

mandate, to eliminate hunger and world poverty in developing countries. IFAD's target groups are the poorest of the world's poor. They include small farmers, the rural landless, nomadic people, indigenous people, and rural poor women. IFAD provides funding and resources to promote economic development for these impoverished rural people.

I am especially pleased that this bill includes a provision I offered as an amendment during the subcommittee markup on the participation of IFAD in the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative. This provision requires the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to this committee on the participation of IFAD in the HIPC initiative. I appreciate the support of my colleagues in the Committee on Financial Services for this provision, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to conclude by thanking the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). Again, he really did bring this legislation forward in an inclusive bipartisan way, and I very much appreciate it and I think the results speak for themselves. This is a very good bill. I support it.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from Vermont. They are reciprocated. We worked well on this together, and it is a case of an authorizing subcommittee and committee doing their job and simply not relying on appropriators to take all of the necessary steps. I am proud of it, and I think the House will be proud of its product coming from the House and ultimately to passage.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the efforts of the Subcommittee Chairman DOUG BEREUTER and the Ranking Member BERNIE SANDERS on H.R. 2604, legislation to reauthorize U.S. participation in the Asian Development Fund and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The Asian Fund and the IFAD are part of a network of regional development institutions that receive substantial support from the United States. Though lesser known than the World Bank, these institutions play a vital role in development efforts globally.

As we consider all possible tools at our disposal in the effort to combat terrorism, I believe that the provision of development assistance is a necessary element. Poverty and economic isolation are not excuses for terrorism, but they clearly create a fertile environment for the violence and fanaticism that characterizes terrorist movements.

Through the development aid provided by the regional development institutions, the United States is working to ensure that poor countries obtain vital linkages to the global economy and that economic opportunity in these countries is widely shared. These efforts

mark not a good anti-terrorism strategy, but also good economic policy and good foreign policy for the United States. The Asian Development Fund, in particular, will play a key role in the redevelopment of Afghanistan in the coming years.

In addition to authorizing U.S. contributions to the IFAD and Asian Development Fund, this bill includes useful language related to U.S. goals on institutional transparency, user fees, and HIV/AIDS strategies in the developing world. The directive on AIDS strategies is particularly important—the AIDS crisis in the developing world remains just as acute today as it was a year ago, and the regional development institutions can and should play an important part in the global effort to address this devastating pandemic.

Finally, the bill provides guidance regarding U.S. support for privatization projects funded by the regional development institutions. The United States has long supported privatization efforts in the developing world, and appropriately so. This language simply provides general principles for how privatization efforts should proceed, recognizing the experiences of failed privatization efforts in recent years.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2604 the Multinational Development Banks Authorization Act. I would like to commend Mr. OXLEY, the Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, and Mr. LAFALCE, the Ranking Member, and also the sponsor, Mr. BEREUTER, for crafting a bill that addresses important development issues in those parts of our world which are struggling to end poverty, hunger and disease and working to restructure, reform and develop their economies for the benefit of all their citizens.

Last year I had the opportunity to travel to Africa on two occasions with a number of my Republican and Democratic colleagues under the auspices of the Trade-Aid Coalition which I initiated last year to focus on the links between trade and economic reform and prosperity.

The continent of Africa faces difficult challenges, but with the help of projects made possible by the multinational development banks, there are clear signs of progress in many of the countries we visited.

This progress is important not only to their economies and the American economy but also to American national security. Increased trade with Africa will lead to a more stable region, and we need only recall the bombings of our Embassies in Tanzania and Kenya to realize that the nations of sub-Saharan Africa are on the front lines of our war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to particularly commend the legislation for addressing the spread of AIDS and calling for the development of a strategic plan and professional training to attack this dreaded disease. This is Africa's greatest challenge, but success stories there prove that the spread of this disease can be controlled.

Additionally, I am pleased to see that the bill calls on GAO to submit a report on the benefits and costs of providing grants to heavily indebted countries instead of loans. Our Trade-Aid Coalition endorses this initiative as making a lot more sense than burdening nations with more loans when they are already fighting to pay off crushing foreign debts.

Mr. Speaker, the world changed last September 11th. That day exposed the fact that American security is very much reliant on sta-

bility and poverty reduction in every corner of the world. This legislation will reduce global poverty and increase global stability, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2604, 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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2215, THE 21ST CENTURY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DEGETTE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2215 be instructed to—

(1) agree to title IV of the Senate amendment (establishing a Violence Against Women Office); and

(2) insist upon section 2003 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by section 402 of the House bill (establishing duties and functions of the Director of the Violence Against Women Office).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2215.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us now would instruct conferees to the U.S. Department of Justice authorization bill to agree on the Senate provisions to make the Violence Against Women Office independent within the Justice Department, and also the House language that provides a clearly defined list of important duties and authority that VAWO should have. The combination of these provisions will effectively strengthen the Violence Against Women Act so that it can carry out its mission.

Before I discuss the reasons why this is so important, I would like to begin by recognizing two Members who have been integral to this issue. The first one, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), has worked on this bill and this issue for quite some time, both as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as a member of the conference committee to H.R. 2215. Working to protect women from domestic violence has always been a high priority for her and her work to protect the integrity of the Violence Against Women Office in the Department of Justice has been invaluable.

I would also like to recognize the work of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), who has always been a champion in the fight against domestic violence throughout her distinguished tenure in Congress. As one of the original sponsors of the Violence Against Women Act, she was integral to its passage. The gentlewoman continues to be a leader who we all look to on the issues and many other issues as well.

