

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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.

□ 1515

MEDICAL DEVICES TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1881) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to make technical corrections relating to the amendments made by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1881

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 "Medical Devices Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC LAW 107-250.

(a) TITLE I; FEES RELATING TO MEDICAL DEVICES.—Part 3 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379i et seq.), as added by section 102 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1589), is amended—

(1) in section 737—

(A) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking "and for which clinical data are generally necessary to provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness" and inserting "and for which substantial clinical data are necessary to provide a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness";

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by striking "manufacturing";

(C) in paragraph (5)(J), by striking "a premarket application" and all that follows and inserting "a premarket application or premarket report under section 515 or a premarket application under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act."; and

(D) in paragraph (8), by striking "The term 'affiliate' means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity" and inserting "The term 'affiliate' means a business entity that has a relationship with a second business entity (whether domestic or international)"; and

(2) in section 738—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking "subsection (d)," and inserting "subsections (d) and (e).";

(II) in clause (iv), by striking "clause (i)," and all that follows and inserting "clause (i)."; and

(III) in clause (vii), by striking "clause (i)," and all that follows and inserting "clause (i), subject to any adjustment under subsection (e)(2)(C)(ii)."; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), in each of clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "application" and inserting "application, report,";

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), beginning in the second sentence, by striking "firms, which show" and inserting "firms, which show";

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking "Where" and inserting "For fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year, where"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), beginning in the second sentence, by striking "firms, which show" and inserting "firms, which show"; and

(II) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking "Where" and inserting "For fiscal year 2004 and each subsequent fiscal year, where";

(D) in subsection (f), by striking "for filing"; and

(E) in subsection (h)(2)(B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as items (aa) and (bb), respectively;

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively;

(iii) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) MORE THAN 5 PERCENT.—To the extent such costs are more than 5 percent below the specified level in subparagraph (A)(ii), fees may not be collected under this section for that fiscal year."

(b) TITLE II; AMENDMENTS REGARDING REGULATION OF MEDICAL DEVICES.—

(1) INSPECTIONS BY ACCREDITED PERSONS.—Section 704(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 374(g)), as added by section 201 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1602), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence, by striking "conducting inspections" and all that follows and inserting "conducting inspections of establishments that manufacture, prepare, propagate, compound, or process class II or class III devices, which inspections are required under section 510(h) or are inspections of such establishments required to register under section 510(i).";

(B) in paragraph (5)(B), in the first sentence, by striking "or poses" and all that follows through the period and inserting "poses a threat to public health, fails to act in a manner that is consistent with the purposes of this subsection, or where the Secretary determines that there is a financial conflict of interest in the relationship between the accredited person and the owner or operator of a device establishment that the accredited person has inspected under this subsection.";

(C) in paragraph (6)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking "of the establishment pursuant to subsection (h) or (i) of section 510" and inserting "described in paragraph (1)";

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I)—

(aa) by striking "each inspection" and inserting "inspections"; and

(bb) by inserting "during a 2-year period" after "person"; and

(II) in subclause (I), by striking "such a person" and inserting "an accredited person";

(iii) in clause (iii)—

(I) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "and the following additional conditions are met:" and inserting "and 1 or both of the following additional conditions are met:";

(II) in subclause (I), by striking "accredited" and all that follows through the period and inserting "(accredited under paragraph (2) and identified under clause (ii)(II) as a person authorized to conduct such inspections of device establishments."; and

(III) in subclause (II), by inserting "or by a person accredited under paragraph (2)" after "by the Secretary";

(iv) in clause (iv)(I)—

(I) in the first sentence—

(aa) by striking "the two immediately preceding inspections of the establishment" and inserting "inspections of the establishment during the previous 4 years"; and

(bb) by inserting "section" after "pursuant to";

(II) in the third sentence—

(aa) by striking "the petition states a commercial reason for the waiver"; and

(bb) by inserting "not" after "the Secretary has not determined that the public health would"; and

(III) in the fourth sentence, by striking "granted until" and inserting "granted or deemed to be granted until"; and

(v) in clause (iv)(II)—

(I) by inserting "of a device establishment required to register" after "to be conducted"; and

(II) by inserting "section" after "pursuant to";

(D) in paragraph (6)(B)(iii)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking "and data otherwise describing whether the establishment has consistently been in compliance with sections 501 and 502 and other" and inserting "and with other"; and

