such a great part of our history.

Mr. Speaker, I openly congratulate Bruce and Paula Ward for their hard and difficult work, but this is the accomplishment that we got.

I also, of course, want to thank all of my colleagues for their support this evening in the passage of that.

Let me move on to my second subject that I wish to address tonight. I say this with a great deal of pride. As most of my colleagues know, my district is in the fine State of Colorado. My district is larger geographically than the State of Florida. Essentially, I have almost all of the mountains in Colorado. So any of my colleagues that have skied in Colorado or if they have been to Aspen or Snowmass or Steamboat or the Colorado National Monument in Grand Junction or the Four Corners down there in Durango or the ski area down there or the San Luis Valley and the agricultural fields, any of that country in Colorado belongs in the 3rd Congressional District.

We take a great deal of pride from what we have to offer as far as the physical beauty of that particular district, and we have just been recognized by the Travel Channel.

Glenwood Springs, that is where I was born and raised. Glenwood Springs is a wonderful community, about 35 minutes from Aspen, Colorado, about 45 minutes from Vail, Colorado, and

about an hour and 10 minutes from Grand Junction, Colorado, so you can kind of triangulate in there exactly where Glenwood Springs is.

Glenwood Springs was named by the Travel Channel as the number one spot in the Nation for cooling off. So if my colleagues have an opportunity to go to Glenwood Springs, my colleagues will see there the most world famous hot springs pool, which is the largest natural spring water pool in the United States.

It is a great resort, and it certainly is deserving of the honor that it received by the Travel Center. We have gotten a lot of calls at the local chamber who want to find out how to visit Glenwood Springs.

But when you go out to visit the 3rd Congressional District, take a look, because the 3rd Congressional District actually is a textbook example of a district that has huge amounts of public lands, of a district that is totally reliable, totally reliable on the concept of multiple use, on a district that has seen as much or more activity as any district in the Nation in regards to wilderness areas.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have put a couple of wilderness areas in place, a district where the water in Colorado, 80 percent of the water in Colorado is in the 3rd Congressional District, 80 percent of the population resides outside the 3rd Congressional District.

Colorado is the only State in the Union where it has no free-flowing water for its use to come into Colorado. It all goes out. Water is a key ingredient of the 3rd Congressional District.

The reason I say it is a textbook example is because you have the issues of public lands. You have the issues of private property ownership. You have the issues of national parks. We have four wonderful national parks in Colorado, all of which are either totally contained or partially contained. In fact, three of the four are totally contained within the 3rd Congressional District, and the fourth, a good portion of it, is in the 3rd Congressional District.

You have the issue of water. You have a number of different issues that we hear about. Here in the East, for example, you do not experience that to any kind of large extent, except if you are in the Appalachian Trail or down in the Everglades, the concept of public lands, because essentially from the eastern border of the 3rd Congressional District in the State of Colorado to the Atlantic Ocean, you have very, very little Federal land ownership or government land ownership.

From that eastern border of the 3rd Congressional District to the Pacific Ocean, you have lots of Federal and public land ownership. There is a lot of history to that.

I intend to take an hour on this floor here in the not-to-distant future to talk about the concept of multiple use, to talk about the grub-staking of the

1800s, to talk about why you have huge quantities of Federal lands in the West and very little Federal lands in the East. There is a reason for it. But it was by the luck of time that the East frankly escaped a lot of government land ownership and the West got saddled with it.

There are a lot of decisions that are made in the East where the pain of public land, in particular, examples is not felt, but it certainly is felt in the West, and that is why you see the West get a little parochial about the fact. We feel the pain out here. There are a lot of issues like water.

In a lot of the areas in the East, your big factor is to get rid of water. You have too much of it. In the West, we are an arid area. We have to store our water. We have to use our water for hydropower. We do not have a lot of water. We are arid States. There are any number of different issues.

I hope as you consider visiting some of our vacation spots which are located in the 3rd Congressional District, for example, Aspen, Beaver Creek, Vail, Steamboat, Telluride, Durango, Grand Junction, Pueblo, all of these areas, they are all in that 3rd Congressional District. When you go out there, take a look, spend just a little time, colleagues, and study the concepts of public land ownership, of private ownership of water in the West and why it differs from water in the East as far as the dynamics of ownership and the dynamics of the system that permits water usage out there.

□ 2015

There are a lot of interesting things, national parks and the maintenance of national parks. The wildlife issues. My particular district, the Third Congressional District, has the largest herds of elk in North America. We have huge populations of mule deer. In fact, this morning I was running. I just came to Washington today. I was running at 4 o'clock this morning in Grand Junction. I saw a coyote and fox in one run. This is in the community. We have a lot of wildlife.

It is a wonderful, wonderful district to represent. It is a great district to go visit. But there are a lot of complex issues that I would urge my colleagues to become a little more acquainted with them if they are not already acquainted with them as it pertains to the West.

Let me move on to another subject that I think is important. We keep hearing about this tax cut that President Bush has proposed. It seems to me that there are some of my colleagues on this floor who have now made it their life duty to kill the tax cut regardless of the ramifications to the economy as a whole. I need to tell my colleagues, we have got to keep in mind what happens.

I had an interesting flight today as I came into Washington D.C. I sat next to a gentleman named Bill. Bill asked me, Well, if you keep the money in

Washington, D.C., and by the way, even under the tax cut of President Bush's proposal, most of the money is kept in Washington, D.C., but going back to the question that Bill had, if you keep the money in Washington, D.C., does that money automatically reduce the debt?

My answer to Bill is, that is the problem. If you keep the money in Washington, D.C., if you keep those surplus dollars here in Washington, it is going to get spent. It does not just sit around here. It is too tempting.

It is like somebody who is on a diet but can be tempted very easily. And I happen to be a good example of that. I like sweets. If I were on a diet, you know, I do not have a lot of resistance towards sweets. If you put me in a candy store on a diet, I cannot help it, I grab some candy.

That is what happens with money in Washington, D.C. It is not just because you have congressional people that are weak. That is not true. In fact, most of my colleagues that I am acquainted with, which are most of them here on the floor, are pretty strong individuals.

But the fact is we have constituents who continually come to the great halls of Congress and want money, and the programs that they want money for happen to be not bad programs. We do not get proposals very often for bad programs. We get proposals for good program after good program after good program. The problem is you do not have enough to do it all. The problem is you have got to have the ability to say no.

If you have got a big pile of money sitting behind you, how do you look at somebody who has a good program but maybe not a necessary program? And there is a big difference between a good program and a necessary program. Some good programs are necessary, but some good programs are not necessary.

So the problem that we have here is, when we have good programs, and constituents, whether it is senior citizens, whether it is young people, whether it is any welfare, any kind of program, and they come to us and they say, Look, why can you not fund this new program for us? You have got all this money. You have got all this surplus.

So we are under a lot of pressure back here by our own constituents who want us to fund their programs. They understand the fact that we have to control spending, unless of course that control impacts their particular program.

So the best thing one can do when you have got an economy that is going south like our economy is currently headed, the best thing one can do is put some dollars back into the pocket of the people who sent the dollars here in the first place.

Remember, here in Washington, D.C., this is the one city in the entire Nation, there is no other city like it in the Nation, that is totally dependent upon taxpayer dollars. If you go to Denver, Colorado, if you go to Port-

land, Oregon, if you go to Laredo, Texas, or Hays, Kansas, or Lansing, Michigan, those communities are not totally dependent like Washington, D.C. is on the transfer of money. Not the creation of wealth, mind you, not the creation of wealth, which is necessary in Laredo or Hays or in Denver and so on. Washington, D.C. is totally dependent on taking money from people who work and transferring it to a bureaucracy in this huge city.

So here in this city, which is totally dependent on these excess dollars, spending these dollars, do my colleagues think it is safe to leave excess money laying around? Do my colleagues know where that money is best used? Not here in Washington, D.C. for redistribution through the bureaucracy.

If you question my analysis on that, ask anybody you want, ask any of your friends. Use this example, say to your friends, Hey, if you just won \$10 million in the lottery, and you feel like you want to give it to charity or you want to put it out in society to help people, would you bring your \$10 million to Washington, D.C. for redistribution to the American people? Of course you would not. You would redistribute that yourself. Why? Because you think you would be much more productive. You think you could get that money put to a much better use out in your local communities.

Therein lies the problem. The tax cut that the President is proposing is a very important leg on a three-legged stool for the survival of our economy, not the survival, that is an overstatement, but for the health of our community, for the health of our economy.

That three-legged stool consists of a tax cut, putting dollars back to the people who are paying these dollars. They have paid too much. When somebody pays too much, they are entitled to a refund. That is number one. We have got to get those tax, at least a portion of those taxpayer dollars without jeopardizing the future of our country. We are not jeopardizing our defense. We are not jeopardizing our education. We are not jeopardizing the health of this economy or this Nation by giving a portion of those dollars back to the people who paid too much in. But that is leg number one on the stool.

The second leg is our monetary policy; and that, as all of my colleagues know, is driven by Alan Greenspan. Now, we do not control Alan Greenspan here in the United States Congress, nor do they in the other House. Alan Greenspan acts independently. I think he has acted with pretty reserved judgment.

