

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, our actions today may cause the courts to review the sentiments behind "one Nation under God" or "In God We Trust" because if the courts look at the importance that we apparently affix to "one Nation under God" or "In God We Trust," then it diminishes the argument that the phrase has de minimis meaning and increases the constitutional vulnerability of the use of that phrase in the Pledge.

Furthermore, the court may look at the legislation under the Lemon test and find that this exercise has no secular purpose and is, therefore, unconstitutional. The section of bill referring to "In God We Trust" as the national motto appears to be vulnerable to the same constitutional attack as the phrase "under God" in the Pledge. Those attacks gain validity because of our actions today.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with a quote from an editorial that appeared in the *Christian Century*, a non-denominational Protestant weekly, which a good friend was kind enough to send me. It reads, "To the extent 'under God' has real religious meaning, then it is unconstitutional. The phrase is constitutional to the extent that it is religiously innocuous. Given that choice, we side with the Ninth Circuit. We see no need, especially for Christians, to defend hollow references to an innocuous God." For those reasons, I urge Members to oppose this legislation.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, in 1776 the great American patriot Thomas Paine wrote, "These are the times that try men's souls."

But right now we are living in times that try men's souls. These are times when our faith is being tested as never before.

Even as we contend with the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, three judges in California decide that our Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional because it includes the words, "Under God."

The values we teach at home and church are universal and should not be left outside the schoolhouse door, or outside of where we work and play every day.

"One Nation Under God" is the foundation of our Pledge of Allegiance. "In God We Trust" is our national motto and should be engraved in our national conscience. I am not afraid to say, "In God We Trust" wherever and whenever I want. All Americans should have that right.

My father, Clifford Shows, was one of those captured as a Prisoner of War at the Battle of the Bulge in World War II. He stands tall when our Flag is displayed. There is nothing more un-American than denying our children the right to honor the symbol of the very freedom we all enjoy today.

The California court ruling flies in the face of every veteran who sacrificed his or her life to protect this nation. The Court's ruling was a disgrace and our people deserve better.

In the 106th Congress I introduced a resolution that encourages "In God We Trust" to be posted prominently in all public and government buildings, just like it is in my own office, right next to the Ten Commandments.

I wrote this bipartisan resolution with the direct assistance of the Reverend Donald

Wildmon of the American Family Association. And I re-introduced it as H. Res. 15 on the first day of the 107th Congress.

This issue is too important to let partisan politics get in the way, and I am happy that we are today considering a measure that reiterates the importance of our National Motto, and the presence of God in our lives.

Let's adopt an "In God We Trust" resolution today—for our families and for our nation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2690, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1315

FEDERAL AGENCY PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4561) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that agencies, in promulgating rules, take into consideration the impact of such rules on the privacy of individuals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4561

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT THAT AGENCY RULE-MAKING TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 553 the following new section:

"§ 553a. Privacy impact analysis in rule-making

"(a) INITIAL PRIVACY IMPACT ANALYSIS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever an agency is required by section 553 of this title, or any other law, to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking for any proposed rule, or publishes a notice of proposed rulemaking for an interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States, the agency shall prepare and make available for public comment an initial privacy impact analysis. Such analysis shall describe the impact of the proposed rule on the privacy of individuals. The initial privacy impact analysis or a summary shall be signed by the senior agency official with primary responsibility for privacy policy and be published in

the Federal Register at the time of the publication of a general notice of proposed rulemaking for the rule.

"(2) CONTENTS.—Each initial privacy impact analysis required under this subsection shall contain the following:

"(A) A description and assessment of the extent to which the proposed rule will impact the privacy interests of individuals, including the extent to which the proposed rule—

"(i) provides notice of the collection of personally identifiable information, and specifies what personally identifiable information is to be collected and how it is to be collected, maintained, used, and disclosed;

"(ii) allows access to such information by the person to whom the personally identifiable information pertains and provides an opportunity to correct inaccuracies;

"(iii) prevents such information, which is collected for one purpose, from being used for another purpose; and

"(iv) provides security for such information.

"(B) A description of any significant alternatives to the proposed rule which accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and which minimize any significant privacy impact of the proposed rule on individuals.

"(b) FINAL PRIVACY IMPACT ANALYSIS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever an agency promulgates a final rule under section 553 of this title, after being required by that section or any other law to publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking, or promulgates a final interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States, the agency shall prepare a final privacy impact analysis, signed by the senior agency official with primary responsibility for privacy policy.

