

Act expands our Federal program for tracing guns used in juvenile crime. Research should be expanded on gun markets to educate the flow of firearms from the legitimate sector to the hands of minors and criminals and how this flow might effectively be reduced."

A few years ago up in Boston in what they called the "Boston Project," they started tracing guns that were used in juvenile homicides and juvenile crimes. Once they started tracing these guns to the illegal gun dealers, they were able to have for 40 months, 40 months, not one child died because we got rid of the illegal guns and we educated our adults.

Now, if we can do that in Boston, why can we not do that across this country? Where I come from in New York, it is very hard to get a gun legally. They have to go through a background check, but eventually they will get it. The problem with New York is all the guns that come into our State are illegal guns, they are guns that we have no control over. What are we supposed to do? Put up a barbed wire fence around New York because we decide that we are going to try to make it safer? And it has made a difference and it has made a big difference, but there is more that we can do.

As a nurse, we hear that homicide rates are down, and thank God they are. What no one is talking about is what it is costing our health care system for those that are surviving. I know the medical care that my son received and still continues to receive and will have to receive for the rest of his life is costing this government a lot of money.

We have four young people in Littleton, Colorado, still in the hospital with spinal cord injuries because of the shootings. The health care that they are going to need. The estimates of health care due to gun violence in this country is almost up to \$20 billion a year. \$20 billion a year. Could we not take that money and put it back into our health care system? Could we not put that towards our educational system? It would help so many of us.

We have an obligation here in Congress. It should not be a battle between Republicans and Democrats. It should be something that we should be working out together and to do the right thing as far as our children and the safety of our children. This is not a slippery road. This is not somewhere we are trying to take away the right of someone to own a gun, but we are asking for responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I plan on being here as much as I can to talk about this subject. There is one more thing that I will ask. The American people have to get involved in this debate and they have to, if they want to change, their voices have to be heard here, and our Congressmen and certainly our Senators need to hear from all Americans.

CONSTITUENT CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight tonight, approximately 32 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to let the Chamber know and all of my colleagues that this special order is one that I secure every week on behalf of the majority, and so I would invite other Members who would like to run down to the floor here for the last 32 minutes to come join us on the floor.

But I want to also mention and refer to a constituent of mine. Her name is Jessika, Jessika Fretwell. She introduced me to Flat Stanley. I got a picture of Flat Stanley here. She faxed the photo, a drawing of Flat Stanley. There is a letter that comes with it, and I would like to read that briefly. She wrote to me.

She said, "In school we read a book about a boy who got mashed by a bulletin board. His name is Flat Stanley. He wanted to go on a trip, so his family folded him up and mailed him to California. I am mailing Flat Stanley to you. Please take him somewhere and write me back telling me where he went. If you have pictures or postcards, please send them too. I will take Flat Stanley back to school and share his adventure with my class. Thank you for helping me with this project. I wish I could fold myself up and visit you. Love, Jessika." And Jessika spells her name with a "K."

So there is Flat Stanley for Jessika. He is on the floor of the United States House of Representatives tonight, and we are proud to have him join us.

□ 2300

I am also pleased to be joined by my good friend and colleague from the great State of Arizona who is here to speak with us tonight. Many of our constituents write to us, not just Jessika but several others. We are here on the floor this evening to refer to some of the comments that have been raised by many of our constituents. We have received so many phone calls and letters in the last few days on the matters of taxes, on Kosovo, on environmental-related topics. I am just curious what kind of things the gentleman from Arizona is hearing about over the weekend and today from his constituents.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding. I am pleased that Flat Stanley joins us on the floor tonight. Usually people leave out the "L" when they describe me, although I am working on the diet.

In all sincerity and seriousness, echoing the comments, though not in complete agreement with my friend from New York who spoke on the floor here earlier, even tonight as we speak, Mr. Speaker, a group of concerned citizens making up a citizens committee on ju-

venile violence meets in the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona. The committee includes clergymen, school administrators and former school administrators, current educators, teachers in the classroom, students in the classroom and parents together as they take a look at the Sixth District of Arizona.