I can tell my colleagues that, a year ago, nobody was criticizing Alan Greenspan when NASDAQ was at an all-time high, the DOW was at an all-time high, the S&P was at an all-time high. Let Mr. Greenspan do his job. His job right now is to put some money back into that economy, not put more

money back in Washington, D.C., put more money back in the economy, which he does by lowering the interest rates. He is doing his job. I fully expect a half-percent cut in the rate next week at their next hearing.

Of course the third leg of that stool, which is so important for us to help restore the health to our economy, is we have got to control spending. One of the easiest tools to control spending is limit the amount of dollars that are sitting around here in a bucket waiting for us and our constituents to spend. If the money is laying around, how do we tell people that it is not available for use for a good program? Again, remember, our choices in Washington, D.C. are not between good and bad programs. That is a pretty easy choice to make. Our choice is between good and good programs. We have got to control spending.

So to recap, this stool must have all three legs on it for one to sit on it, for our economy to stabilize. We have got to control spending, number one. Alan Greenspan has got to bring down those rates. He is doing that, number two.

But number three, again, it falls back on our shoulders here in these fine Chambers. We need to put some of those tax dollars back into the people's pockets, in their local communities, so it stays in the local community.

I will give my colleagues an example. You take any town in America and take a dollar, a dollar in that community. You keep the dollar, this is in any town in America, you keep the dollar in that community; and that dollar circulates in that community. It works in that community.

What you do with taxes, you take that dollar out of the community, and you move it to Washington, D.C. where it circulates clear across the country in some cases. You think that dollar in Washington, D.C. that came from this community goes back to this community? Of course it does not. Of course it does not. It is very important for us to realize what a dollar does in the local community.

Now of course this theory is all shot to pieces if, in fact, the people in the local community take their dollars, go out in their backyard, and literally bury it in the ground. But short of that, a dollar in a community has a lot more opportunity to create wealth than a transfer of wealth from your local community to Washington, D.C.

These people back here in Washington, including the U.S. Congress, we thrive on dollars that we did not have to go out and compete for those dollars. The government does not have to go out and figure out a creative product. They do not have to invent a better mouse trap or come up with a cure for the common cold to create dollars in Washington, D.C. All they do is look at people across the country, our work force, and they say, well, we need a little more food in Washington. We need a little more, you know, juice in Washington. So we are going to raise your

taxes. Well, we did raise their taxes. And do you know what? The taxpayer has overpaid.

For a period of time, we have instability in our economy. The best way to pull stability back to the economy is to put dollars back in those taxpayers' pockets.

Now we will hear some of my colleagues on this floor, colleagues who say, Well, wait a minute. You should not give money back to a taxpayer if that taxpayer happens to be making any kind of money, say if they are middle income or higher income. You should give that dollar to people at the very lowest end of our economic society.

Well, now, wait a second. A tax refund should go to the people who pay taxes. If you are not paying taxes, you should not get a tax refund. You should not get a tax credit.

Now, granted, we do have the lower economic part of our society; and that is why we have welfare. But let us call a welfare system welfare. Do not mix it up or interchange it with the taxing system. The taxing system takes money from productive working people and moves that to Washington. It also takes money, which is later refunded because those people do not pay taxes, and puts it back in there.

But my point here very clearly is, you do not gain the economic stability, that stimulus that you need by taking dollars and giving them to people, giving it to people who have not paid taxes. A tax cut is for those people who have paid the taxes.

Now, am I concerned about different economic brackets? Of course I am. But what is my primary focus here? My primary focus is to strengthen the economy for everybody. If we can go out and stimulate certain parts of the economy, for example, the agriculture community, if we can go out and strengthen them, and everybody in the economy benefits because the entire economy is strengthened, what is there to criticize?

I think that it is fundamentally unfair for any of my colleagues to automatically say, Oh, this tax cut is for the rich. That is a bunch of propaganda in my opinion. Or, Oh, the tax cut, we cannot afford the tax cut. Leave the money in Washington. Trust us here in Washington, D.C. with your extra dollars. It will go to reduce the debt. Promise, we will not spend it on new programs or additional spending.

You cannot resist it back here in Washington, D.C. in part because your own constituents will not let you resist spending that money. Again, if your constituents sense that you, as an elected Representative, have access to dollars, they will come after them.

Last week I had legitimate requests just in one day. It involved the space program. It involved the new program for education. It involved the seniors' program. I think it involved the military request. I had a request in the period of about 3 hours of meetings for

over \$900 million. That is in a typical day of a typical Congressman here in Washington, D.C. Do you think I could have said no to those people, they are all good programs, if I had had \$900 million sitting behind me in my office for distribution?

That is why it is important that we give a fair and legitimate look to President Bush's proposal. I am telling you, this vote counts. This issue counts. This economy needs to be stabilized. This is not a laughing matter. There is no juggling a couple political balls in the air.

What we are involved with here is clearly in the next period, short period of time, trying to stimulate that economy, to curb it from its downward spiral, to put consumer confidence back out there. The best way to put consumer confidence back into the marketplace is to put dollars into the taxpayers' pockets. Because unless they bury it in the ground, as I said earlier, those taxpayers will use it for creation of capital and stimulation.

Now, I want to move on from this point, from the tax cut and from President Bush. I have got to tell my colleagues something. In my opinion, he is doing a tremendous job. He is traveling the country. He believes it in his heart. He is convinced that the way to stabilize this economy is through his program. I think it is incumbent upon every one of us in these Chambers to give that at least a fair evaluation.

□ 2030

I am telling you because if we do not, if we trash the President's program for the sake of trashing it or if we trash it for the sake of partisan politics, then we may very well be responsible for not putting that third leg on the stool.

Furthermore, our responsibility goes not only beyond working with the President of the United States and his leadership in trying to put that tax policy in place, but we also have our own independent responsibility of controlling spending. Last year, out of these Chambers spending went out at 8-9 percent. This year we have to hold it around 4 percent. If we do not, we will have contributed to signing off on another leg of that three-legged stool.

This is not a joking matter. All you have to do is ask anyone who has been in the stock market how they felt yesterday at 4:00 Eastern time when the stock market closed. We have a problem with consumer confidence. This is not the Depression of the 1930s. This is not December 7 or December 8 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. We have had much worse crises. It is not November 23, 1963 when President Kennedy was assassinated. But if we do not pay attention to it, it could move into the ranks of a much more serious problem than it is today, and I hope that we look at it very seriously.

Let me talk now, I really was spurred to action not too long ago when I read an ad in the New York Times. Let me talk for a few moments about what

that ad said. First of all, let us talk about the tax policy in this country.

One of the taxes, a specific tax that we have in this country, not a lot of countries in the world have this, in fact a lot of countries do not do this, but in the United States, around the turn of the century as a result of a lot of class warfare and jealousy by what some people would say are the haves and the have-nots, they created a new tax in the United States, and that tax was to tax somebody on their death called the death tax.

Now, remember in the United States you are taxed at every stage of your life. You are taxed when you eat and when you drive. You are taxed when you work, you are taxed when you warm your house, you are taxed when you fill your bathtub with water, when you buy a piece of property, any kind of property, and finally just to kind of round it off, our taxing system, let us go ahead and tax Americans at death to make sure that we squeeze every ounce of blood we can before citizens go on to the next world.

That tax came about, in part, to go after the Carnegies and the Fords and the rich people to kind of teach them a lesson for being successful. This is a country where we say you invent the better mousetrap, you are rewarded. Go out there and live your dreams, and the jealousy factor kicks in and here comes Uncle Sam, time to tax you on your death.

Let me tell you what has happened over the years. That death tax has devastated many small families in America. By small, I am not talking about the wealthy families. I am not talking about Bill Gates' father or Warren Buffett or David Rockefeller or George Soros or the Cooks or Russells or the Roosevelts or the Paul Newmans and some of these others, I am talking about the Smiths, the Brobachs, the Strobbs, the Soros, the Neslantics.

I could go through family after family after family who are not billionaires, who are out there living their life's dream, who are out there in hopes that their hard work will allow them to give the generation behind them a little opportunity to get ahead in life. Just a little opportunity to continue the family business for one more generation. Who would have ever dreamed that in the United States of America the government itself, Uncle Sam itself, would be in the practice of discouraging family business from going from one generation to the next generation. Would be in the business of punishing family farms and ranches from going from one generation to the next generation.

One of the famous statements that we have heard in the propaganda where my colleagues try to justify the death tax, it only affects 2 percent of our society. It only affects 2 percent of the wealthiest people of our society. You know something, that is blatantly misleading; and most of the people that say it say it out of ignorance or they

know that they are intentionally misleading you.

Let us go back to my cup example. Somewhere in the third district in the State of Colorado you have got somebody, and here is what it takes to become subject to the death tax. Say you have a contractor out there who owns a bulldozer, free and clear; a dump truck, free and clear; a backhoe, free and clear; and a shop, free and clear; and let us say that property is located in Vail, Colorado or Glenwood Springs, Colorado. You know what, that person is subject to the death tax. You know what happens, no matter who earns the money in the community, the fact is that you have a dollar that is earned, whether it is a wealthy person or that contractor, you have a dollar in any town U.S.A. in that local community, colleagues, that dollar is in that community. What the death tax says is hey, because they have been successful in this community, we are going to take the dollar, not just from the family that earned the dollar, we are going to take that dollar from the entire community and transfer it to a community called Washington, D.C. in the East.