"(2) CONTENTS.—Each final privacy impact analysis required under this subsection shall contain the following:

"(A) A description and assessment of the extent to which the final rule will impact the privacy interests of individuals, including the extent to which the proposed rule—

"(i) provides notice of the collection of personally identifiable information, and specifies what personally identifiable information is to be collected and how it is to be collected, maintained, used, and disclosed;

"(ii) allows access to such information by the person to whom the personally identifiable information pertains and provides an opportunity to correct inaccuracies;

"(iii) prevents such information, which is collected for one purpose, from being used for another purpose; and

"(iv) provides security for such information.

"(B) A summary of the significant issues raised by the public comments in response to the initial privacy impact analysis, a summary of the assessment of the agency of such issues, and a statement of any changes made in the proposed rule as a result of such issues.

"(C) A description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant privacy impact on individuals consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the privacy interests of individuals was rejected.

"(3) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The agency shall make copies of the final privacy impact analysis available to members of the public and shall publish in the Federal Register such analysis or a summary thereof.

“(c) PROCEDURE FOR WAIVER OR DELAY OF COMPLETION.—An agency head may waive or delay the completion of some or all of the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) to the same extent as the agency head may, under section 608, waive or delay the completion of some or all of the requirements of sections 603 and 604, respectively.

“(d) PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING COMMENTS.—When any rule is promulgated which may have a significant privacy impact on individuals, or a privacy impact on a substantial number of individuals, the head of the agency promulgating the rule or the official of the agency with statutory responsibility for the promulgation of the rule shall assure that individuals have been given an opportunity to participate in the rulemaking for the rule through techniques such as—

“(1) the inclusion in an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, if issued, of a statement that the proposed rule may have a significant privacy impact on individuals, or a privacy impact on a substantial number of individuals;

“(2) the publication of a general notice of proposed rulemaking in publications of national circulation likely to be obtained by individuals;

“(3) the direct notification of interested individuals;

“(4) the conduct of open conferences or public hearings concerning the rule for individuals, including soliciting and receiving comments over computer networks; and

“(5) the adoption or modification of agency procedural rules to reduce the cost or complexity of participation in the rulemaking by individuals.

“(e) PERIODIC REVIEW OF RULES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall carry out a periodic review of the rules promulgated by the agency that have a significant privacy impact on individuals, or a privacy impact on a substantial number of individuals. Under such periodic review, the agency shall determine, for each such rule, whether the rule can be amended or rescinded in a manner that minimizes any such impact while remaining in accordance with applicable statutes. For each such determination, the agency shall consider the following factors:

“(A) The continued need for the rule.

“(B) The nature of complaints or comments received from the public concerning the rule.

“(C) The complexity of the rule.

“(D) The extent to which the rule overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with other Federal rules, and, to the extent feasible, with State and local governmental rules.

“(E) The length of time since the rule was last reviewed under this subsection.

“(F) The degree to which technology, economic conditions, or other factors have changed in the area affected by the rule since the rule was last reviewed under this subsection.

“(2) PLAN REQUIRED.—Each agency shall carry out the periodic review required by paragraph (1) in accordance with a plan published by such agency in the Federal Register. Each such plan shall provide for the review under this subsection of each rule promulgated by the agency not later than 10 years after the date on which such rule was published as the final rule and, thereafter, not later than 10 years after the date on which such rule was last reviewed under this subsection. The agency may amend such plan at any time by publishing the revision in the Federal Register.

“(3) ANNUAL PUBLICATION.—Each year, each agency shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the rules to be reviewed by such agency under this subsection during the following year. The list shall include a brief de-

scription of each such rule and the need for and legal basis of such rule and shall invite public comment upon the determination to be made under this subsection with respect to such rule.

“(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For any rule subject to this section, an individual who is adversely affected or aggrieved by final agency action is entitled to judicial review of agency compliance with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) in accordance with chapter 7. Agency compliance with subsection (d) shall be judicially reviewable in connection with judicial review of subsection (b).

“(2) JURISDICTION.—Each court having jurisdiction to review such rule for compliance with section 553, or under any other provision of law, shall have jurisdiction to review any claims of noncompliance with subsections (b) and (c) in accordance with chapter 7. Agency compliance with subsection (d) shall be judicially reviewable in connection with judicial review of subsection (b).

“(3) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) An individual may seek such review during the period beginning on the date of final agency action and ending 1 year later, except that where a provision of law requires that an action challenging a final agency action be commenced before the expiration of 1 year, such lesser period shall apply to an action for judicial review under this subsection.