If there is one difference that typifies the two schools of thought here in the House of Representatives, it is that our friends on the left tend to look to Washington for solutions and put a trust in the Washington bureaucracy. I believe if given a choice between Washington bureaucrats and the people at home, I would choose the people at home. It is in that spirit that our friends meet, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans concerned looking for practical solutions to the problems they face.

I think we would all concur that one thing we learn in our time here, whether it is through letters that we receive, and I have a few tonight, or through town hall meetings or just in our everyday lives when we return home to our district, I think we are all impressed and reimpresed with the fact that the people whom we serve in our respective districts have a lot of good ideas, and so it is the intent of our citizens committee on juvenile violence to take a look at the vexing problems that have plagued us and the recent tragedies at hand.

I might also point out that I continue to receive e-mail, phone calls, faxes and letters concerning the extraordinary and disturbing transfer of technology and nuclear espionage carried on by the Red Chinese in this country. Indeed, there are those in my district who have said that it is as if we are living in a real-life Allen Drury novel, that there are those in this city and on the editorial boards or in the assignment editor chairs of various television networks who steadfastly refuse to take a look at the serious problems we have. Yet through investigative reports, such as those by Bill Gertz of the Washington Times and the new book that has been produced, the partial title being "Betrayal" which details what sadly has transpired and, according to the author, how some in the current administration have undermined our national security, that continues to be a main concern. And, of course, again the topic to which we always return is the notion of this government serving the people rather than the people serving the government. We have seen a disturbing reversal, if you will, in this century in terms of the fact that this government, it would seem, both in attitude and in the action of reaching into the pockets of hardworking Americans seems to ask for more and more and ask working Americans to get by with less and less.

I received a letter from my friend Ryan in Apache Junction, Arizona, just on the border of Maricopa and Pinal Counties there at the foot of the beautiful Superstition Mountains.

Ryan writes, movingly and with conviction:

Every corner an American turns today has a tax waiting for him or her. It's ridiculous and it's time that it was stopped. I'm tired of paying income tax, property tax, license plate taxes, sales tax, inheritance tax, Social Security tax and capital gains tax. I find all of these taxes unfair, oppressive and un-American. Does anyone remember why we left our oppressors in England? Because of high taxes and religious constraints. Where do we go now? When is enough enough? Forty percent of one's wages taken out in taxes? Fifty percent of someone's check taken out in taxes? Make me proud and allow my family and I to live a better life through tax relief.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Your constituent has a good friend in one of mine from Fort COLLINS, Colorado, Robert Seymour, who wrote to me just last week:

The administration's budget plan for next year was presented to Congress on February 1. It imposes new taxes that will make it harder for millions of American families to save for their own retirement needs and will seriously jeopardize the financial protection of families and businesses. Providing for retirement and securing your family's financial security should not be a taxing experience. Americans are taking more responsibility for their own financial futures and they have made it clear that they oppose both direct and indirect tax bites that jeopardize their retirement security and their ability to protect their families. Congress on a bipartisan basis soundly rejected a similar approach last year and I strongly urge you to do the same this time around. Please oppose any new direct or indirect taxes like those commonly referred to as DAC, COLI and PSAs, the typical alphabet soup of Washington, DC, all of these new taxes on annuities and life insurance products.

This is an individual who obviously is saving for his future and his retirement and is getting fed up, as many constituents are around the country, with the new proposals that we are seeing coming out of the White House this very day, to increase the level of taxation on the American people.