I want to thank these esteemed Members for their leadership and say what an honor it has been to work with them on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Office of the U.S. Department of Justice was created in 1995 to implement the programs created under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The creation of this office was critical to transforming the work done in the States to address the issues of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

The establishment of this office meant that for the very first time there was a strong showing of leadership from the Federal Government on the issue of domestic violence. This leadership has lent guidance and support to all the different entities at the State level to work to reduce the incidence and lessen the impact of violence against women. Law enforcement officers, prosecutors, the courts, and victim service organizations have all been assisted by the guidance given by the Violence Against Women Office. That office has served as a powerful voice within the administration, ensuring that keeping women and children safe from abuse is a top priority of the Federal Government.

The office also administers grants to States, tribal communities, local communities, and domestic violence and sexual assault providers to assist with improving the methods in which the criminal and civil justice systems respond to violent actions against women.

How has the office improved the way we deal with domestic violence? I would just like to describe a few ways in which the office has been transformative on the issue. The Violence Against Women Office has worked with U.S. Attorneys to ensure enforcement of the Federal criminal statutes contained in the Violence Against Women

Act and assisted the Attorney General in formulating policy relating to civil and criminal justice for women.

The office also works closely with State and local organizations, with the understanding that ending violent crimes against women and children requires coordinated community-based responses. It administers over \$270 million in grants each year to assist States and tribes to deal with the problem of domestic violence. The office also ensures the appropriate training of judges and other law enforcement personnel.

The Department of Justice Health and Human Services National Council on Violence Against Women, staffed by the Violence Against Women Office, has raised awareness in this country about the nature and harmful effects of domestic violence and, as a result, there is a great deal more awareness of domestic violence and its effect among the general public.

These are just a few of the myriad ways in which the Violence Against Women Office has provided leadership. So what exactly is the problem we are here to address? Unfortunately, the Violence Against Women Office has never been instituted under Federal statute, and much of its power has been undermined, thereby reducing its effectiveness. Because this office was never instituted under a Federal statute, it is vulnerable to being stripped of its power. And, indeed, that is exactly what has been happening lately.

In fact, there is nothing to prevent this administration or any other administration from summarily shutting the office down completely. Right now, the office is in a location well outside the main Department of Justice building, and its director, who used to have a seat at daily meetings of executive leadership with the Attorney General, now has very limited access to the power structure within the agency.

Just a few months ago, in fact, the policy office was effectively shut down. This completely undermines it and hobbles the office's ability to retain its status both as a national resource and an international leader on the issue of domestic violence.

Currently, the Justice Department is engaged in reorganizing internal offices that distribute grant funding, including the Violence Against Women Office. These plans, unfortunately, include reducing the already understaffed office as well as consolidating its funding goals with other unrelated grant programs. This again will only serve to further undercut the effectiveness of the office.

Now, the good news is that both the Senate and the House DOJ authorization bills take important steps to remedy this situation. What we need to do now is to combine the best provisions of both bills to protect this office from any further erosion of its status and ability. Both the House- and Senate-passed bills would statutorily institute the Violence Against Women Office,

which is a very important step. However, we need to make sure that the differences between the two bills are resolved in such a manner that it will guarantee the effectiveness of the office.

The Senate language creates an independent office within the Department of Justice, giving it a high profile and guaranteeing the ability of the office to formulate policy and to assist the other governmental agencies in their work on violence against women. This, combined with the House language, listing its duties and authorities, will restore the Violence Against Women Office to its former position as a national leader, and an agent for change on the issue of combating domestic violence around the country.

The Federal Government should not forfeit our leadership on such an important issue. We owe it to the women and children in this country who have been affected by the scourge of domestic violence. I urge my colleagues to vote for my motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado would instruct conferees on H.R. 2215 to agree to title 4 of the Senate amendment but insist on adding the new section 2003 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by section 402 of the House bill.

I will not oppose the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado, but there are a few things that I think she ought to think about before the conferees actually meet on this subject.

□ 1400

The motion will basically instruct conferees to create a separate and independent Violence Against Women's Office in the Department of Justice headed by a director appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I supported such an amendment in the House Committee on the Judiciary, but in response to concerns about this proposal, it was amended to permit the attorney general the discretion to put the office in the Office of Justice Programs so that the grant-making function of both offices could coordinate. The Department of Justice has testified it prefers the House provision, and is concerned about balkanizing the various grant making offices that currently exist in OJP.

Most would agree that the current organizational structure at OJP is in need of reform, and this administration is undertaking steps to streamline and improve the organization and administration of OJP. As a result of various authorizing statutes and funding mandates by Congress, and organizational decisions made by past attorneys general, OJP consists of five bureaus, six

program offices, and seven administrative offices. Each of the five bureaus is headed by a presidential appointee by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This structure does not include the Office of Community Oriented Policing.

Some argue persuasively that mandating that there be a separate VAWA office will further complicate the current structure at DOJ and make it more dysfunctional. Furthermore, a completely separate office would require additional resources to support the administrative functions of the office. I have heard that a completely separate office would require \$10- to \$15 million in funding, which I presume would come out of VAWA program funds.

I want to repeat that because the consequence of establishing this office precisely as the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) is advocating might mean \$10- to \$15 million more in administrative expenses, and \$10- to \$15 million less in program, depending upon the decisions being made by the appropriators. I advise the gentlewoman that is a potential consequence of this motion.

I have discussed this matter with a number of Members and my constituents. The staff of the Committee on the Judiciary has met with Senator BIDEN's staff, the Senate Judiciary Committee staff, and various groups who support the creation of a separate office. As the conference proceeds, all of these viewpoints have and will continue to be heard, about I am confident a compromise can be reached.