(ii) in the second sentence—

(I) by striking "inspections" and inserting "inspectional findings"; and

(II) by inserting "relevant" after "together with all other";

(E) in paragraph (6)(B)(iv)—

(i) by inserting "(I)" after "(iv)"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

"(II) If, during the two-year period following clearance under subparagraph (A), the Secretary determines that the device establishment is substantially not in compliance with this Act, the Secretary may, after notice and a written response, notify the establishment that the eligibility of the establishment for the inspections by accredited persons has been suspended.";

(F) in paragraph (6)(C)(ii), by striking "in accordance with section 510(h), or has not during such period been inspected pursuant to section 510(i), as applicable";

(G) in paragraph (10)(B)(iii), by striking "a reporting" and inserting "a report"; and

(H) in paragraph (12)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) the number of inspections conducted by accredited persons pursuant to this subsection and the number of inspections conducted by Federal employees pursuant to section 510(h) and of device establishments required to register under section 510(i)."; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking "obtained by the Secretary" and all that follows and inserting "obtained by the Secretary pursuant to inspections conducted by Federal employees";

(2) OTHER CORRECTIONS.—

(A) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 301(gg) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(gg)), as amended by section 201(d) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1609), is amended to read as follows:

"(gg) The knowing failure to comply with paragraph (7)(E) of section 704(g); the knowing inclusion by a person accredited under paragraph (2) of such section of false information in an inspection report under paragraph (7)(A) of such section; or the knowing failure of such a person to include material facts in such a report."

(B) ELECTRONIC LABELING.—Section 502(f) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352(f)), as amended by section 206 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1613), is amended, in the last sentence—

(i) by inserting "or by a health care professional and required labeling for in vitro diagnostic devices intended for use by health care professionals or in blood establishments" after "in health care facilities";

(ii) by inserting a comma after "means";

(iii) by striking "requirements of law and, that" and inserting "requirements of law, and that";

(iv) by striking "the manufacturer affords health care facilities the opportunity" and inserting "the manufacturer affords such users the opportunity"; and

(v) by striking "the health care facility".

(c) TITLE III; ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 301(b) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1616), is amended by

striking "18 months" and inserting "36 months".

(2) **PREMARKET NOTIFICATION.**—Section 510(o) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360(o)), as added by section 302(b) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1616), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking "adulterated" and inserting "or adulterated"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking "adulterated" and inserting "or adulterated"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking "semicritical" and inserting "semi-critical".

(d) **MISCELLANEOUS CORRECTIONS.**—

(1) **CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 515.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

(i) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 515(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360e(c)), as amended by sections 209 and 302(c)(2)(A) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1613, 1618), is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) (as added by section 209 of such Public Law) as paragraph (4).

(ii) **MODULAR REVIEW.**—Section 515(c)(4)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360e(c)(4)(B)) is amended by striking "unless an issue of safety" and inserting "unless a significant issue of safety".

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 210 of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1614) is amended by striking "as amended" and all that follows through "by adding" and inserting "is amended in paragraph (3), as redesignated by section 302(c)(2)(A) of this Act, by adding".

(2) **CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 738.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 738(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j(a)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "(a) Types of Fees.—Beginning on" and inserting the following:

"(a) **TYPES OF FEES.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning on"; and

(II) by striking "this section as follows:" and inserting "this section."; and

(ii) by striking "(1) **PREMARKET APPLICATION,**" and inserting the following: "(2) **PREMARKET APPLICATION,**".

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 738 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j), as amended by subparagraph (A), is amended—

(i) in subsection (d)(1), in the last sentence, by striking "subsection (a)(1)(A)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2)(A)";

(ii) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "subsection (a)(1)(A)(vii)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2)(A)(vii)";

(iii) in subsection (e)(2)(C)—

(I) in each of clauses (i) and (ii), by striking "subsection (a)(1)(A)(vii)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2)(A)(vii)"; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking "subsection (a)(1)(A)(i)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2)(A)(i)"; and

(iv) in subsection (j), by striking "subsection (a)(1)(D)," and inserting "subsection (a)(2)(D),".

(C) **ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 102(b)(1) of Public Law 107-250 (116 Stat. 1600) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "section 738(a)(1)(A)(ii)" and inserting "section 738(a)(2)(A)(ii)".