My letters are similar to yours. We receive thousands of them on a week-by-week basis. I am glad to be a part of a Republican majority that is here to put the voice of the people ahead of the voice of the special interests that exist right outside these halls in Washington, DC and in Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Colorado, Mr. Speaker. As I hear him speak, I think about another tax that I continue to hear about, the death tax, what has been called by the Washington bureaucracy, the estate tax. That really seems to suggest something rather placid and pastoral when, in fact, it is the death tax where this government taxes you literally upon your death. My good friend from Colorado summed it up very succinctly with echoes of history, not unlike when Ryan pointed out the genesis of our Nation in opposition to our English cousins imposing taxation, my friend from Colorado, and I will quote him again because many an audience enjoys this statement, I am pleased to offer him the proper and full

credit, unlike some others in American politics who take lines from time to time, Mr. Speaker, but according to my good friend from Colorado, "There should be no taxation without respiration." I think that is especially appropriate.

I think I have related the story in times past, recently in Winslow, Arizona, we were not standing on the corner but we were on the corner where the police station and the city hall is located and we were having a town hall meeting. It was in the middle of the day and a couple of young men from the high school who aspired to attend one of our Nation's military academies came to that town hall meeting. A few more honored citizens, senior citizens, if you will, were there and they were talking about the egregious nature of the death tax, how it affected their small businesses, how it affected their family farms and ranches, how it was driving families out of business. One of the young men heard us talking about this and then, with almost a military bearing, I mean the very flower of American youth, he stood there, "Congressman, sir, do you mean to tell me the Federal Government taxes you when you die?" And the assembled citizenry there started to chuckle, knowingly, almost like our good friend Art Linkletter and now Bill Cosby with the television segment "Kids Say the Darndest Things," but, Mr. Speaker, that laughter soon faded, because there was nothing funny about the question. The sad fact about the death tax is this. For all the rigmarole, for all the hunting down and contacting heirs and business partners, the Federal Government procures roughly 1 percent of its revenue from the death tax. Yet almost three-quarters of that 1 percent goes to tracking down the people who apparently owe the taxes through the convoluted structure that we have here.

I have remarked in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I think it bears repeating, this country has been blessed with an outstanding group of individuals at its birth, Catherine Drinker Bowen made mention in her great work in 1966, "The Miracle at Philadelphia," the assemblage of so many great thinkers and true patriots. One of those patriots, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, incredibly well-versed in a variety of different subjects, a man of letters, a printer, a diplomat, a scientist.

Yet even Dr. Franklin, with all his prescience, I believe would be shocked to realize today that the republic which he helped to found would literally tax people upon their death, even with his saying in Poor Richard's Almanac, "There are only two certainties in life, death and taxes."

□ 2310

Understand that Dr. Franklin did not say there was a certainty that one would be taxed on their death, and this is one of the absurdities we see in our tax structure that my friend Ryan points out, that others point out,

whether it is the death tax, or the marriage penalty, or other tax policies that seem to do their best to disrupt the family unit and continue to ask Americans to sacrifice more and more so Washington can allegedly do more.

Those of us in the new majority and people in the Sixth District of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, say the opposite should be true. Washington bureaucrats should sacrifice so that individuals and families can do more with their hard-earned money in terms of saving, investing and building for the future.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It is interesting that my colleague mentions Dr. Franklin, because when Ben Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were working together over the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, there is a story that I have heard from a number of historians about how the two of them disagreed on one key point, a key phrase, and that was the word "unalienable," whether to use "unalienable," which was Franklin's preference, or "inalienable" which was Jefferson's preference. And it is a key distinction.

Ultimately Franklin won the debate, and the difference between "unalienable" and "inalienable" is a matter of taxation in many ways. Historians suggest that they pronounce "unalienable" the following way: unalienable which means that one cannot place a lien, they cannot place some kind of claim from the government on any of the rights to life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness.