The gentlewoman's motion says nothing about the coordination of grant-making functions of the new VAWA office with OJP. I can only assume that she would like to create a completely separate grant-making structure that does not have to coordinate with OJP, thereby siphoning program funds to pay for administrative infrastructure. A bigger bureaucracy is not necessarily better. Many would prefer to spend precious Federal dollars on combating violence against women instead of creating a new bureaucracy to implement the Violence Against Women Act.

Also, while the motion instructs conferees to include the provision of the House bill relating to the duties and functions of the director of the VAWA office, the motion says nothing about a similar provision found in section 403 of the Senate bill. I can only assume the gentlewoman wants it dropped.

To those who say that a separate office is needed to raise the profile of the director in these issues, I would direct them to the very language of the House bill which the motion would direct conferees to include. Under that language, the director of the VAWA office would serve as special counsel to the attorney general on the subject of violence against women. The director would work with the judicial branches of Federal and State governments on these

issues. The director would serve at the request of the attorney general as the representative of the Department of Justice on task forces, committees and commissions addressing violence against women issues. The director would serve at the request of the President as the U.S. representative on these issues before international bodies.

The list goes on. I do not know what could be more high profile than designated in the statute that the director will be the point person in the Federal Government on issues relating to violence against women.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion because it generally captures that which has already been agreed to and will allow the conferees to continue to work on these and other very important administrative and organizational issues.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), and congratulate her for all of her many years of fine work on this issue.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this motion is in very good hands, and the gentlewoman has done such a good job describing it that I am going to be brief.

The DeGette motion instructs conferees to accept the Senate provision to create the independent Violence Against Women Office in the Department of Justice, and to accept the House provisions defining the duties and authority of the Violence Against Women's Office, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for accepting this motion. We appreciate that very much.

This office has been really important. Since 1995, it has heightened awareness throughout the United States about what happens with domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. This office formulates policy, and administers more than \$270 million annually in grants to State governments as well as to local community organizations, trains police and prosecutors and courts to address violence against women. In addition, it assists these organizations with the ability to give the highest quality of services to the victims and full administration of justice.

The importance of the Violence Against Women Office cannot be overestimated. In fact, and I think this is very important, a survey conducted by the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence reports that domestic violence has dropped 21 percent since the inception of this office, showing that the grants that they have given out have borne fruit. But much more remains to be done. Nearly 25 percent of the women in the United States, that is one-quarter of the women who are the majority in the country, reported that they have been physically or sexually assaulted by a current or former intimate partner at some point in their

lifetime. We think that makes it worth \$10- to \$15 million.

The statistics illustrate the importance of that office to the health, safety and the very survival of women in many parts of this country. As has been pointed out, this wonderful resource is not authorized by statute, and as such, is not a permanent part of the anti-violence efforts. We want to pass the bill H.R. 28, the Violence Against Women Office Act, which would make it permanent. I was pleased that the bill was included in the Department of Justice authorization approved by the House last year.

It is for this reason we stand today to ask the conferees to agree to the House and Senate-passed language and ensure the Violence Against Women Office is given the permanent status that it desperately needs to address the crisis of violence against women in the coming years.

The office's work with grantees on very sensitive issues is vital, and can be best addressed through a separate and independent office and not the more broadly focused Office of Justice Programs. In addition, we want the conferees to adopt the detailed description of the duties of the director of the Violence Against Women's Office, contained in the House-passed Department of Justice authorization bill. It defines several important duties for the director, including serving as a special counsel to the attorney general on the subject of violence against women, and serving as a liaison with the judicial branches of the Federal and State governments on matters relating to violence against women.

Ending violence against women and girls is an ongoing struggle, and one of our best tools is the office. It is imperative that it be made permanent, and I urge my colleagues to support the office.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the DeGette motion to instruct the conferees of H.R. 2215, the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act.

Since 1994, Congress has demonstrated our commitment to eradicating domestic violence. Passing the DeGette amendment is consistent with our demonstrated goal of protecting victims and stopping the cycle of violence that plagues millions of children every day.

This motion refers specifically to the bill introduced last year by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and myself to make the Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice permanent and independent with qualified experts in the field of domestic violence. I support the inclusion of the Senate language in combination with the House language

in the Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act.

A permanent and visible office is essential. It is essential to implement the Violence Against Women Act programs, and expertise among personnel promotes the most effective and efficient use of Federal dollars. Since the creation of the Violence Against Women Office in 1995, we have learned the critical importance of securing permanence for this office. The office has successfully administered effective VAWA grant programs, and heightened awareness of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking within the Federal Government and throughout the Nation. The office also provides invaluable expertise to States, developing programs to reduce domestic violence in their communities.

Domestic violence rates have declined by over 21 percent since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act; and yet a July 2000 study reported by the Department of Justice, in that study nearly 25 percent of women surveyed stated that they had been physically and/or sexually assaulted by a current or a former intimate partner at some point in their lifetime. These statistics are unacceptable. As violence continues to demonstrate so many families, a permanent Violence Against Women Office is necessary to ensure that VAWA's benefits continue to reach victims all across the country.

The current office is not specifically authorized by statute, and as such, is a de facto part of the Office of Justice Programs. Within OJP, the Violence Against Women Office has developed exceptional expertise in both the efficacy of policy and the accountability of VAWA grant administration. The Violence Against Women Act grant programs are extensive and far reaching. The success of a grant depends on the Department of Justice's development of good implementation policies and technical assistance.