Now you tell me that only 2 percent of the people in that community are impacted by that. I will give you an example, Cortez, Colorado. Down there we had a very prominent citizen, not somebody who just came into town and had all of this money showered on them. It was somebody that lived the American dream. They worked 7 days a week, and their dream was to have a family business where his sons and daughters could work with him, where his sons' and daughters' sons and daughters could work in the family business.

Unfortunately, due to an untimely death, his dream never came true. Was it because he had not been successful? No. He had been successful. It was because Uncle Sam came into that community of Cortez, Colorado and said this person has been too successful. We do not care about the fact that he is the largest contributor to jobs in this community. We do not care about the fact that he is the largest contributor to the local charities or the dollars he makes are not circulated in Washington with the exception of taxes, Uncle Sam says we do not care that removing this money not only from the family, but removing it from the community of Cortez, Colorado, to Washington, D.C., we do not care that that hurts that community. The fact is that we have an American citizen who has been too successful and we should punish him.

That is exactly what the death tax does and do not let them tell you that it only affects 2 percent of the people. "Only" may mean in the very end after all of the wealthiest people in the country through the protection of their foundations and floors of lawyers, it may mean that actually writing the check may be only 2 percent, and actu-

ally I think it is higher, but take a look at what it does to the local communities. Look at what it does in Third Congressional District of Colorado, where we see farms and ranches that have to be broken into subdivisions out of open space so Uncle Sam can be paid his ransom to make sure that the next generation cannot ranch, and I am going to give you some examples.

I read an ad lately in The New York Times, and I use this word reluctantly but I think it is the most hypocritical ad I have seen in a long time. It is called "The Responsible Wealth," and it is a group of multicentury millionaires and billionaires, and they signed this ad and said do not do away with the death tax, it is good for society. Now, it is all signed, and I will give you some examples of people who signed it, William Gates, Sr., Bill Gates' father. By the way when he was interviewed, he did this interview in the foundation office. What does the foundation do, it is a tool to protect your assets from the death tax. Let us mention a couple names. Steven Rockefeller; David Rockefeller; George Soros; Peter Barnes; Paul Newman, the actor; Frank and Jinx Roosevelt.

Do you think for one moment that any one of the people that signed this ad have not already hired some of the best death tax attorneys in the country to make sure that any death tax they are liable for is minimized. Don't you think it is a little hypocritical that someone would say do not do away with the death tax when they have already protected themselves from the brunt of the death tax.

I would ask Mr. Newman and Mr. Gates, how many of my ranchers in Colorado, how many of my local hardware store owners in Colorado can afford the attorneys that you have so they do not have to pay the death tax? How much punishment do you think that it is to these families. You know, we have had a vote on this floor on the death tax, and my bet is that anybody on this floor who is worth more than a million dollars that voted to keep the death tax in place, in other words they support the death tax, number one, and number two they are worth more than a million dollars, I bet none of my colleagues who fits in those two categories that has not already done their death tax or estate planning so that the taxes against them personally are minimized.

This death tax has a tremendous negative impact on communities across this country, whether it is Sacramento, California or in Michigan, or down in Florida, or even in the East in Virginia. This death tax punishes people and it punishes families. This is the United States of America. This is a country where we encourage or theoretically, we are supposed to encourage the family unit. A lot of times the family unit is brought together by the family farm or family ranch or the family business. Why is it the business

of this government to go out and punish these people because they have been successful? Why?

Let me tell you a few things that I think are very important, and I think the best way to talk about this is to actually bring up some true-life examples. Since I have been talking about the death tax here on the floor, colleagues, as all of you know when we broach a subject like this, we often get letters from our constituents pertaining to this subject. Let me visit with you and share with you some of the letters I have received in my office about what this death tax has done to their families.

This letter is from Harold and Roberta Schaeffer. My guess is that Mr. Gates has never seen or has no idea of what kind of exposure this small family, the Schaeffers, has to the death tax.

□ 2045

Nor am I convinced that this Mr. Gates cares about it. Nor am I convinced any of the other 200 people, including Paul Newman and some of the other very wealthy individuals, really give a hoot about some of the people that have sent me these letters.

These people are not billionaires. These people are not movie stars. These people do not have foundations. These people do not have trusts. These people do not have the attorneys to get them around it. And they are going to have to face up to one of the most punitive, unjustified taxes in the history of the American taxing system.

Let us go on.

Dear Scott. And these people are from Colorado. Roberta and I just finished watching your estate tax speech on TV. We are both very proud because you stated our real concerns and our problems that we face with this unfair taxation.

As you well know, farming and ranching out here in western Colorado is no slam dunk. If our farm is ultimately faced with this death tax burden, there is absolutely no way we could ever afford and justify holding on to our farm. This in turn will prevent us from keeping it as a farm for future generations, keeping it from becoming just one more development out in the middle of the countryside, keeping it available to the deer and the elk, and I saw over 600 head of elk just this afternoon on the property, keeping it available for unencumbered natural gas production.

Scott, we are only able to meet the daily operating costs of our farm under the present economic conditions of agriculture. Unless there is positive action taken by Congress on the death tax problem, we will try to start making necessary plans to arrange our affairs so that my family is the ultimate winner of a lifelong struggle, the lifelong struggles of my parents and Roberta and me. There is no way we will allow the IRS and Washington, D.C., to take it all away. They just flat don't

deserve it. This, of course, will make it necessary to begin the destruction or the development of one of the largest open space areas in all of Garfield County, Colorado.

Again, we appreciate your efforts.

What did this letter say? Think about what the letter said. If you continue, Uncle Sam, on your track of coming after us, we are not a billionaire family. Again, this is not the Rockefellers or the Gates or the Carnegies, people like that, or Paul Newman. This is a small agricultural family who has worked very hard, the generation before him, his father and mother, and now he and his wife want to pass it on to the next.

But what is the summary of the letter? Let me repeat.

If the death tax is kept in place, this is the impact that he talks about in this letter. He has four things. Number one, I cannot keep it as a farm for future generations. Number two, keeping it from becoming just one more development out in the middle of the countryside. Number three, keeping it available to the deer and elk. And he says in this very letter that he saw 600 head of elk on his property just the afternoon that he wrote me this letter. You think they are going to be there after the government is done with the death tax and that becomes a subdivision? Think again. And keeping it available for unencumbered natural gas production.

This is a real letter from some people out there. They do not have a floor full of lawyers. They do not have a foundation. They do not have a trust. All they have got is a hardworking family, and the dreams that all of us dream, that something we do in our life can pass on to the kids in the next life.

It is interesting. I see Warren Buffett and some of these other people say, "Well, I'm giving all away but a small percentage of my estate." Let me tell you, when you are worth several billion dollars, even 2 percent, that does not sound like a lot until you figure out the calculation. Those lawyers protect the true foundations.

Again, remember, these foundations were not put out there just because these wealthy people wanted to take a little time and create some more paperwork and create another structure in their life to have to worry about. These were created so that the very wealthiest could avoid the death tax or minimize the death tax. Yet they have the audacity to come out to the rest of us and sign this ad.

Mind you, this is not all the wealthy people that have signed it clearly, and many of my good friends have this kind of wealth. They did not sign that ad.

But understand what a death tax does. Remember, a death tax does not have a time span between it. In other words, if you have dad who is working on the ranch with son who has the grandson, or this son's son or the grandson here, so we have three generations. If grandpa dies and the prop-

erty then passes to his son or his daughter, and that son or daughter, they then pay the estate tax. Let us do it here. I think it is easier to follow.

Here is generation A, generation B, and generation C. Generation A dies. Estate tax right here. The death tax right there to B. So B has to come up with the money to pay off this estate tax so that he in hopes or she in hopes can pass this on to their next generation.

But what happens if, after A dies, B unfortunately is killed in a car accident at a young age? Let us say B is killed at age 50 in a car wreck. Do you know what happens? Even though his father may have died just a few months before, you have the death tax there, and the minute B dies, you have got it again, even if it is in a short period of time. What do you think the odds of survival of that ranch or that small business are?

Remember that the people that signed this ad that say a death tax is good for our country, these people protect themselves. Let us call it B for billionaire. They protect themselves with lawyers and lawyers and foundations and foundations, so that when Uncle Sam comes in, they cannot quite pierce it. They cannot get in there. So it is real easy to stand with a big chest and say, "By gosh, this death tax ought to stay in place." It is about time that person went up and visited that little family business or that little family farm or that contractor who owns a dump truck and a bulldozer and a building.

Let us be realistic. Our common goal in these Chambers is to preserve the family unit, and a part of the family unit is to preserve from one generation to the next generation those small businesses and those family dreams.

Let me read on. Here is a letter I got I think last week.

Dear Mr. McInnis, I am writing to encourage you to keep the repeal of the death tax on the front burner. As an owner of a family business, it is extremely important that, upon our death, the business be able to be passed to our son and to our daughter, both of whom work in the business, without a threat of having to liquidate to pay the death taxes on assets that have already been taxed once.