But we see this Federal Government and the people here in Washington, D.C. have found a way to abridge the desires of Dr. Franklin, to make it so that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are no longer unalienable. There are, in fact, liens placed against life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and I will bring up another example written by a constituent of mine, this time in Ft. Morgan, Colorado. Kathleen Tarver wrote, and she is very frustrated. You can just hear the frustration in the tone of this letter. It says:

"This January I resigned my job and retired early at the age of 50 to cut our taxes," she says. "We are penalized for being married, and we have no children so you guys really sock it to us. Higher fees on everything we buy or use are higher taxes."

Says: "We have been putting almost the maximum allowed into our 401(k) to help cut our taxes. But I may not live long enough to spend the money because you look at my retirement dollars as your money," she is speaking about Washington in general, "determining for me how I can spend it." She says that the era of big government seems to be back. Here at the end she says:

"I don't want to hear you guys in Washington say one more time, 'We have to save Social Security.' Do it now, and do it right. We have saved Social Security five times now because you continue to steal from it. Give us

our money. Stop stealing it." Cut our taxes.

Very frustrated constituent, and I can tell my colleague I am on Kathleen's side, and I know the gentleman from Arizona is as well. We receive letters like that routinely, but it really speaks to the 223 year origins of our great country, when these very noble gentlemen were meeting in Philadelphia at this miraculous time that you described and trying to chart a new course for our country, one that is based on the realization that our rights come from God. They do not come from the crown, they do not come from the king, they do not come from some document, they do not come from people in the capital city.

These rights come to us from God himself, and they are un-a-lien-able rights. They should be treated that way. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness should come as real liberties, as real rights. There should be no tax upon them. There should be no burden that one is saddled with if they want to enjoy living in complete freedom and liberty as America proposes to make possible for all Americans.

Here is one more letter, another one from Ft. Collins. Russell Beers wrote to me. Says Republicans have a majority. Pass a tax proposal, and put it on Clinton's desk, and let him veto it. He says he would prefer a flat tax, but he underlines: Just do it. It has cost him \$700 just to have someone figure his taxes for him this year.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, and I can certainly sympathize with his constituent. And I receive many letters, and they are not confined to April 15, by the way, because some folks get their extension to try and work out their taxes on through October 15, and it has become a particularly vexing problem for a lot of Americans.

But let us address my colleague's constituents' concern because, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that these comments are not falling on deaf ears. Indeed, as the first Arizonan in history honored to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means, the committee with primary jurisdiction over the Tax Code and ultimately over tax relief, I am pleased to point out that it is our intention in July to sit down and write a massive bill of tax cuts, because again we believe this is very true, as the preceding letter my friend read from Colorado. We understand that in most American families both parents work not out of choice, but out of necessity, one parent working essentially to pay the incredible tax obligations that befall many families. Essentially for one salary in essence to be almost free and clear, the other spouse, the other parent, must work quite simply to pay the taxes.

My colleague's constituent pointed that out in her letter. The subsequent letter that he read from the gentleman is a call to action, and it is our intent to move forward with a tax bill that is

expansive because we believe over 10 years time we need to reaffirm the fact that this money does not belong to the Federal Government, that the tax burden and bite should not be so excessive as to force parents out of the home and into the workplace not because of career aspirations, but because of the necessity of paying the tax bill and dealing with the tax burden. And our notion is over 10 years time to return almost \$800 billion to the American people because it is their money to begin with. It does not belong to the bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. SCHAFFER. It absolutely is. It is dollars that the American people work hard for, and in order to maintain a truly free and liberated Republic we have to do everything we can here in Washington to insist that those dollars are left in the pockets and in the hands of those people who work hard to earn them in the first place.

Let me just reemphasize the point again with another letter from our constituent who lives in Loveland, Colorado, Toni Colson.

"Dear Representative SCHAFFER, I am your constituent from Loveland. As a business owner and grandparent, I'm very concerned about the serious economic problems facing our country. I feel our current income tax structure is having a very negative impact by taxing production, savings and investment, the very things which can make our economy strong."