Additionally, strong leadership of an independent Violence Against Women Office is necessary for ensuring that the Federal criminal, civil and immigration law responsibilities created by the VAWA and its reauthorization in 2000 are carried out consistently, department-wide to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and trafficking. The office's work with grantees such as State coalitions on these very sensitive and important issues is critical to meeting the goals in the Violence Against Women Act.

I am confident that a combination of these provisions can establish the independence of the office and avoid unnecessary duplication within the existing infrastructure of the Department of Justice. Ending violence against women requires constant education, advocacy and implementation at all levels of our society, work that depends on strong leadership from a Federal Violence Against Women Office.

Mr. Speaker, with this office, I believe that we can continue to make

progress on minimizing the epidemic of domestic violence that we currently face. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the DeGette motion to instruct the conferees.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1415

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for coming here to make I think important improvements and to make recommendations that I think we will take to heart in considering where we go in terms of family abuse, violence against women, which has been gaining increasing bipartisan support in both bodies. I am very pleased with the work of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who brings this motion to instruct before us.

Mr. Speaker, remember that it was the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who has tried to give statutory foundation to the Violence Against Women Office, and it was our colleague, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), on the Committee on the Judiciary whose amendment was accepted and is now a subject of us instructing our conferees how to move.

It is clear from this discussion that there is bipartisan support. We still have a long way to go. But in Michigan, in Detroit, we are getting ready for our second metropolitan area town hall meeting which will be at Greater Grace Church at the end of this month. The first one held over a year ago brought together for the first time police, prosecutors, social workers, victims, family, clergy, lawyers and community people who were really inspired by the Federal involvement in this.

What we are simply doing here today is letting our conferees know that this office should be as strong and as independent as they can make it because they have been working with the U.S. Attorneys, they have been training the judges and the prosecutors and the members of the private bar, they have been working with Immigration and Naturalization Service.

So this is a huge step forward. I am very pleased to be associated with it. Obviously, the only direction we can go now, and we are deciding this, I think, as we gain more experience with the office itself, what we are trying to make sure is that we do not have an office that is just a grant agency. We want to be able to distribute grants where they are appropriate, but also it has to be a policy mechanism that advises the administration and the Congress alike.

I thank all the Members on the floor that have spoken in support of this.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distin-

guished gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time and commend on a bipartisan basis the efforts of those on the floor right now to help battered women.

The Violence Against Women Act was a promise by Congress to make America and the home a safer place for women. This act promised to finally treat domestic violence like the crime that it is, to improve law enforcement, to make streets safer for women, and to vigorously prosecute perpetrators. It promised more counseling and more shelters to provide a safe haven for abused women.

But, Mr. Speaker, underfunding and neglect have made this promise half-filled at best. The Violence Against Women Office cannot lead our Nation's efforts to serve victims of domestic violence if it is merely a check-writing organization. It needs strong statutory authority and adequate staff to do its job.

The Violence Against Women Office is essential to the Government's role in preventing violence, but private industry must also play a vital role.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you one example. One year ago, Harman International lost a 26-year employee who was brutally attacked and killed by her estranged husband. In response, Harman International worked with the Family Violence Prevention Fund to develop a comprehensive domestic violence prevention policy and to educate its employees about domestic violence. Harman International's policy states that domestic violence is not tolerated, and provides employees flexibility to take time off to handle the legal and mental consequences of domestic violence. The program protects those employees and helps the company by recognizing that the work of a victim of domestic violence suffers as she suffers.

But as Harman International was developing this policy, it discovered that few other companies have similar policies and programs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to work across the board to prevent domestic violence in both public and private sectors. I commend successful efforts to date, like those of Rainbow Services, Ltd., a haven for battered women in San Pedro, California, and I commend companies like Harman International.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important motion.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who has done so much on this bill.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the DeGette motion to strengthen the independence of the Violence Against Women Office within the Department of Justice.

As we all know, violence against women continues to be a significant

problem in our Nation. Domestic violence and sexual assault are still scourges on our Nation. The statistics are chilling. Nearly 1 in 3 women experience physical assault by a partner. These horrible crimes damage lives and tear families apart. The Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA for short, is a proven part of the solution to these problems.

There is much evidence of the success of VAWA. For example, in my State of Wisconsin, before the availability of VAWA grants there were only 15 nurses in the entire State who knew how to work with victims of sexual assault, collect forensic evidence, and work with law enforcement. Now there are over 150 nurses in Wisconsin who are trained to help victims. This training not only helps put the victim more at ease under the circumstances, but also increases the likelihood that prosecutions will be successful.

What was not included when VAWA was reauthorized last session was a permanent and statutorily authorized VAWA office within the Department of Justice. The VAWA office has been key to raising awareness within the Federal Government and the Nation about the impact of sexual assault and domestic violence. It is well-recognized for its distribution of \$270 million in annual grants to local communities to fight violence against women.

But the office does far more. The office also works with U.S. Attorneys to enforce Federal criminal statutes. It provides technical assistance to local prosecutors, health care professionals, shelter staff, and domestic and sexual assault organizations.

Under the previous administration, the VAWO director was visibly and actively involved in the every-day work of the Justice Department. She participated in the daily meetings of the executive leadership with the Attorney General. She was a major international voice on violence against women issues, and consulted extensively with the various divisions within the department about violence against women issues. VAWA requires work with the FBI, the INS, and the civil and criminal divisions of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, while I understand the management concerns that lead some Members of Congress and the Department of Justice to want to locate the Violence Against Women Office within the Office of Justice Programs, I believe the mission of the Violence Against Women Office is much larger than just a grant administration organization. There are also limits on the Office of Justice Program's statutory authority to engage in policy work. Under the current structure this has been a serious impediment to the work against the Violence Against Women Office.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD testimony of Lynn Rosenthal, executive director of the National Network to End Domestic Violence, that

was given before the Committee on Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Drugs in the other body. Her testimony provides numerous examples of why we need an independent Violence Against Women Office.