This letter brings up a good example. Remember that this property, the property that you own, that you are going to get taxed on upon your death, you have already paid taxes on it. So this property, with this small exception of some IRAs, and they should be taxed, but with that small exception, the property that is hit by the death tax has already had its taxes paid. It is double or triple or even worse taxation and, as is pointed out here, without a threat to liquidate to pay inheritance tax or death taxes on assets that have already been taxed once. Of all of the taxes we pay, this tax, the death tax, is truly double taxation and unfair.

I am aware that several wealthy people, i.e., William Gates, Sr., George

Soros, et cetera, have come out against repeal of the death tax. This is one of the most self-serving demonstrations I have ever seen. They have theirs in trusts, in foundations, in offshore accounts, et cetera, and will pay no or minimum tax. Whatever their political motivations are, they certainly do not represent or speak for the vast majority of farmers and ranchers and small business owners in this country.

Again, I urge you to push hard for the repeal of the death tax. Signed, Anthony Allen.

This letter came out of California.

This letter came out of the West: My wife and I graduated and got married and started farming in 1961. Our children and us have worked from daylight till after dark with very few days off for the last 40 years. We have paid sales taxes, we have paid property taxes, we have paid income taxes, and we have paid Federal taxes on all of our trucks, on our trailers, on our properties, to mention just a few of the taxes that we have really had to pay.

After all of the years, we have built up enough equity to earn a decent income. Now we want to start planning for old age and death with estate planning and life insurance that we can afford. We hope that the Federal Government will not force our children to sell this farm to pay that death tax. The State of Colorado has given us some relief, but now it is time for the United States Government to do the same.

Let us go on. I am not going to read every letter here, but I want you to get the gist.

Here is one. This guy's name is Chris Anderson. He is 24 years old. This is this new generation, the young men and women of my children's age. This young generation offers more promise than any generation in the history of this country. This generation is going to bring more to this country and contribute more to this country than any other generation in the history of this country. I have never had more confidence in a generation than I do in the 20-something-year-olds right now.

Are we going to go out there and start them out by saying, look, your dad and mom want to contribute to your success, your dad and mom want to help you continue to make this country greater and so, therefore, Uncle Sam is going to step in between your folks and you and penalize by a death tax? Is that really the theory that we want to operate under in this country?

Listen to this. Here is a 24-year-old young man.

I am Chris Anderson. I am 24 years old, and I run a small mail order business. I listened with great interest when you talked about the death tax. In all likelihood, I will not face the problems you are outlining, at least not in the near future. I am not in line to inherit a business. However, I am soon to be married and look forward to having a family; and perhaps one day my children will want to follow in my footsteps.

Here is a 24-year-old young man who is about to be married, he is not going to inherit a business, he has his own small business which he has started, and Chris is saying to me, look, someday maybe I can realize my dream of passing it on to our children.

Chris goes on. I hope and pray that they will not face the additional grief caused by death tax. A 55 percent tax is, at best, a huge burden on the family business and the loved ones of the deceased. At worst, it can be a death blow that ruins what could otherwise have been the future of yet another generation.

Here is a 24-year-old young man. You see what I talk about when I say how great this generation is. At 24 years old, frankly, when I was 24 I am not sure I was thinking about the next generation. But here this young man at 24 years, he and his fiancée are thinking about the next generation, and they are thinking many years into the future. When they talk about, at worst this death tax could be the death blow that ruins what otherwise could have been the future of yet another generation, this letter is not a plea for help. I just wanted to let you know that, although I am not a victim of this tax, I appreciate and applaud the fight against it.

I firmly believe that Congress and the government at large need to recognize that America's future is and will always be firmly rooted in the success of small businesses. Many of these businesses are family-owned with the need for the next generation to continue them into the future.

I spent a few years working for a small family-owned business. Not just myself but several workers depended on the income they derived from working for this small family business.

So Chris is saying here I spent many years working for a small business, and many of us, including his fellow employees, depended on the success of that business owner for their employment. This addresses directly the point, that these people who signed that ad say it only affects 2 percent. It affects an entire community when you take that money out of the community and transfer it to Uncle Sam's headquarters in Washington, D.C., for redistribution.

I fear for those workers, Chris says, when the tax man comes knocking. This tax has claws that rip at many more people than the immediate family of the deceased.

This is critical. Mr. Speaker, this is critical. This death tax, as said by Chris in his letter, has claws that reach beyond the person that is being taxed. It reaches and impacts the workers, the entire community. He says it here. He says claws that rip at many more people than the immediate family of the deceased. It has a huge negative impact on the employees of these family businesses. I hope that your constituents recognize this, and they will continue to put their trust in working to do away with this death tax.

This was Chris Anderson. Chris is from New Jersey. My district is in Colorado. This is a young man who took time, he and his fiancée, to send me a letter to say how punitive and what this death tax does.

We are in a society where tax is necessary. Obviously, we want the best schools we can fund. We want a strong military. We want a transportation system. But do we have to reach to the point that we have got to go to double or triple taxation and to a tax that on its face is unfair? Can you imagine what our forefathers would have thought that we were going to tax not only every stage of life but, upon death, to tax death, death as a taxable event?

Here is another one.

Dear Scott, I wish there were some way I could help you get this tax eliminated. They are discriminatory and socialistic taxes. I can't for the life of me understand how they got passed. How can anyone advocate taxing somebody twice?

I can answer your question, John. Back here in the Capitol or in the government, they depend on taxing for revenue, not going out and setting up a business and creating capital. They will tax you at every opportunity they can, unless we have a balance, and the balance we have out there, colleagues, are your constituents and the harm that we are doing to the very people we represent if we put punitive and unfair taxes on their shoulders.

□ 2100

If we do not recognize the fact that they have overpaid their taxes, if we do not recognize the fact in tough economic times, we should not keep their dollars, as President Bush says, in Washington, D.C. to spend on more Federal programs; but we should take their dollars and give it back to the people who earned it.

Now, John, some people would say that tonight I get emotional when I speak here at the podium, but I firmly believe that the punishment that we are dealing out here to families in America and communities in America by this death tax, by not refunding some of this surplus, is unstabilizing. It has negative impacts that some of the people who may have signed that New York Times ad have never tasted in their life, but a lot of small families in America and a lot of small communities in America have that bitter taste.

Let us go on with John's letter: "Why should a family who has worked for 45 years and paid their taxes on time every year, year after year after year; who has worked in their family business; who has built up a dream for their next generation, be taxed in this manner?"

John, the only answer I can give you is that it is unfair. We know that. I am addressing my colleagues' constituents.

Finally, let me wrap up here. Let us just look at a real quick one here. Der-

rick Roberts, his family's ranch in northern Colorado for 125 years. Listen to this letter. I ask my colleagues to listen. Derrick Roberts: "My family has ranched in Colorado for 125 years. My sons and daughters are the sixth generation to work this land." The sixth generation. "We want to continue, but the Internal Revenue Service is forcing almost all ranchers and many farmers out of business. What's the problem? It's the death tax. The demand for our land is very high and the 35-acre ranchettes are selling in this area for as high as \$145 an acre. We have 20,000 acres. We want to keep it as open space, but the United States Government is making it impossible, because we will have to pay 55 percent of the value of that land when my parents die. Ranchers are barely scraping by these days anyway. If we were willing to develop home sites, we could stop the ranching, but since we want to save the ranch, we are in trouble.

"Now, the family has been able to scrape up the estate tax or the death taxes when each generation died up to this point. This time, though, I think we are done for. Our only other option is to give the ranch to a nonprofit organization and I can assure you, they all want it. But they won't guarantee they won't develop it. My dad is 90. We don't have a lot of time left to decide what to do." That is what Derrick says.

"We are only one of 2 or 3 ranchers that are left around here. Many ranches have been subdivided. One of the last to go was a family that had been there as long as ours. When the old folks died, the kids borrowed money to pay the death tax. Soon, they had to start selling cattle to pay the interest on the death tax. When they ran out of cattle, the ranch was foreclosed, and now it is being developed. That family that owned that ranch now lives in a trailer near town and the father who was a multi-generation rancher now works as a highway foreman for the State highway department."

Is that fairness? Is that what we call the theory that we all grew up under, the dream of the American family, and the dream of one family helping the next generation? Of course it is not.

Madam Speaker, I would hope, in conclusion, that all of my colleagues take serious note of just what kind of impact that death tax has once we get below the billionaires that signed that ad for The New York Times. Those billionaires that signed that ad, and I do not know for sure, but I bet the finest dinner in Washington, because I know they are going to have to buy it, I bet the finest dinner in Washington, every one of those people that signed that that are wealthy people have already built their foundations, have already minimized their death tax.

So these people are up here, but what about that gap down there? That is what I am talking about, I say to my colleagues, that gap in here. Those are

the people that we better pay some serious attention to. Those are the people that will suffer when this economy turns sour, if we do not put some of those tax dollars back in their pocket like the President says. Those are the people that will not be able to go from generation to generation with a family business.

We have, I say to my colleagues, a very, very important mission in front of us, and that mission is to help protect the families that put us here; to help provide for the future generations, through the wealth of their own families, through the wealth of hard work, through the wealth of love. It is not because of Uncle Sam that these people have been successful. It is so, so important for us to look beyond the gates of Washington, D.C., a city which is almost wholly operated on taxpayer dollars. It is time for us to look to middle-America and see exactly what our tax policies are doing, to see what kind of punishment.