“(B) In the case where an agency delays the issuance of a final privacy impact analysis pursuant to subsection (c), an action for judicial review under this section shall be filed not later than—

“(i) 1 year after the date the analysis is made available to the public; or

“(ii) where a provision of law requires that an action challenging a final agency regulation be commenced before the expiration of the 1-year period, the number of days specified in such provision of law that is after the date the analysis is made available to the public.

“(4) RELIEF.—In granting any relief in an action under this subsection, the court shall order the agency to take corrective action consistent with this section and chapter 7, including, but not limited to—

“(A) remanding the rule to the agency; and

“(B) deferring the enforcement of the rule against individuals, unless the court finds that continued enforcement of the rule is in the public interest.

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of any court to stay the effective date of any rule or provision thereof under any other provision of law or to grant any other relief in addition to the requirements of this subsection.

“(6) RECORD OF AGENCY ACTION.—In an action for the judicial review of a rule, the privacy impact analysis for such rule, including an analysis prepared or corrected pursuant to paragraph (4), shall constitute part of the entire record of agency action in connection with such review.

“(7) EXCLUSIVITY.—Compliance or non-compliance by an agency with the provisions of this section shall be subject to judicial review only in accordance with this subsection.

“(8) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection bars judicial review of any other impact statement or similar analysis required by any other law if judicial review of such statement or analysis is otherwise permitted by law.

“(g) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means information that can be used to identify an individual, including such individual’s name, address, telephone number,

photograph, social security number or other identifying information. It includes information about such individual’s medical or financial condition.”

(b) PERIODIC REVIEW TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

(1) INITIAL PLAN.—For each agency, the plan required by subsection (e) of section 553a of title 5, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), shall be published not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) In the case of a rule promulgated by an agency before the date of the enactment of this Act, such plan shall provide for the periodic review of such rule before the expiration of the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. For any such rule, the head of the agency may provide for a 1-year extension of such period if the head of the agency, before the expiration of the period, certifies in a statement published in the Federal Register that reviewing such rule before the expiration of the period is not feasible. The head of the agency may provide for additional 1-year extensions of the period pursuant to the preceding sentence, but in no event may the period exceed 15 years.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—Section 801(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) the agency’s actions relevant to section 553a;”

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 553 the following new item:

“553a. Privacy impact analysis in rulemaking.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4561, the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act. Throughout my tenure as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have worked to strike a proper balance between laws designed to preserve the safety and security of Americans and those which needlessly compromise our civil liberties. The Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act helps preserve this balance.

H.R. 4561 requires that rules noticed by Federal agencies for public comment under the Administrative Procedure Act be accompanied by an initial

privacy impact assessment which explains how the proposed rule will affect personal privacy. The issuing agency would then receive public views on the privacy impact of the proposed rule and issue a final privacy impact analysis which explains how the Federal agency will obtain, utilize, and safeguard personally identifiable information.

Importantly, the bill contains a judicial review provision to ensure that Federal agencies adhere to its requirements. In this respect H.R. 4561 mirrors regulatory enhancements to the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which require Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of proposed legislation and regulations on small businesses. Furthermore, unlike existing Federal statutes which protect against the unauthorized disclosure of personal information obtained by the Federal Government, the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act prospectively ensures that Federal agencies consider the privacy impact of proposed rules before they become binding Federal regulations.

This bill reflects a spirit of commitment to privacy rights by providing the American public a mechanism which simply requires an agency to give advanced notice and opportunity to comment on how rules issued by Federal agencies will affect their personal privacy. As such, it reaffirms our fidelity to the fundamental civil liberties cherished by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this measure enjoys broad bipartisan support on the Committee on the Judiciary and is endorsed by as diverse a group of organizations ranging from the American Civil Liberties Union to the National Rifle Association. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4561, the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act. I believe this legislation will improve the regulatory process and protect Americans from unjustified or unintended invasions of privacy. Individuals are required to provide detailed personal information while conducting a variety of everyday activities including credit card purchases, Internet usage, medical care, financial transactions, and the delivery of basic government services. Public transmission of this information further heightens the potential of identity fraud, a growing problem which impacted more than 700,000 Americans last year.

While the Identity Theft and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1988 was enacted to address this problem, the FBI stated that identity theft remains America's fastest-growing white collar crime. Under this legislation, Federal agencies must consider the impact of proposed regulations on individual privacy. They will be required to include an initial privacy impact analysis with

proposed regulations that are circulated for public notice and final privacy impact analysis that describes the steps that were taken to minimize the significant privacy impact of proposed regulations and justifies any alternative with respect to privacy that was chosen by the agency. In addition, the bill provides judicial review of the adequacy of an agency's final privacy impact, similar to that provided by the Regulatory Flexibility Act for small businesses. Essentially, the bill requires agencies to take responsibility for privacy concerns of individual citizens.