TESTIMONY OF LYNN ROSENTHAL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL NETWORK TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND DRUGS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, on behalf of the National Network to End Domestic Violence, thank you for providing the opportunity for me to share with you our views on the critical role of the Violence Against Women Office. The National Network is a network of statewide domestic violence coalitions around the country, who in turn represent more than 2,000 local domestic violence shelters and programs, and hundreds of thousands of battered women and their children.

In particular, I want to thank you, Senator Biden, for your landmark report "Violence Against Women: A Week in the Life of American Women" prepared by the Senate Judiciary in October of 1992. This report, a snapshot of the lives of women across the country, graphically described 200 incidents of domestic and sexual violence that occurred in just one week of one year. This report had a profound impact on my personal commitment to end violence against women, and many times over the past ten years I have returned to this report when I have needed inspiration and guidance to continue this important and often difficult work. It is this report that I begin with today.

September 1, 1992 12:45 a.m.: Rural California— "A woman with five children is physically abused by her husband. He punches her in the head with his fist. She sustains bruises. She escapes and runs to a friend's house for the night. She reports that she is afraid to call the sheriff because her husband threatens to take their 11-month old baby."

September 1, 1992 late afternoon: Maine— "A woman in her early twenties is thrown out of her trailer home by her boyfriend as her two sons, ages two and three, watch. Bruised and cut she attempts to leave with her sons. The two-year old child is taken from her by her boyfriend and she is ordered to leave and threatened with further violence. She departs her home with one of her children, but does not contact the police."

What might be different today for these women and countless like them because of the Violence Against Women Act? Because of VAWA, hundreds of police officers have been trained in the dynamics that keep these women trapped in violence relationships, and now play leadership roles in their communities. Because of VAWA, legal assistance is available for women facing the devastating fear of losing their children to perpetrators. Because of VAWA, more women reach out for help, seek shelter, obtain protective orders and are treated with dignity and respect by law enforcement officers. It was VAWA's critical focus on victim safety and offender accountability that brought about these important changes in our culture.

In retrospect, Congress conceived a brilliant formula for successful implementation of VAWA. Congress provided the states with critical funds and policy direction through the state formula grants and discretionary programs such as the pro arrest grants, rural, tribal, legal assistance to victims, research and training and technical assistance programs that collectively comprise the Violence Against Women Act.

But there is another partner to thank in this work, a partner who often works quietly

but tirelessly to ensure that Congress' intent and the needs of the field are never forgotten as the day-to-day work in the field continues. That partner is the Violence Against Women Office.

First established as a high-level Office in Main Justice with full access to the policy-making and implementation functions of the Department, VAWO and its expert staff created a national awareness about the impact of violence against women that had never existed before. Within weeks of being appointed as the first director of VAWO, Bonnie Campbell was inundated with requests for help and technical expertise from the national and international leaders. Governors called, asking VAWO to help them plan statewide strategies for addressing domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Leaders in government from other countries asked VAWO to share the U.S.'s groundbreaking legislation and methods with them. The Director of VAWO was a leader of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing.

These images of leadership greatly inspired the work of those of us on the frontlines, many of whom had been struggling for many years with limited resources and lack of public attention to the bruised and bleeding women we were seeking in our programs every day. The vision of a Presidentially-appointed, highly placed spokesperson galvanized the work at the state and local level. State and local legislators and policy makers were impressed with the strong commitment shown by the Department of Justice to ending violence against women, and became inspired to become leaders themselves in this battle.

The work of advocates at the state and local level was made easier and more effective because VAWO took on the equally important challenge of coordinating the inter-agency work that VAWA mandated. Your vision for ending violence against women was broad. VAWA created numerous grant programs in DOJ that required coordination with the grant programs in HHS, created new federal crimes, established new federal immigration rights, required states to honor each other's protection orders, established standards for the local issuance of protection orders and arrests of perpetrators of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and required state and local communities to come together in multidisciplinary efforts to develop policy and strategies for dealing with violence against women.

The number of agencies and offices required to carry out these substantive responsibilities is stunning. VAWA's mandates impact the U.S. Attorney's Offices, the INS, the FBI, HHS, the Civil and Criminal Divisions of DOJ, even parts of HUD, Labor, and DoD. Leadership was needed to coordinate these far-reaching implementation efforts—and VAWO stepped ably into that role, convening the National Advisory Council (an unprecedented public and private partnership of business, government, and public service sectors) and working with the various federal entities charged with the work of implementing VAWA. If VAWO had not been there, it is hard to imagine how the demand for federal and state coordination, leadership, and policy guidance could have been met.

When VAWO was housed in Main Justice, the director and her staff were able to work with other components of DOJ and other federal agencies to develop comprehensive policies regarding the implementation of VAWA. For example, the Full Faith and Credit Provision of VAWA 1994 simply said that states shall honor sister jurisdictions protective orders. The plain language of this provision did not explain how a state would know another

state's protective order is valid, nor did it say whether or not a state must establish a protective order registry to implement this law. These are the practical concerns of turning a visionary law into a reality. VAWO led a collaborative effort that included the DOJ Office of Policy Development and the Executive Office of the U.S. Attorneys to develop practical policy guidelines that make it possible for all states, territories and tribes to make good use of the Full Faith and Credit Provision of VAWA.