Now, we know that taxes are necessary, but we doggone well better sit down and figure out which taxes are fair and necessary, and that is the trail that we should walk.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS, PATIENT PROTECTIONS, AND HMO REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fervor and emotion that my colleague just spoke about, especially in dealing with the death tax situation, because we have many people back in my home State of Iowa that need this type of relief if, in fact, they are going to pass on their family farms to their children. The way that that tax is calculated and who the benefit goes to can be done many ways. One can say the benefit goes to the person who dies, and that person may have some considerable assets; but in actuality, it is the person who inherits that has to pay the tax, and if we look at who these people are, very, very frequently, they do not have assets. They are not rich, and then they end up having to sell off half of the farm in order to pay the Federal taxes. I think that needs to be fixed.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak tonight on an issue that I find emotional too, and that has to do with the Patients' Bill of Rights and patient protections as it relates to HMOs.

Madam Speaker, about a week ago I was in my apartment here in Washington watching C-SPAN; and there was a panel on, a panel of former Members of Congress, and they were being interviewed and giving comments about what they thought would happen this year in the legislative arena. And these pundits were giving their opinions on tax cuts and prescription drug

benefits and other things, and then one of the panelists said something. He said, "You know, I think this deal about patient protection doesn't need to be done. You know, I really don't know anyone who has been harmed by HMOs." Madam Speaker, I nearly fell off my sofa. I nearly fell off my sofa when this pundit, this former Member of Congress said, "You know, who needs patient protection, HMO reform because, after all, nobody is being hurt." I thought to myself, what world is that man living in? What world is that man living in?

I thought, does he not read the newspapers? Does he not see stories like this: "What his parents didn't know about HMOs may have killed this baby." Maybe this former Member of Congress, who I happen to know; he is a friend, he is a fine man, but I am thinking to myself, how could he make this comment?

Does he not see newspapers like this: "HMOs' cruel rules leave her dying for the doc she needs." Where has he been?

Madam Speaker, before coming to Congress, I was a reconstructive surgeon. I took care of lots of babies that were born with congenital defects like this cleft lip and cleft palate. Fifty percent of the reconstructive surgeons in the country in the last 2 years have had cases like this denied by HMOs as not being medically necessary. What world does that man live in? I thought to myself, well, maybe he does not read the national news magazines. Maybe he did not see the cover on Time Magazine that featured this family with this little girl, this little boy, a husband, a mother that documented how the mother died because the HMO inappropriately denied care. Maybe he does not live in that world. Maybe he does not read Time Magazine.

I thought to myself, maybe he does not read The Washington Post. Most people in Washington do, especially former Members, but maybe he does not. Maybe he did not see the cover story in the Washington Post about this young lady who was hiking 40 miles west of here, fell off a cliff, broke her arm, her pelvis, stunned, fractured her skull, laying there at the bottom of the cliff. Her boyfriend phones in the air flight. They take her to the emergency room. She is treated, and then the HMO does not pay her bill because she did not phone ahead for prior authorization. I thought to myself, what world does this man live in?

I thought to myself, maybe this former Member of Congress has not been watching any of the debates on the floor of Congress. Maybe he has not been following the Patients' Bill of Rights, the debate that we had. Maybe he did not bother to watch the debate we had on the floor when sitting right in that chair was this little boy a few years afterwards. This little boy when he was about 6 had a high fever one night, like about 104 or 105, so his mother phones the HMO, she is told to take him to this one hospital, the only

one that is authorized, about 70 miles away, he has a cardiac arrest on the way, he ends up with gangrene in both hands and both feet, and this is what happens when you have gangrene in both hands and both feet. They have to be amputated. I thought, maybe that man had not watched our debate here on the floor. What world is he living in?

But I will tell my colleagues this: this little boy who, when he came to the floor for that debate, was now about 6 or 7, pulls on his leg prostheses with his arm stumps. But do my colleagues know what? This little boy is real; and if he had a finger, Madam Speaker, and we could prick it, he would bleed. And if he had a hand, some day he would be able to caress the cheek of the woman that he loves, and maybe he would be able to play basketball. But do my colleagues know what? According to this pundit, this former Member of Congress sitting on this panel, after all, there is not anyone being injured by HMOs; it is just baloney.

□ 2115

Madam Speaker, I beg to differ. People come up to me all the time here in Washington and back home in Iowa. They tell me about stories like this, how it is affecting them or their family.

Just a few days ago, about a 48-year-old woman came up to me. She had had a mastectomy for cancer. She had been going through chemotherapy. Her physician had recommended that she have an important test to see whether the tumor had returned. Her HMO denied it. She came up to me in tears in Des Moines, Iowa. She battled that HMO through an internal review and finally they said yes. Then, when she was going to go for her test, they pulled the rug from underneath her and they said no.

She said, Greg, I had to do something I have never done before. I had to ask my husband to carry on for me on this fight, because that HMO has just worn me out. I asked my husband to carry on this fight because I didn't have the energy. I don't have the energy anymore to fight that HMO.

Do Members know what? If that woman dies because she has not gotten her test, what is the HMO out? Nothing, because she is dead. That is not fair and that is not justice. I beg the pardon of that pundit who was on that panel, that man who I like but who does not seem to understand or has been insulated in some way from what has gone on everywhere else in this country.

Why do Members think the biggest line in the movie *As Good as It Gets* was when Helen Hunt tells Jack Nicholson, "You know, that HMO is just preventing my son with asthma from getting the care that he needs." Then she went into a long string of expletives.

My wife and I were in the theater that night. We saw something we had

never seen before: People stood up and clapped. What world is that man living in?

Well, Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle in both Houses who have been fighting for 5 or 6 years now to get a strong Patients' Bill of Rights passed, they will not give up, because we know that this is affecting millions of people every day on decisions that some HMOs are making.

We need to fix that. We need to fix that here in Washington, because this problem was started by Washington. It was started right here in 1974, when Congress passed a law which took that oversight of insurance plans away from the States, for heaven's sake, where it had been for 200 years, took it away from the States under a bill called the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA; they took it away from the States and put nothing in its place, and basically gave immunity to health plans, employer health plans, from the consequences of their decisions, an immunity that no other industry in this country has.

Madam Speaker, I sit on the Committee on Commerce. Last year we heard testimony on the tire problem, where tires were blowing out. At last count, there were about 118 people killed from that. Madam Speaker, what do Members think would happen if Congress passed a law that gave legal immunity to tire makers? Why, we would be run out of Washington on a rail.

Yet, we are dealing with today a law that gives an HMO that makes this kind of decision that results in this kind of injury for somebody who gets their insurance from their employer a free ride. It needs to be fixed. It needs to be fixed.

It is a pretty difficult fight. The HMO industry, their business allies, and some in Congress have fought this tooth and nail. They have spent \$100 million at least trying to prevent the Patients' Bill of Rights from actually becoming law.

Our first victory, though, came in 1999 when the House overwhelmingly passed the bipartisan bill that I and my colleague, a conservative Republican, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), and a Democrat, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), wrote. We passed that bill by a vote of 275 to 151 in the face of very stiff HMO industry opposition.

For the last 6 months, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), and I rewrote our bill. We negotiated with Senator MCCAIN to bring him into this fight. On February 6, we introduced our bill, H.R. 526, the Bipartisan Patient Protection Act of 2001, and Senators MCCAIN, EDWARDS and KENNEDY introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, this bill represents a meaningful bipartisan compromise on patient's rights issues such as scope, who does the bill cover; plan accountability; employer liability.

I want to go into some more detail. My bill, the Ganske-Dingell bill, includes the basic protections that need to be addressed in this debate, such as the right to choose one's own doctor; protections against one's doctor being gagged by HMOs, not being able to tell us the whole story; access to specialists, such as pediatricians and obstetrician-gynecologists; access to emergency care; access to plan information, so we know what is going on in the plan.

My bill covers all 190 million Americans in private insurance, including ERISA plans, non-Federal government plans, and plans in the individual market. The bill addresses the concerns of those who want to protect States' rights by allowing States to demonstrate that their insurance laws are at least substantially equivalent to the new Federal standards, thereby leaving in place equivalent or stronger State laws. States can continue to enforce their patient protection laws under our bill.

Under our bipartisan bill, patients would be assured that doctors can make medical decisions involving the medical care. When a plan denies coverage, a patient would have the ability to pursue an independent review of the plan's decision by a panel of medical experts, independent of the health plan. That decision would be binding on the plan.

Our bill outlines a new compromise on liability, a new compromise on liability that provides for meaningful accountability for injured patients. We took the lead from the Supreme Court in its case *Pegram v. Herdrich*, and addressed the desire of multistate employer plans for uniformity of benefit decisions.

The new bill creates a bifurcated Federal and State liability system. Injured patients can hold health plans accountable in State court for disputes involving the quality of medical care, those involving medical necessity decisions. However, patients who were injured by a plan's administrative non-medical decision to deny benefits or coverage would proceed to Federal court, and additionally, punitive damages are prohibited in State court unless the plan shows a willful or a wanton disregard for patients' rights or safety.

Our bill also addresses other concerns raised by the bill that passed the House in 1999. For instance, our new bill says, "Employers may not be held liable unless they 'directly participate' in a decision to deny benefits that result in injury or death."