Well, Ms. Colson has hit the nail right on the head. If you look at our tax policy, the graduated income tax structure that we have today, the harder you work and the more productive you are, the higher the percentage of taxation on your income. We actually punish hard work with the current Tax Code. As it stands today, we punish those who put money aside and try to save it, we punish people who make the right kinds of investment decisions that are not only in their own personal best interests as families, but provide the capital and the availability of capital on the market to create more jobs, to create more businesses and to expand the economy.

As my colleagues know, I think often about the trillions of dollars in private capital that is locked up today. Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, estimates that there is \$11 trillion in private capital that is locked up somewhere in America today because the owners of that cash are afraid to take it out and use it productively, and why? Because the Federal Government punishes those who act responsibly and help to move toward promoting a more vibrant and stronger economy.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Colorado is right. I would just amend this.

We are looking, and I think we should reemphasize this, not at billions but trillions of dollars, and it is amazing to see what is locked up because of the disincentive to inject those funds

into the economy, the disincentive to invest in businesses because of the excessive taxation.

□ 2320

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, we should be prepared and indeed, Mr. Speaker, there may be many within the sound of my voice or within this television signal who ask the question, but wait a minute; do not your friends on the left always offer the rejoinder, tax cuts for the wealthy?

I would say to them, yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the tired rejoinder we hear. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is all in how one defines who is wealthy, because the rhetoric has become so incendiary and so predictable that if there is a tax cut at all it must go to the wealthy.

I would invite my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at an estimate that was prepared for all of us by the Joint Committee on Taxation. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means asked for this and, Mr. Speaker, this is not something that deals with the trillions of dollars, as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, pointed out earlier. This is something that deals with the very human equation of average families in America.

We should also point out that this process does not occur in a vacuum. Indeed, I was glad my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, joined me in his first term here in the 105th Congress, my second term but the first term on the Committee on Ways and Means, as we actually offered tax relief to families with first a \$400 per child tax credit that increases to \$500 and indeed we have found that a family of four earning \$30,000 a year, in essence, pays really no income tax if they take advantage of the different deductions and tax credits available to them, an average family of four.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, just raise that income by \$10,000 again a family trying to succeed, trying to get ahead, in raising that income to \$40,000 for a family of four the tax bill is in excess of \$2,000 for that family.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, it is curious to hear the tired rhetoric of tax breaks for the wealthy because the sad fact is, apparently our friends on the left define wealthy as a middle income earner and a middle income taxpayer earning \$40,000 a year.

So that is one of the ironies and that is real life, the very human equation, not lost with mind-boggling figures of billions and trillions but just the simple challenge of an annual income for a middle income family. That is what we reiterate here, that this money belongs to the people, not to the Washington bureaucrats.

The first three words of our Constitution are very instructive and they are as instructive as they are poetic. We, the people; not, they, the government, but we the people; all of us, Mr. Speaker.

It is that responsibility which we find uppermost in our minds.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Listening to the people is something that we are certainly all about and want to do as often as we can.

Here is a personal letter from Weston, Colorado, from someone who wrote on this very point, and again he is very critical of government and the Federal system. This is a paragraph I am reading from the middle of the letter from Dr. Owens, and he says, as you can tell, I favor smaller government and less interference with State and local governments who are in a better position to make decisions on most issues. You people in Washington have very distorted concepts of what really goes on out in the real world. Do not believe all you read in the polls. I have taught research and statistics and we have a saying in research: Statistics do not lie but liars often use statistics, he says.

He is absolutely right. He says polls can show almost anything pollsters want them to, just as anyone can find a passage in the Bible to support almost any belief. These are both possible if one takes things out of context and ignores parts that do not suit them.

He talks about the occupant of the building at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue as proof of the above and he says the people we know do not believe the approval ratings that we see with the things going on, again down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I have to amend the gentleman's letter a little bit to fit within the House rules about referring to the individual at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue directly, but again this is an individual from Weston, Colorado, who understands full well that it is the voice of the people that needs to be heard over and above those of special interests.