When VAWO moved to the Office of Justice Programs, the responsibilities of the Office became more focused on the technical aspects of grant making and less on the policy issues that emerge in building programs that address victim safety and offender accountability—the cornerstones of VAWA. This trend seems to have continued under the new administration, and is cause for great concern. Although we have made great strides in some ways, in others our work is just beginning. Our need for a vigorous, proactive Violence Against Women Office has not diminished.

The tremendous needs and gaps uncovered by VAWA in 1994 led to its reauthorization in 2000, and the work at the state and local level has become more, not less, complex. VAWA requires the criminal and civil justice systems to work together with community services. VAWA funds prosecutors, courts, law enforcement, victim services, community-based assistance programs, tribal governments, and state coalitions. This broad range of professionals in turn serves victims and survivors living in rural towns and large urban cities, as well as immigrant, disabled, and older victims of abuse. VAWA grants provide needed services in communities of color and communities of faith. And all of these services are provided in the context of a complex system of federal, state, local, and tribal laws.

Addressing all of these mandates, understanding all of these laws, and reaching all of these communities is a tough challenge on the state and local level. Now more than ever, we need an active, high-profile Violence Against Women Office to help establish baseline standards for this increasingly complex work, and to provide consistent interpretations as to how the mandates of VAWA are to be met.

We need an Office staffed with program managers and policy analysts that have subject matter expertise, not just grant-making skills. Three examples of VAWA programs speak vividly to this need for the combined functions of grant-making and policy analysis within the same office. First, the Legal Assistance for Victims Program grantees might well call VAWO to ask for assistance in developing appropriate screening and conflicts protocol, or for help in developing policies to implement the new funding mandate that civil legal assistance be provided to sexual assault survivors. This new area of law requires guidance not simply on allowable expenses of a grant, but on what the civil legal needs are of such victims, and what challenges to expect in crafting these new programs. It takes a policy analyst familiar with these complicated issues to give the right answers or know how to find them. The lives of sexual assault survivors all across the country will be dramatically impacted by the answers to these questions.

Second, jurisdictions receiving Grants to Encourage Arrest funding need to know how the VAWA 2000 amendments to the Full Faith and Credit mandate of VAWA 1994 will impact their program practices. For example, states must certify that its laws, policies and practices do not require victims to bear costs associated with prosecution, filing, registration or service of a protective

order. This requires not just grant managers who know the paperwork needed to meet the certification requirements, but policy experts who know how to craft changes in state law and policies to come into compliance with this new requirement.

Grantees of the Grants to Encourage Arrest and Enforce Protection Orders Program must also certify that their jurisdictions do not allow the issuance of mutual protection orders. If there is no legislative opportunity to satisfy this funding condition, grantees will turn to VAWO for expert guidance on alternative ways to meet this funding condition. A policy analyst must be available to speak to the various ways this requirement can be met, whether through changes in court rules or administrative memorandums. What may seem a technical certification requirement is so much more than a check on a grant application. Requiring states to prohibit the issuance of mutual protective orders as a condition of funding is about fulfilling the intent of VAWA to make systemic changes in the way states respond to critical issues of victim safety. We need look no farther than the recent highly publicized protective order case in Kentucky to know the importance of such requirements.

Finally, the new immigration rights and procedures created by VAWA are numerous and complex; grantees of all the VAWA programs need technical assistance to help them understand when critical immigration issues arise and how grantees can best help immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. This work must be done very carefully. The lives of whole families are in danger—this really is a matter of life and death.

It is more important than ever that The Department of Justice provides leadership and guidance, inspiration, and policy support for the local and state work on domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Now, more than ever, states need a strong Violence Against Women Office. It is only through this leadership that we one day we will know for certain that a week in the life of American women is no longer a week filled with violence.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the recent actions on the part of the administration that clearly indicate that the Violence Against Women Office is not a high priority. The policy staff of the office is woefully understaffed. In addition, the pending reorganization of OJP threatens to dismantle the expertise the Violence Against Women Office provides to local grantees.

The language added by the other body that this motion asks the House to endorse would statutorily authorize an independent Violence Against Women Office within the Department of Justice. I believe this recognizes the importance of the office. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to instruct.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1994, Congress passed the Violence against Women Act, which has had great success in reducing violence against women and domestic violence gen-

erally. One of the things that act did was to create the Violence Against Women Office in the Justice Department. That office has been instrumental in directing the efforts against domestic violence. But the office has lost influence and is in danger of losing its role or much of its role in the pending reorganization within the Department of Justice.

With the strong bipartisan support, the House and the Senate have both passed provisions in the appropriations authorization bill to make the office permanent and statutory, but it is critical that the statutory creation of this office reflect the essential components of the office.

The office cannot serve as the leader in promoting the changes needed to effectively serve victims of domestic violence, sexual stalking and trafficking if it is merely a check-writing office, as it is often regarded today. The office needs the authority to create policy regarding violence against women and needs to have a presidentially-appointed, Senate-confirmed director in order to ensure that these issues continue to have a high profile at local, State, Federal and international events.

This motion to instruct will accomplish these purposes, and that is why I rise in support of the motion to instruct. I commend the gentlewoman for offering it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that many years ago in the now receding past, I was privileged to be the sponsor in the Colorado legislature of one of the first omnibus domestic violence bills in the country, and in fact that bill was passed in 1995 in Colorado.

The thing we learned at that time was that one of the biggest barriers to preventing and stopping domestic violence is a lack of awareness by everybody around the country. This is a problem that is faced nationwide, which is why Congress passed the Violence against Women Act and why the Violence Against Women Office was set up in 1995.