Madam Speaker, I have talked to business groups all across the State of Iowa, employers who run small businesses. I asked them, I say, "When you hire an HMO to provide a health plan for your family and for your employees, do you as an employer ever get involved in the medical decision-making?" And they say, "Not on your life. Number one, it is a privacy issue. We

do not want to know what is happening to our employees in their private medical life. We do not want them to know what is going on in our family, either. But we do not get involved in that."

Under our bill, Madam Speaker, that employer cannot be held liable. In recent months, the debate on patient protection has focused on whether or not and to what extent we should hold HMOs accountable when they make medical decisions that harm patients, or even cause them to die.

In recent weeks, congressional offices have been inundated, as I am sure the gentlewoman's office has, Madam Speaker, with messages opposing a strong patient protection bill of rights like our Bipartisan Patient Protection Act of 2001.

I feel, Madam Speaker, that our colleagues need to hear the truth about the liability provisions in our bill, and why I have included those liability provisions in our bill.

Madam Speaker, many opponents to liability provisions in patient protection bills such as the Ganske-Dingell bill say, Why do we need them in the first place? Well, the goal of the liability provision is to ensure that patients receive the proper health care when they need it, and that a patient has a right to redress when the plan makes a medical decision to deny a claim for benefits and causes injury or death.

Under current law, as I said, the patient has access to an internal review process. If there is still a dispute upon conclusion of the plan's internal process, the patient may only seek the value of the benefit in Federal court under section 502 of ERISA. There is no provision under current law for consequential damages caused by the failure to provide the benefit, whether or not there was an injury.

Some States, however, have passed provisions that would allow the patient to hold some health plans accountable in State court for failing to provide adequate care.

Madam Speaker, under our new liability provision, when a patient is denied a benefit, he or she will have access to a swift internal review process and a strong independent external review process to help settle disputes, and that, in the vast majority of times, will get the patient appropriate care.

If the patient feels he or she is owed a benefit under the review process, they will have access to existing 502 ERISA remedies in Federal court to seek the benefit, but not other damages. In those rare cases when a patient suffers harm or death as a result of the plan's action, a patient will have access to Federal court under ERISA section 502 if the dispute was a purely administrative contractual decision. In order to prevail and recover limited damages, the patient would need to show that the plan acted negligently in making the decision, and that the decision caused the patient's injury or death.

But, Madam Speaker, if the dispute involves a medically-reviewable decision, the patient will be able to seek redress in State court under applicable State law. Generally, our bill prohibits punitive damages if the health plan follows the review process and follows the determination of the external review entity.

In our new bifurcated Federal-State liability, this is a significant compromise. It is a significant move from the State cause of action in the original bill that passed the House, the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill, in 1999. Our original language did not change the existing remedy in section 502 of ERISA. Rather, it simply clarified that State causes of action were not preempted under section 514.

The business and insurance industry raised concerns that this approach would inhibit their ability to administer a multistate employee health benefit plan.

□ 2130

Madam Speaker, we made the step towards the business community. Our new bill answers that concern by leaving suits involving benefit administration in Federal court under section 502, thereby allowing employers and insurers to have uniformity in administering their health plans across State lines.

The first part of the liability section in our bill adds to that existing Federal remedy under section 502. Under this new Federal cause of action, a plaintiff may seek both economic and non-economic damages. By excluding medically reviewable decisions from the Federal remedy, group health plans will only be subject to liability under section 502 for benefit administrative decisions. That includes decisions such as whether a patient is eligible for coverage, whether a benefit is part of the plan or other purely administrative contract decisions.

Punitive damages are not allowed under the Federal cause of action. A civil assessment can be awarded upon showing clear and convincing evidence that the plan acted in bad faith. That standard carries a high burden of proof and is consistent with State statutes for the award of damages. That standard ensures a health plan will not be subject to these damages for simply making a wrong decision.

The patient would have to show that the plan has demonstrated flagrant disregard for health and safety in order for the plan to be liable. Madam Speaker, before exercising that legal remedy, the patient would have to exhaust both internal and external appeals processes.

If the patient suffers irreparable harm or death prior to completion of the process, the patient or the plan can continue the review process and the court can consider the outcome.

The second part of the liability section in the Ganske-Dingell bill amends ERISA section 514 to allow cause of ac-

tions in State court for a denial of a claim for benefits involving a medically reviewable decision, a medically reviewable decision that causes harm or death to a patient.

In our bill, punitive damages are prohibited in cases where the plan follows the requirements of the appeal processes. That provision protects plans and businesses when they follow the decision of the external review panel.

But I ask, Madam Speaker, if an industry exhibited a willful and wanton disregard for safety, would you grant them immunity? Under current ERISA law, they have it. We simply say in this section that if they exhibit willful and wanton disregard for safety that they would be liable if it results in an injury.

The Ganske-Dingell bill removes the preemption of State law in ERISA 514. That allows injured patients to bring a cause of action in State court for injuries by a medical decision.

That new provision is a significant compromise, because it limits the scope of actions that can be filed in State court to those involving a medically reviewable decision, whereas the bill that we passed here in 1999, the industry said that you could take contractual decisions into State court. We did not think our bill did that, but we were willing to clarify that, and that what is what we have done.

In addition, we think that our current bill's bifurcated liability provision is consistent with the current direction of the courts in interpreting ERISA law.

Recent Supreme Court decisions and the 5th Circuit decision involving Texas' health plan liability law would allow the continued development of State case laws. The health plan liabilities laws that have passed in nine States, Arizona, California, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas and Washington, would not be preempted in our new liability provision. It would be under other bills that are currently being developed, and it would have been under past efforts to create an exclusive, and this is important, Madam Speaker, under an exclusive Federal remedy. All of those preempt State law.

Our new bill further clarifies that employers are protected from liability in either Federal or State court, unless they directly participate in a denial that causes death or harm.

Madam Speaker, that "direct participation" standard was developed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HILLEARY) and later used in the Coburn-Shadegg substitute. The business and the insurance communities said the previous Norwood-Dingell language was too broad because it held employers harmless unless they exercised discretionary authority to make a decision on a particular claim.

In a spirit of bipartisan compromise, we rewrote the section. We moved towards our critics. But what did they do? They took a step away. They

trashed our bill again. Talk about a moving goal post.

In addition to the direct participation protection, our bill specifically lists decisions that are not considered direct participation. Those specific actions include the employer selection of the group health plan, which plan they choose, the health insurance issuer, third-party administrator or other agent, employers are protected in any cost benefit analysis undertaken by the selection of the plan.

They are protected for any participation in the process of creating, continuing, modifying or terminating the plan or any benefit, and they are protected for any participation in the design of any benefit under the plan. There are additional protections for employers who advocate, who advocate on behalf of an employee in the appeals process.

Furthermore, our bill clarifies existing ERISA law to make certain that a group health plan can purchase insurance to cover losses incurred from suits under this title, just as any medical health professional would do when they know that they are responsible for making medical decisions.

Madam Speaker, recently President Bush sent a letter to Congress outlining his principles for patient protection legislation. And while the President's principles were in nature general, I was pleased to note that our bill met almost all of the President's stated goals, and those goals included providing comprehensive patient protections, applying those protections to all Americans. That is a significant improvement over what we saw in the Senate last time, a review process where doctors make medical decisions and patients receive care in a timely fashion and protections for employers, but the President calls for only allowing Federal lawsuits.

Madam Speaker, such an action would preempt State patient protection laws, including those in Texas, and would treat HMOs differently than all other businesses that could hurt people.

Madam Speaker, I do not know how you can move everything into Federal court and then say at the same time that you are preserving State law. How do you stand, Madam Speaker, in two places at the same time?

As with the President's stated goals, our Ganske-Dingell Bipartisan Patient Protection Act provides patient protections for all Americans, as I said. In addition, our bill empowers governors to certify their State's patient protections provisions as being equivalent to the Federal floor through a process similar to the one for participation in the State children's health insurance program, so that States can continue to enforce their own laws for their citizens.

In addition, our bill has every one of the patients protections listed in the President's statement of principles, emergency room care, OB/GYNs for

women, prescription drug coverage, clinical trials, pediatricians, stopping gag clauses, health plan information choices and continuity of care.

Our bill provides for a quick internal, independent external review process modeled after the strong Texas medical care review process, because getting prompt medical care is the goal of our bill. Our bill requires exhaustion of the review process. Only if a patient dies or is irreparably harmed can a family go to court before the review is completed.

Madam Speaker, it has never been clear to me how you can write a provision that says you have to go through an appeals process before you can go to court when the initial decision can result in an injury in a result such as this.

This mother and father did not have a chance to go through an internal or an external appeal process before their little boy had his cardiac arrest en route to the hospital and developed gangrene and had to have both hands and both feet amputated. But under our bill, because he suffered irreparable harm, that HMO would be accountable, and it should be accountable.

Anyone who tries to pass a law that gives a free skate to a health plan on a case like this I would say is ignoring the scales of justice.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with President Bush and my colleagues to ensure swift passage of the Patient Protection Act so that the President can sign into law patient protection legislation as he so frequently talked about during his Presidential campaign.