At a time when identity theft and misuse of personal information is rampant, increasing this bill will go a long way in protecting the American citizens from victimization. That is why it is supported by broad bipartisan, diverse political and philosophical organizations, such as the ones the chairman mentioned. I support the legislation and strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 2002, I introduced H.R. 4561, the "Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act." I was pleased to be joined by several cosponsors on the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, including the distinguished Ranking Member MEL WATT, and Representatives CHABOT, GEKAS, NADLER, and GREEN. Since its introduction, the bill has garnered the support of an additional 37 members of Congress, including Judiciary Committee Chairman F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, and several other distinguished members of Congress.

It is clear that this bill's many cosponsors do not agree on every issue. In fact, many observers have been particularly impressed by the political diversity of its legislative sponsors. The same can be said of the bill's non-congressional supporters, which include groups ranging from the National Rifle Association to the Electronic Privacy Information Center—from the Eagle Forum to the American Civil Liberties Union.

Supporters share a commitment to protecting the privacy cherished by American citizens—a value increasingly imperiled in an information age in which personal information is captured and compiled, manipulated and misused, bought and sold in ways unimagined just a few years ago. The sphere of privacy, which Justice Brandeis eloquently described as the "right to be let alone," is not only rapidly diminishing, it is increasingly penetrable. Special care is necessary to ensure that personal information remains personal, absent a sound reason to treat it otherwise.

This value is neither Republican or Democratic; liberal or conservative, it is an American value.

The Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act takes the first—necessary—step toward protecting the privacy of information collected by the federal government, by requiring that rules noticed for public comment by federal agencies be accompanied by an assessment of the rule's impact on personal privacy interests, including the extent to which the proposed rule provides notice of the collection of personally identifiable information, what information will be obtained, and how this informa-

tional will be collected, protected, maintained, used and disclosed.

H.R. 4561 further provides that final rules be accompanied by a final privacy impact analysis, which indicates how the issuing agency considered and responded to privacy concerns raised by the public, and explains whether the agency could have taken an approach less burdensome to personal privacy.

Unlike existing laws protecting against the disclosure of information already obtained by the federal government, the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act provides prospective notice of a proposed rule's effect on privacy before it becomes a binding regulation.

While some have decried the loss of personal privacy by private companies, it must be emphasized government alone has the authority to compel the disclosure of personal information; and unlike a private commercial gatherer of personal data, the government can put you in jail based on what it uncovers. For this reason, the government has an obligation to exercise greater responsibility when enacting policies which undermine privacy rights. An earlier version of this measure was introduced last Congress by Representative CHABOT, a fellow member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a strong defender of privacy rights.

Importantly, H.R. 4561 permits individuals adversely affected by an agency's failure to follow its provisions to seek judicial review pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In this respect, the bill tracks amendments to the Regulatory Flexibility Act championed by Representative GEKAS, which provide for judicial review of rules issued without regard to their impact on small businesses. Mr. Speaker, I can say, without hesitation, privacy is no less important to American citizens than regulatory burdens are to American businesses, and this measure reflects this recognition.

Earlier in the Congress, the Judiciary Committee played a central role in House consideration of the Department of Homeland Security. Several pro-privacy provisions which I authorized, including the creation of a Privacy Officer at the new Department, and a prohibition against the creation of national identification cards were reported by the Judiciary Committee and adopted by the Select Committee on Homeland Security. While I continue to support the creation of a federal department dedicated to homeland security, we must continue to ensure the privacy rights of all Americans are not needlessly compromised by the government, and the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act helps maintain this vigilance.

Finally, I want to emphasize H.R. 4561 will not unduly burden regulators nor will it hinder law enforcement. The Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act will apply the best anti-septic—sunshine—to the federal rulemaking process by securing the public's right to know about how rules will affect their personal privacy. It also ensure that citizens have the opportunity not only to critique the substance of a rule, but to do so with an understanding of the reasoning and justification upon which the rule was predicated by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, recent polls reflect growing public unease about the diminishing sphere of privacy brought about by rapid technological and social change. The Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act helps address these

concerns by providing the American public with a modest, although necessary mechanism which requires federal agencies to give advance notice, and an opportunity to comment, on how rules issued by federal agencies will affect their personal privacy.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my tenure in Congress, I have striven to keep faith with my sworn obligation to protect and preserve the Constitution of the United States. This precious document, which secures our fundamental rights and liberties, will endure as a charter of freedom only as long as there are those with the fidelity to live by it and the courage to defend it. Of the several philosophical foundations which undergird the Bill of Rights, the right to privacy provides a central, organizing principle which gives content to the substantive protections contained in our Founding document.