However, if we are going to have a strong and effective Violence Against Women Office, it must be permanent, it must be independent, and it must be prepared to do much more than just simply administer grants. It needs to do outreach and education, and it needs to have the kind of stature within the Justice Department on a continuing basis that it did when it was once instituted. So, for those reasons, it is essential that we pass this motion to instruct and that we instruct the conferees both to adopt the Senate provisions that establish the office and also the House provisions that delineate the duties of the office.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I commend Congresswoman DEGETTE for bringing this motion to the floor and I thank her, Congresswoman

SLAUGHTER, and Congresswoman BALDWIN for their leadership on this issue.

The Violence Against Women Office of the U.S. Department of Justice was created in 1995 to implement the Violence Against Women Act. The creation of this office greatly strengthened the efforts of states to fight domestic violence, because for the first time, they had strong leadership and funding support from the federal government.

Under President Clinton, the Violence Against Women Office was a powerful voice within the Administration. The Director had strong support from the White House, and was a recognized leader in the fight to end domestic violence. It was clear that the safety of women and children was a top priority for the federal government.

Under the leadership of President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft, the Violence Against Women Office has been systematically weakened. Just within the last two months, the policy department of the Violence Against Women Office disappeared, and the Director of the office has no access to the Attorney General or the President and no seat at the table to affect the policies of this Administration with concern to violence against women.

This is one of a series of actions by this Administration to diminish the importance of women's issues.

In one of his first actions, in January 2001, President Bush closed down the White House Office on Women's Initiatives and Outreach. The purpose of this office was to advance policies such as the Family and Medical Leave Act and to serve as a liaison between the White House and advocates for women.

Next, President Bush tried to eliminate funding for the regional Women's Bureau offices in the Department of Labor. The Women's Bureau had a mission of promoting the welfare of working women, improving their working conditions, and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment. This was further evidence of the Administration moving backwards on progress for women.

Violence against women doesn't rate highly in the Bush budget either. The President's budget falls \$111.3 million short of fully funding critical programs such as transitional housing for victims of domestic violence, shelter services, and rape education and prevention. Obviously, President Bush does not support full funding of the Violence Against Women Act.

Today we have the chance to send a clear message to the conferees, that ending violence against women is a top priority. To do that, we need to restore a strong, independent Violence Against Women Office with the authority to impact critical public policy decisions. This is not a time to backtrack on our commitment to ending domestic violence against women.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of Representative DEGETTE's motion to agree to provisions in the DOJ Authorization bill that strengthen and elevate the Violence Against Women Office. This is an important motion that deserves our support.

Since 1995, the Violence Against Women Office at the Department of justice has handled policy issues regarding violence against women, provided national and international

leadership on the subject and worked with other DOJ offices to implement the mandates of the Violence Against Women Act.

The Office is responsible for coordinating the training of judges, law enforcement personnel and prosecutors in responding to victims of domestic violence, stalking and assault. It works with states and localities to provide a coordinated community response to domestic violence and establishes public education initiatives to heighten awareness about domestic violence.

The office has awarded more than \$1 billion in grant funds, making over 1,250 discretionary grants and 336 formula grants to states. These grant programs help train personnel, establish specialized domestic violence and sexual assault units, assist victims of violence, and hold perpetrators accountable.

In Mercer County, New Jersey, local social service groups have used grant funding from the Office to recruit and train pro bono attorneys and advocates to help provide legal assistance to battered women and their families.

Domestic violence is still shockingly pervasive in our society. The National Violence Against Women Survey found that domestic abuse rates remain disturbingly high. Clearly this violence is a national concern, and we need to do everything within our capabilities to make sure that it receives due attention.

The DeGette motion to instruct would go a long way toward strengthening and elevating this office and its mission. The Violence Against Women Office should be front and center in the Department of Justice. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Congresswoman DEGETTE's Motion to Instruct Conferees on Department of Justice Authorization (H.R. 2215). This motion instructs conferees to agree to Senate provisions to strengthen the Violence Against Women Office and make it independent within the Justice Department.

The Violence Against Women Office (VAWO) of the U.S. Department of Justice was created in 1995 to implement the laws and programs created under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. Through the creation of VAWO, a clear voice of leadership on addressing domestic violence, stalking, sexual assault and trafficking from the federal government. VAWO has been a powerful voice within the Administration, ensuring that the safety of women and children is a top priority to the federal government.

Because the Violence Against Women Office was never instituted under federal statute, the administration and management of the office has been at the discretion of leadership in the Department of Justice. Consequently, VAWO has been slowly stripped of much of its power and effectiveness. Presently, the Director of VAWO has very limited direct access to the Attorney General or the White House. At one point, VAWO helped advise every entity in the Justice Department charged with implementing and enforcing laws created by VAWO. VAWO has seen all the staff of that division, including its director, suddenly transferred to places in the Department where they can no longer work on policy issues regarding VAWO.

Violence against women continues to remain a critical issue in our society that requires special attention. In the U.S., nearly

25% of women surveyed reported that they had been physically and/or sexually assaulted by a current or former intimate partner at some point in their lifetime, and 1 in 6 women has experienced an attempted or completed rape in her lifetime. If VAWO will continue to be an integral part of developing and implementing the Administration policy on violence against women, it must have the authority to do so. The Senate version of H.R. 2215 creates an independent Office within the main area of Justice, giving it a high profile and guaranteeing the ability of the Office to make policy and assist other governmental agencies in their work on violence against women.