Unfortunately, these average, regular, ordinary, every day citizens, they are counting on their Members of Congress to voice their opinions, to voice their concerns and be the ones who are the guardians of the public trust and a legitimate public trust.

What they are up against, though, and the gentleman knows this as well as I do, is when we walk right outside the House chamber in these lobbies right outside the Capitol, there are legions of lobbyists who are paid by various special interests to come here and give us another viewpoint on what America looks like from the perspective of the banks of the Potomac. Fortunately we have the loud voices of people like Dr. Owens in Weston, Colorado, who take the time to write us letters and help us keep the Congress on an even center.

I know the gentleman hears from many constituents who help the gentleman in that regard.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I do, indeed. I would also make the point that one of the ironies of serving here in Washington is that especially sadly on the left, a number of the special interest

lobbyists are subsidized with taxpayer funds, which is one of the incredible ironies, something we have tried to change but the institutional inertia here, it is an uphill battle dealing with that. It is one of the curiosities.

The gentleman mentioned the voice of the people and in addition to letters, and I brought a couple down tonight, but I just think about a variety of radio townhall meetings we have held lately and the subject that comes up time and again, Mr. Speaker, is our national security; for even as our Founders in that wonderfully practical and poetic preamble to our Constitution delineated that one of our constitutional responsibilities was to provide for the common defense.

Again, we have serious problems here. Almost everyone I speak with during these radio townhalls in a district in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, say the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has been working to prepare a bipartisan report. It was prepared in January or February. When will the House move to release that because the White House is reticent?

We must move quickly to release that report.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Before the gentleman goes on to the point about the comment, let me just ask about these town meetings. I hold a town meeting in my district every week and hold several others on top of that when we are not in Washington, and it is a great opportunity to listen to thousands of constituents who show up and voice these same kind of concerns that I have read from some of the letters.

I am curious about what the gentleman called a radio townhall meeting. Tell me how that works.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The challenge in representing a district, really in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is trying to get everywhere all the time.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman's district is that size?

Mr. HAYWORTH. The district is that size. Although a rancher in Show Low said, here is a perfect slogan, a big man for a big district, I do not exactly think that is the case. Even I cannot get all the way around all the time.

So several broadcasters in the area are willing to set up programs and quite often on a Monday or Tuesday will set them up where constituents from the comfort of their home or at work or via mobile phone, if they are out on the streets and byways, can call in and we can discuss issues and it actually invites everyone into the townhall.

The past several townhalls I have had, Mr. Speaker, again and again and again and again, the question of national security comes up. It evokes evidence that we have heard from Dr. Owens that people are concerned. They believe that our national security has been frittered away. Indeed, we have read in the press that the technology

transfers and the espionage carried out by the communist Chinese rivals that of the Rosenbergs in the 1950s.

While we see the drips and drabs and the old spin game going on at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, we must move as a House, if there is reticence in the executive branch, to release this report.

I would point out for the record, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton, following receipt of the report from the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), in a bipartisan fashion, could have released the report immediately. While there are legitimate national security concerns in terms of not exposing our sources and means of procuring our own information through counterintelligence, there are still serious concerns that the American people need to know about.

Again Mr. Speaker, I would renew the call that this House, if the reticence, if the stonewalling, if the dribs and drabs and endless spin continue from the administration, that this House should take every action necessary, including meeting in a closed session, if that is necessary, to vote out this report so the American people can understand the extent of the problem we confront.

□ 2330

Because whether we worry about security in the home, security in the school, Social Security for our seniors in generations yet to come, undergirding all of that is our very existence as a constitutional republic and our national security. This House took steps tonight to bolster our national security, not bullet-for-bullet or bomb-for-bomb in the Balkan theater, but to try and avert the danger of returning to the days of the hollow force, and it is in that spirit we continue to work in this House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SERRANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Tuesday, May 17, and today, on account of a death in the family.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HILL of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.