(3) **PUBLIC LAW 107-250.**—Public Law 107-250 is amended—

(A) in section 102(a) (116 Stat. 1589), by striking "(21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.)" and inserting "(21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.)";

(B) in section 102(b) (116 Stat. 1600)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (i) and (2), respectively; and

(iii) by striking:

"(b) **FEE EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES SUBMITTING PREMARKET REPORTS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A person submitting a premarket report" and inserting:

"(b) **FEE EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ENTITIES SUBMITTING PREMARKET REPORTS.**—A person submitting a premarket report"; and

(C) in section 212(b)(2) (116 Stat. 1614), by striking "such as phase IV trials,".

SEC. 3. REPORT ON BARRIERS TO AVAILABILITY OF DEVICES INTENDED FOR CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the barriers to the availability of devices intended for the treatment or diagnosis of diseases and conditions that affect children. The report shall include any recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services for changes to existing statutory authority, regulations, or agency policy or practice to encourage the invention and development of such devices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREENWOOD. 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 S. 1881.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1881, the Medical Devices Technical Corrections Act. S. 1881 is the companion to H.R. 3493, a bill I introduced with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), which makes technical and clarifying amendments to the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002. That bill was signed into law by President Bush on October 26, 2002, and made sweeping changes to the laws that govern device approvals to establish new programs and streamline processes to accelerate the availability of medical devices to patients.

H.R. 3493 passed the House on January 27 by a vote of 333 to zero and S. 1881 had passed by unanimous consent in the Senate on November 25, 2003. S. 1881 amends the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act to ensure that it is being implemented properly.

These two bills differ slightly, and the amended bill we are considering today is the conferenced version of this legislation. Staff have resolved the fairly minor differences between the Senate and House versions of the legislation, and this legislation should ultimately become law.

Some of the changes are truly technical, while others clarify the intentions of Congress in the Medical Device

User Fee Act. For example, this legislation ensures that the user fee reductions that apply to small businesses apply for 2004 and years in the future. In addition, S. 1881, as amended, clarifies that as part of the third-party inspection program, companies must submit reports of inspectional findings consistent with current FDA practices. And S. 1881 clarifies which data need to be submitted for a firm to be eligible for third-party consideration.

Medical devices are some of our health care system's most remarkable innovations. The provisions in this technical and clarifying amendments bill will allow the FDA to continue to reduce review times, increase the efficiency of its operations, and allow these wonderful technologies to be delivered to patients more quickly.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BARTON), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and the ranking members, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and each of their staff for this legislation. This has been another outstanding example of teamwork and bipartisanship on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I urge Members to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation, which will help ensure that FDA's medical device user fee and third-party review programs operate as intended. The goal of those programs is to promote timely access to medical devices without compromising FDA's ability to evaluate properly the safety and effectiveness of those devices.

Successful bipartisan negotiations produced the authorizing legislation for these programs, and it is the same with this follow-up measure. I commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) for their work on this successful committee effort.

Unfortunately, the need for non-controversial technical corrections is not the only obstacle preventing the medical device user program from fulfilling its potential. It is important for colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be aware that continuation of the user fee program, and it is this program that enables patients to receive cutting edge medical devices on a timely basis, the continuation of the user fee program hinges on the appropriations process.

User fees do no incremental good if they supplant rather than supplement Federal spending. As in the successful prescription drug user fee program, the continuation of user fees depends on sufficient annual appropriations. Last year's appropriation for medical device

reviews was insufficient to sustain the medical device user fee program. If this year's appropriation does not address this shortfall, the user fee program could very well fold.

Hard work went into establishing that program. The existence of that program enables patients more timely access to medical devices at no additional cost to American taxpayers. We need to make sure the program does not fold.

Mr. Speaker, as this House continues its rush to give more tax cuts to the most affluent people in the country, therefore making a choice to underfund too often health and education, it is important that we focus on this very important, essential program.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the appropriations committee that funds the Food and Drug Administration, I feel that I must register my concerns.

We have seen user fees for human drugs, animal drugs, and now medical devices. That is fine—companies are paying for a service, and they have been able to invest in FDA to gain efficiency.

Mr. concern arises over requirements in the user fee legislation for certain levels of appropriations for those programs—usually referred to as “triggers”. Medical devices is the most extreme example. The authorizing legislation requires tremendous increases in appropriated funding.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter that Chairman YOUNG and I sent to Chairman TAUZIN last October outlining these concerns.