I support this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the Women's Resource Center, The Safety Zone, and The Women's Coalition in the Virgin Islands. These are organizations in my district that work on violence against women issues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 3, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Collins
Ackerman	Bonior	Combest
Aderholt	Bono	Condit
Akin	Boozman	Conyers
Allen	Borski	Cooksey
Andrews	Boswell	Costello
Armey	Boucher	Cox
Baca	Boyd	Coyne
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Cramer
Baird	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Baker	Brown (FL)	Crowley
Baldacci	Brown (OH)	Cubin
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Ballenger	Bryant	Cummings
Barcia	Burr	Cunningham
Barr	Burton	Davis (CA)
Barrett	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Bartlett	Callahan	Davis (IL)
Barton	Calvert	Davis, Jo Ann
Bass	Camp	Deal
Becerra	Cantor	DeFazio
Bentsen	Capito	DeGette
Bereuter	Capps	DeLauro
Berkley	Capuano	DeLay
Berman	Cardin	DeMint
Berry	Carson (IN)	Deutsch
Biggert	Carson (OK)	Diaz-Balart
Billirakis	Castle	Dicks
Bishop	Chabot	Dingell
Blagojevich	Chambliss	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clay	Dooley
Blunt	Clement	Doolittle
Boehlert	Clyburn	Doyle
Boehner	Coble	Dreier

Duncan Kilpatrick
Dunn Kind (WI)
Edwards King (NY)
Ehlers Kingston
Ehrlich Kirk
Emerson Kleczka
Engel Knollenberg
English Kolbe
Eshoo Kucinich
Etheridge LaFalce
Evans LaHood
Everett Lampson
Farr Langevin
Fattah Lantos
Ferguson Larsen (WA)
Filner Larson (CT)
Fletcher Latham
Foley LaTourette
Forbes Leach
Ford Lee
Fossella Levin
Frank Lewis (CA)
Frelinghuysen Lewis (KY)
Frost Linder
Gallegly Lipinski
Ganske LoBiondo
Gekas Lofgren
Gephardt Lowey
Gibbons Lucas (KY)
Gilchrest Lucas (OK)
Gillmor Luther
Gilman Lynch
Gonzalez Maloney (CT)
Goode Maloney (NY)
Goodlatte Manzullo
Gordon Markey
Goss Matheson
Graham Matsui
Granger McCarthy (MO)
Graves McCarthy (NY)
Green (WI) McCollum
Greenwood McDermott
Grucci McGovern
Gutierrez McHugh
Gutknecht McInnis
Hall (OH) McIntyre
Hall (TX) McKeon
Hansen McKinney
Harman McNulty
Hart Meehan
Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)
Hastings (WA) Menendez
Hayes Mica
Hayworth Miller, Dan
Hefley Miller, Gary
Herger Miller, George
Hill Miller, Jeff
Hilleary Mink
Hilliard Mollohan
Hinchey Moore
Hinojosa Moran (KS)
Hobson Moran (VA)
Hoeffel Morella
Hoekstra Myrick
Holden Nadler
Holt Napolitano
Honda Neal
Hooley Nethercutt
Horn Ney
Houghton Northup
Hoyer Nussle
Hulshof Oberstar
Hunter Obey
Hyde Olver
Inslee Ortiz
Isakson Osborne
Israel Ose
Issa Otter
Istook Owens
Jackson (IL) Oxley
Jackson-Lee Pallone
(TX) Pascrell
Jefferson Pastor
Jenkins Payne
John Pelosi
Johnson (CT) Pence
Johnson (IL) Peterson (MN)
Johnson, E. B. Peterson (PA)
Johnson, Sam Petri
Jones (NC) Phelps
Jones (OH) Pickering
Kanjorski Pitts
Kaptur Platts
Keller Pombo
Kelly Pomeroy
Kennedy (MN) Portman
Kennedy (RI) Price (NC)
Kerns Pryce (OH)
Kildee Putnam

Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)

Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)

Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake Hostettler Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Cannon Lewis (GA) Murtha
Clayton Mascara Norwood
Crane McCreery Traficant
Davis, Tom Meek (FL) Weller
Delahunt Millender-
Green (TX) McDonald

□ 1454

Mrs. CUBIN and Messrs. SCOTT, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and TANCREDO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY AND RURAL INVESTMENT ACT OF 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-426) on the resolution (H. Res. 403) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-427) on the resolution (H. Res. 404) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2002.
Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

W.J. “BILLY” TAUZIN,
Chairman.

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 Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HIGHER OIL PRICES DUE TO EXCESSIVE LAWS AND REGULATIONS DEMANDED BY BIG GOVERNMENT LIBERALS AND ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISTS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the very people who have caused high gas prices in this country are now crying the loudest about the oil companies raising prices. Most experts say gas prices are going to go much higher.

What is causing this is not collusion among the oil companies as much as laws and rules and regulations demanded by big government liberals and environmental extremists. Approximately 36 oil refineries have closed in this country since 1980 due to costly environmental rules. This keeps gas prices high and will drive them even higher.

Environmental groups have demonstrated for years against drilling for oil anywhere in this country. ANWR is just the latest example. This has kept gas prices high, and they will go higher if we do not at some point get some common sense back into our rules and regulations in this regard, and if we keep not letting anybody produce any oil in this country. This keeps gas prices high and will help drive them even higher.

When I was a boy, a poor man could start a gas station. Now, because of all the environmental rules and regulations and red tape, it costs a fortune to open a gas station. This causes gas prices to be higher, and will drive them higher if we do not, as I said a moment ago, get a little common sense and balance back into these rules.

Oil companies have been forced to merge and get bigger to survive. Small companies have been forced out of business by excessive and overly costly and expensive regulations. This has caused gas prices to be higher, and probably are headed even higher.

Sometimes those who shout the loudest about being for the little guy are