I believe I have done my part to uphold this body's sacred obligation to preserve the sanctity of our Constitution, and urge my colleagues to do the same by supporting the Federal Agency Protection of Privacy Act.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4561.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL COMMUNITY ROLE MODELS WEEK

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 409) supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Role Models Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 409

Whereas individuals who are motivated every day by traditional American values such as selflessness, compassion, dedication, courage, and integrity have a positive effect on society by encouraging others to act in a similar manner;

Whereas individuals in local communities located throughout the United States embody these values in their daily work, communities, and homes;

Whereas children and adults would benefit from learning about individuals in their community who embody these values and about what motivates them;

Whereas because children learn and act by examples they experience on a daily basis, they need role models from their local community with whom they can realistically relate;

Whereas inspiring stories about an individual that a child knows or might meet in the community can make a difference in that child's decisions and life;

Whereas the Recognizing Achievement—Rewarding Excellence Foundation (R.A.R.E. Foundation) based in Troy, Michigan, has es-

tablished a program to recognize exceptional people who work in the community and further educate children in the community about such people;

Whereas the R.A.R.E. Foundation is willing to provide guidance to any community interested in starting such a program; and

Whereas National Community Role Models Week is a fitting tribute to the many individuals who displayed motivation, selflessness, compassion, dedication, courage, and integrity during the aftermath of the terrorist attacks against the United States which occurred on September 11, 2001: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Community Role Models Week;

(2) commends the Recognizing Achievement—Rewarding Excellence Foundation based in Troy, Michigan, for establishing a program to recognize exceptional people who work in the community and further educate children in the community about such people; and

(3) encourages the establishment of similar programs in communities throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 409.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker I am pleased to have the House consider House Concurrent Resolution 409. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for introducing this measure and working so hard to bring it to the floor.

I am a co-sponsor of this important resolution that expresses the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of the National Community Role Models Week. This resolution encourages communities to adopt programs that recognize local heroes and educate children about them.

In addition, this resolution recognizes an organization of southeastern Michigan that has established a program to recognize outstanding community residents and teach children about work ethic values and accomplishments. Since 1998 the Recognizing Achievement—Rewarding Excellence, or RARE, Foundation of Troy, Michigan, has identified hundreds of unsung heroes in the Detroit Metropolitan area. Some award winners include an entrepreneur who built a successful company that teaches moderately handicapped people to live on their own, a receptionist who created a care pro-

gram for the spouses of terminally ill employees, and a principal of an elementary school located in a poverty-stricken and drug-impacted neighborhood who led the school to achieve the national Blue Ribbon award.

Children need role models today more than ever. A role model from a child's family or community can make a great difference in a child's life. Although we often hear inspiring stories about famous individuals, we seldom publicly recognize exceptional people in our communities who can better relate to kids. There are many working individuals in our local communities who are motivated every day by values such as selflessness, compassion, dedication, courage, and integrity. Although these people could be a wonderful role model for children in their communities, their efforts are seldom publicly recognized; and as a result, people in the community cannot benefit from not knowing about them. Since children learn by examples they experience on a daily basis, they need role models from their local community.

More than rock stars or sports figures, these individuals can better inspire children to think about their personal heroes and reflect upon their dreams and aspirations. It is essential that we validate and promote at a local level the exceptional values possessed by many individuals within our communities. Establishing an annual week for identifying role models in our local communities would remind us how each individual, no matter his or her profession, plays a vital role in the greatness of this Nation. I commend the RARE Foundation for establishing a program to recognize community role models, and I encourage other communities to establish similar programs. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER) in considering Con. Res. 409, supporting the goals and ideals of National Community Role Models Week, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 409 supports the goals of National Community Role Models Week and the Recognizing Achievement—Rewarding Excellence Foundation, the RARE Foundation.

While today's athletes and entertainers have inspiring stories of perseverance, endurance, and dedication and are indeed noteworthy individuals, they are often far removed from the lives that young people live. However, parents, teachers, nurses, crossing guards, the so-called working stiff, ordinary everyday people are the people that interact and touch the lives of young people on a daily basis. People that go to work every day to earn an honest living that provide a service and