The HMO industry has made a lot of allegations. One of the things that they have talked about is that employers would be subject to a multitude of frivolous lawsuits. We have already spoken a lot about that.

As I have said, our bill would allow employers to be liable only, only if they have entered into the decision-making.

Another HMO allegation is that with a strong appeals process there is no need for legal accountability for managed care. Madam Speaker, who are they kidding?

Look, they have legal accountability in Texas, and they need it. There is a case in Texas where a man was suicidal in the hospital. His doctor said that he needed to stay in the hospital. His HMO said, no, he does not; he can stay if his family wants to pay for it, but we are discharging him. So the family took him home, and that night he drank half a gallon of antifreeze, and he died.

It is important that Texas has that accountability, that legal, that liability provision. Because the way that their appeals process is supposed to work is that if there is a dispute between the treating doctor and the health plan and it is in a case like this where something bad could happen immediately, then it goes to an expedited

review before the HMO can kick out the patient, but the HMO just ignored it.

The HMO just ignored Texas law. And in that situation, that is why you need at the end of the day accountability and liability for a health plan that makes that kind of decision that results in a man going home and drinking half a gallon of antifreeze and dying.

These are real cases. How about a patient who sustained injuries to his neck and spine from a motorcycle accident? After which, he was taken to the hospital. The hospital's physicians recommended immediate surgery, but the health plan refused to certify. The surgery had to be canceled. Soon afterwards, the insurer did agree to pay, but by then the patient was paralyzed.

Are you going to tell me that that patient who is going to spend the rest of his life paralyzed does not have his right to a day in court because he did not have the time to go through an external appeals process?

□ 2145

How about the patient who was admitted to the emergency room of his community hospital complaining of paralysis and numbness of his extremities. The treating emergency room physician concluded that the gravity of the patient's neurological condition necessitated his immediate transfer to an academic hospital and made the arrangements. The health plan denied the authorization and recommended others.

By the time the physician was able to have the patient transferred, the patient had sustained permanent quadriplegia, could not move both arms or his legs, paralyzed from the neck down.

Now, that patient did not have a chance to go through an internal and an external appeals process, but he sure as heck did suffer irreparable harm. Our bill handles that situation. The opposition's do not.

Another HMO industry allegation is that the Ganske-Dingell bill liability provision would significantly increase the cost of health insurance. The truth of that allegation is blown way out of proportion. They always say, yes, if the cost goes up so much, then so many people are going to lose their insurance.

The Congressional Budget Office scored other liability provisions such as that contained in the Norwood-Dingell bill that passed in the 106th Congress, showing that premiums would rise about 4.1 percent over 5 years. Critics of our bill pounced on that, that costs were going to skyrocket. But they were wrong.

The part of the bill that costs the most was not the liability provision. It was the section designed to prevent the lawsuits that is common to all of the patient legislation plans that we have seen, and that was the internal and external review sections.

In addition, the HMO industry failed to note that the total CBO projection

was spread over 5 years with virtually no cost in the first year and about 1 percent per year after that up to 4 percent total. Now, compare that with the average 7 percent annual increases in recent years by the HMO industry itself.

Opponents have cited an ever-changing and ridiculously wide range of job loss figures for every 1 percent increase in cost. First, the opponents of legal accountability cite the figures that 400,000 individuals would lose their health coverage for every 1 percent increase in premiums. When the GAO challenged that figure, saying that it was based on outdated information and did not account for all the relevant factors, opponents lowered the job loss figure to 300,000 for every 1 percent.

Again, the GAO looked at this and caused opponents to lower their estimate a second time to 200,000. However, none of those predictions have come to pass. For example, between 1988 and 1996 the number of workers offered coverage actually increased despite premium increases each year.

Now, the next allegation I will answer is that consumer support for patient protection evaporates when they learn that it will cost them some additional premiums. This is another one of the HMO industry's distortions. Patients want a real enforceable patient protection Bill of Rights, and they are willing to pay something for it.

A 1998 nationwide survey by Penn, Schoen & Berland showed that 86 percent of the public support a bill that would give patients' health plan legal accountability, access to specialists, emergency services, and point of service coverage. When asked if they would support a bill if their premiums increased between \$1 and \$4 a month, 78 percent supported the bill.

Madam Speaker, the House-passed bill, the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill, would have raised insurance premiums an average of 4.1 percent. That would have meant increases in employee premiums of about \$1.36 per month for an individual and \$3.75 a month for a family member.

Finally, I want to dispel the allegation that patients are satisfied with the quality of care being provided by HMOs. HMOs frequently do these surveys of their membership, and they come up with some figure like 80 percent of the enrollees are happy with their care or satisfied. What they fail to point out is that these are all the healthy people in their plan who are not utilizing the plan.

I mean, does anyone think, when they saw that movie "As Good As It Gets" and saw the response to Helen Hunt's descriptor of her HMO that the public is not aware of this?

A recent public opinion survey found that most Americans believed problems with managed care have not improved, 74 percent. Most think that legislative action is either more urgent or equally as urgent as when this debate

began, 88 percent. A 1999 survey of physicians and nurses reported that 72 percent of physicians and 78 percent of nurses believed that managed care has decreased the quality of care for people who are sick.

In addition, Republican pollster, Linda Divall, did a post-election poll right after this last election of issues that the new President and the newly elected Congress should work together on to accomplish for the good of the country. In every group, men, stay-at-home moms, working women, a Patients' Bill of Rights was at the top of the list.

Madam Speaker, the American public wants and deserves a strong patient Bill of Rights now, this year. It is time for us to put on the President's desk a bill like the Ganske-Dingell bill or the McCain-Edwards bill. We need to get it signed into law, Madam Speaker.

Millions of people are having decisions that HMOs are making today. To go back to what I started about at the beginning of the speech, for anyone to say that people are not having any problems with HMO, I would just have to say, what world are they living in?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. POMEROY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending the funeral of a former legislative leader.

Mr. KELLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the hospitalization of his daughter.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 14.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, March 20.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, March 15.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GANSKE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1191. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prescription Drug Marketing Act of 1987; Prescription Drug Amendments of 1992; Policies, Requirements, and Administrative Procedures; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No. 92N-0297] (RIN: 0905-AC81) received March 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1192. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Rapid City, South Dakota) [MM Docket No. 00-177; RM-9954] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1193. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Woodville and Wells, Texas) [MM Docket No. 00-171; RM-9926] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1194. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Window Rock, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00-237; RM-10006] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1195. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Sioux Falls, South Dakota) [MM Docket No. 00-200; RM-9967] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1196. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Aspen, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 00-215; RM-9994] received March 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1197. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 107-50); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1198. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 107-51); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1199. A letter from the Department of Defense, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of December 31, 2000, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 741. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 496. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to promote deployment of advanced services and foster the development of competition for the benefit of consumers in all regions of the Nation by relieving unnecessary burdens on the Nation's two percent local exchange telecommunications carriers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 725. A bill to establish a toll free number under the Federal Trade Commission to assist consumers in determining if products are American-made (Rept. 107-21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. ISTOOK (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 973. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the operation by the National Institutes of Health of an experimental program to stimulate competitive research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Ms. CAPITO, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 974. A bill to increase the number of interaccount transfers which may be made from business accounts at depository institutions, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. PETERSON of

Pennsylvania, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HART, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut):

H.R. 975. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 15 percent reduction in payment rates under the prospective payment system for home health services under the Medicare Program and to permanently increase payments for such services that are furnished in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. VITTER:

H.R. 976. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to achieve full funding in fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 977. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide increased authority for school personnel to discipline children with disabilities who engage in certain dangerous behavior; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for dry and wet cleaning equipment which uses non-hazardous primary process solvents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 979. A bill to authorize the President and the Governor of a State to suspend certain environmental and siting requirements applicable to fossil fuel fired electric power plants to alleviate an electric power shortage that may present a threat to public health and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, 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. WAMP (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 980. A bill to establish the Moccasin Bend National Historic Site in the State of Tennessee as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DIAZ-

BALART, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LINDER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OSE, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TANCREDI, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORBERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 981. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 982. A bill to prohibit assistance for Kosovo unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that residents or citizens of Kosovo are not providing assistance to organizations engaging in or otherwise supporting ethnically-motivated violence in southern Serbia or in Macedonia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. BONO:

H.R. 983. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to assign the same priority to providing renewable energy production incentive payments for landfill gas facilities as the priority assigned to providing such payments for other biomass facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the occupational taxes relating to distilled spirits, wine, and beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the dollar limitation on contributions to funeral trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that long-term vehicle storage by tax-exempt organizations which conduct county and similar fairs shall not be treated as an unrelated trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:

H.R. 987. A bill to transfer management of the Banks Lake Unit of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 988. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HORN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 989. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a 3 year pilot program to assist law enforcement officers purchasing homes in locally-designated at-risk areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. HART, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 990. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for charitable deductions for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DREIER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. LARGENT):

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat gold, silver, and platinum, in either coin or bar form, in the same manner as stocks and bonds for purposes of the maximum capital gains rate for individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself and Mr. SIMMONS):

H.R. 992. A bill to provide grants to local governments to assist such local governments in participating in certain decisions related to certain Indian groups and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KELLER:

H.R. 993. A bill to improve the prevention and punishment of criminal smuggling, transporting, and harboring of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 994. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to nonprofit community organizations for the development of open space on municipally owned vacant lots in urban areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 995. A bill to provide permanent appropriations to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund to make payments under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 996. A bill to ensure the timely payment of benefits to eligible persons under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (42 U.S.C. 2210 note); to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 997. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive the part B premium penalty for individuals entitled to TRICARE health benefits as a member or former member of the uniformed services, or dependent of such a member or former member, and to amend title 10, United States Code, to waive the TRICARE requirement for enrollment in Medicare part B in the case of individuals enrolled under the Federal Employees Health Benefits program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 998. A bill to reduce gun trafficking by prohibiting bulk purchases of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 999. A bill to strengthen the standards by which the Surface Transportation Board reviews railroad mergers, and to apply the Federal antitrust laws to rail carriers and railroad transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1000. A bill to adjust the boundary of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site in the State of Ohio, to authorize an exchange of land in connection with the historic site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1001. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make optional the requirement that a State seek adjustment or recovery from an individual's estate of any medical assistance correctly paid on behalf of the individual under the State Medicaid plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1002. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of Biscayne National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1003. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount of wages that a farmer can pay for agricultural labor without being subject to the Federal unemployment tax on that labor to reflect inflation since the unemployment tax was first established, and to provide for an annual inflation adjustment in such maximum amount of wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1004. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to establish a procedure under which individuals whose names do not appear on the list of registered voters in an election for Federal office at a particular polling place may cast provisional

votes at the polling place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHOWS (for himself, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. HART, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1005. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that violent video programming is limited to broadcast after the hours when children are reasonably likely to comprise a substantial portion of the audience, unless it is specifically rated on the basis of its violent content so that it is blockable by electronic means specifically on the basis of that content; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1006. A bill to amend the Emergency Steel Loan Guarantee Act of 1999 to prohibit steel companies receiving loan guarantees from investing the loan proceeds in foreign steel companies and using the loan proceeds to import steel products from foreign countries that are subject to certain trade remedies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KELLER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY):

H.R. 1007. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. TERRY (for himself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BUYER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota):

H.R. 1008. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation and the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Administration from taking action to finalize, implement, or enforce a rule related to the hours of service of drivers for motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Ms. CAPITO):

H.R. 1009. A bill to repeal the prohibition on the payment of interest on demand deposits; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1010. A bill to provide emergency relief to small businesses affected by significant increases in the prices of heating oil, natural gas, propane, and kerosene, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 1011. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide public access to quality medical imaging procedures and radiation therapy procedures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for expenses incurred in teleworking; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. HART, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BEREU-TER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCREARY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WOLF, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HORN, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. QUINN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. KERNS, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. GORDON):

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H. J. Res. 37. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment and voting, by congressional district, of electors for the election of President and Vice President, and to provide procedures for electing the President and Vice President if no candidate receives a majority of electoral votes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. REYES, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COYNE, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing support for a National Reflex Sympathetic Dystrophy (RSD) Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. LEE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WELLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H. Res. 87. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal investment in programs that provide health care services to uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved areas be increased in order to double access to care over the next 5 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. LEACH, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 25: Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. KELLY.
 H.R. 27: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 31: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 40: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 65: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 85: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 100: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GRUCCI, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 101: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GRUCCI, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 102: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GRUCCI, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 122: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BAKER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SIMMONS,

Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HORN, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HART, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 134: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 145: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 148: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 161: Mr. ARMEY.
 H.R. 162: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 179: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 202: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 214: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 220: Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 236: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 240: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 250: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 257: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 267: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 275: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SCHAFER, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 283: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 285: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 288: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 295: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 303: Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. WILSON, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. REYES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. NEY, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 308: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 320: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H.R. 322: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 326: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BACA, Mr. FRANK, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 336: Ms. HART, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 340: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 342: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 347: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 348: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 369: Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 374: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 381: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 385: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 430: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 435: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 456: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 457: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 481: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 488: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 493: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 496: Mr. OTTER and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 499: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 500: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 503: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 511: Ms. SOLIS and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 518: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 525: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 526: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 527: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 572: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 577: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 579: Ms. NORTON, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 581: Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 590: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 600: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 606: Mr. HOLT, Ms. HART, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. REYES, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 611: Ms. LEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 612: Ms. HART, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 613: Mr. UPTON and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 626: Mr. UPTON and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 627: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 650: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 664: Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 676: Mr. BAKER and Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 683: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 686: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 694: Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 699: Mr. GOODE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 708: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 712: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOYD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 717: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MICA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 726: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 737: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 738: Mr. STUMP, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. KING, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 744: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 755: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 762: Mr. BALDWIN.

H.R. 769: Mr. HILLEARY.
 H.R. 770: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 787: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 794: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 808: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 818: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 827: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HORN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 868: Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. HART, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WICKER, Mr.

PLATTS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 877: Mr. PAUL and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 891: Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 899: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 912: Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 914: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 933: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 936: Ms. HART, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BACA, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 938: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 948: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 959: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 962: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 969: Mr. STEARNS and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 13: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. TERRY, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 27: Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KIRK, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CRANE and Mr. TANCREDO.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. HORN and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 41: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 42: Ms. LEE, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HORN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WU, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 57: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 17: Mr. LUTHER and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H. Res. 18: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Ms. HARMAN.

H. Res. 27: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 47: Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Res. 67: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms.

MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 73: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

AMENDMENTS

Under Clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 327

OFFERED BY: MR. OSE

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Paperwork Relief Act".

SEC. 2. FACILITATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DIRECTOR OF OMB.—Section 3504(c) of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Paperwork Reduction Act"), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(6) publish in the Federal Register on an annual basis—

"(A) a list of the requirements applicable to small-business concerns (within the meaning of section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.)) with respect to collection of information by agencies, organized in such a manner that such small-business concerns can easily identify requirements with which they are expected to comply (e.g., organized by North American Industrial Classification System code and industrial/sector description (as published by the Office of Management and Budget)); and

"(B) the agency that issued each such requirement and the website address for such agency; and

"(7) make available on the Internet the information described in paragraph (6)."

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY POINT OF CONTACT.—Section 3506 of such chapter 35 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) In addition to the requirements described in subsection (c), each agency shall, with respect to the collection of information and the control of paperwork, establish one point of contact in the agency to act as a liaison between the agency and small-business concerns (within the meaning of section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.))."

(c) ADDITIONAL REDUCTION OF PAPERWORK FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESSES.—Section 3506(c) of such chapter is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3)(J), by striking the period and inserting ";" and "

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

"(4) in addition to the requirements of this Act regarding the reduction of paperwork for small-business concerns (within the meaning of section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.)), make efforts to further reduce the paperwork burden for small-business concerns with fewer than 25 employees."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE REGARDING PUBLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the

Office of Management and Budget shall publish the first list of requirements required under paragraph (6) of section 3504(c) of title 44, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), and make such list available on the Internet as required by paragraph (7) of such section (as added by subsection (a)), not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE TO STUDY STREAMLINING OF PAPERWORK COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS AND DISSEMINATION FOR SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end of subchapter I the following new section:

"§ 3521. Establishment of task force on feasibility of streamlining information collection requirements and dissemination

"(a) There is hereby established a task force (in this section referred to as the 'task force') to study the feasibility of streamlining requirements with respect to small-business concerns regarding collection of information and strengthening dissemination of information.

"(b) The members of the task force shall be appointed by the Director, and shall include the following:

"(1) At least two representatives of the Department of Labor, including one representative of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and one representative of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

"(2) At least one representative of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(3) At least one representative of the Department of Transportation.

"(4) At least one representative of the Department of the Treasury.

"(5) At least one representative of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

"(6) At least one representative of each of two agencies other than the Department of Labor, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, the Department of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration.

"(7) At least two representatives of the Department of Health and Human Services, including one representative of the Health Care Financing Administration.

"(c) The task force shall examine the feasibility of requiring each agency to consolidate requirements regarding collections of information with respect to small-business concerns within and across agencies without negatively impacting the effectiveness of underlying laws regarding such collections of information, in order that each small-business concern may submit all information required by an agency—

"(1) to one point of contact in the agency;

"(2) in a single format, or using a single electronic reporting system, with respect to the agency; and

"(3) on the same date.

"(d)(1) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act, the task force shall submit a report of its findings under subsection (c) to—

"(A) the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Small Business of the Senate; and

"(B) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

"(2) Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of such Act, the task force shall submit to the individuals described in

paragraph (1) a report examining strengthening dissemination of information and including—

“(A) recommendations for implementing an interactive system for the requirements in section 3504(c)(6) that would allow small-business concerns to identify information collection requirements electronically;

“(B) guidelines for each agency for developing interactive reporting systems that include a component that edits the information submitted by a small-business concern for consistency;

“(C) recommendations for electronic dissemination of such information; and

“(D) recommendations, created in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council (established pursuant to Executive Order 13011, issued July 16, 1996), for the coordination of information among the points of contact described in section 3506(i), so that those points of contact can provide small-business concerns with information collection requirements from other agencies.

“(e) As used in this section, the term ‘small-business concern’ has the meaning

given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3520 the following new item:

“3521. Establishment of task force on feasibility of streamlining information collection requirements and dissemination.”