OCTOBER 21, 2003.

Hon. W.J. (Billy) TAUZIN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAUZIN: We are writing to you as our partners in maintaining the viability of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). We have a very collegial and positive working relationship with your Committee in its role as authorizers for FDA activities, and we appreciate your diligence in providing critical oversight. However, we write to you today with concerns we have as appropriators with the responsibility for setting annual appropriations levels for the FDA.

We see a trend occurring within the authorizing legislation for user fee programs. Prescription drug user fees were first authorized in 1992. That legislation included a “trigger” which required that appropriations for FDA as a whole and for drug review, in particular, meet certain levels in each of the years that the user fees were in effect. The two reauthorizations of those user fees retained the appropriations requirements; in fact, in the last reauthorization in 2002, additional triggers were added. Also in 2002, medical devices user fees were enacted. Again, requirements for FDA appropriations were integral to the user fee legislation. In the case of the medical device legislation, the requirement for appropriated funding of the medical device program included substantial and sustained increases in budget authority. The authorization language stipulates that if the cumulative appropriations trigger is not met, the user fee program will cease at the end of fiscal year 2005. This requirement was included without consultation with the Committee on Appropriations.

Most recently, the House and Senate have passed similar legislation allowing for the

collection of animal drug user fees. Again, both the House and Senate versions of the bill contain requirements for certain levels of FDA appropriations. According to some published reports, your Committee had received assurance from the leadership that funding levels for animal drug reviews would be increased in fiscal year 2004. Again, the Committee on Appropriations was not consulted in these negotiations.

In effect, these triggers in user fee legislation earmark FDA funds for human drugs, medical devices, and animal drugs. The Committee on Appropriations has always supported FDA as a whole and has resisted efforts to add budget authority to one program area at the expense of another. If we let user fee triggers drive our decisions, the FDA programs to suffer would be those not covered by fees—blood, vaccines, counter-terrorism activities, food safety, or bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) prevention. We firmly believe that a strong FDA must balance the needs of all its mission areas to best benefit public health. We have serious concerns about the prevalence and scope of appropriations requirements embedded in user fee authorizing legislation for FDA, and about the lack of consultation with our Committee in legislating such requirements.

A larger problem is the fact that your Committee's jurisdiction over the Agriculture Appropriations Bill is limited to the FDA. It is our Committee's task to establish fair allocations of resources among competing interests under the jurisdiction of all authorizing committees. Legislating triggers for individual programs serves to thwart our efforts at fairness by favoring a limited number of programs at the expense of others in our bill—including the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), agriculture research, and conservation activities. These programs are critically important to many members and their constituents.

As always, we are available to discuss the issue with you, and would be glad to do so. We share your dedication to improve the effectiveness and viability of FDA's programs that are crucial to our nation's well being.

Sincerely,

C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee
on Appropriations.
HENRY BONILLA,
Chairman, Subcommittee
on Agriculture,
Rural Development,
FDA and Related
Agencies.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1881, 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. GREENWOOD. 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.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT KIDS LOVE A MYSTERY IS A PROGRAM THAT PROMOTES LITERACY AND SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 373) expressing the sense of Congress that Kids Love a Mystery is a program that promotes literacy and should be encouraged.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 373

Whereas knowledge, wisdom, and children are the greatest assets of a democracy;

Whereas books enable one generation to pass on its knowledge and wisdom to the next;

Whereas learning to read is one of the greatest privileges the Nation extends to its children;

Whereas children most often choose mysteries as their favorite books;

Whereas the Mystery Writers of America sponsors Kids Love a Mystery, an outreach program designed to bring mystery writers and children together to encourage literacy and the love of reading; and

Whereas the Mystery Writers of America recognizes the value in celebrating the importance of reading for children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Kids Love a Mystery is a program that helps promote literacy and reading and should be supported and encouraged; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation encouraging the people of the United States and interested groups to promote Kids Love a Mystery with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 373.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 373, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). The concurrent resolution would establish Kids Love a Mystery Month and recognize the importance of encouraging children to read books, and especially mystery stories.

I am pleased that First Lady Laura Bush has agreed to serve as honorary chair of Mystery Writers of America's Kids Love a Mystery Program. Mrs. Bush expressed the appropriate sentiment for us all when she said, “Our love of reading is what makes us tuck a paperback under our arm on the way