

original appearance. Local residents regarded the courthouse as the heart of the county and as a symbol of their community.

This resolution expresses our condolences to the town of Pittsboro and all of Chatham County, North Carolina, for their loss of this historic and significant building, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 1364. This resolution honors the historic and community significance of the Chatham County Courthouse and expresses condolences to Chatham County and the town of Pittsboro for the fire damage sustained by the courthouse on March 25, 2010.

The cornerstone of the Chatham County Courthouse was laid in 1881. The courthouse was completed in 1882. For nearly 130 years, justice and the rule of law preserved this three-story brick courthouse. It stood as the central landmark and community gathering-place for Pittsboro and Chatham County. It helped form the identity and independence of the people of Chatham County.

On March 25, 2010, the Chatham County Courthouse was partially destroyed by a tragic fire. Firefighters and emergency responders fought courageously to save the structure and the historic archives within it. They also protected the public and surrounding buildings from damage.

State, county, and city officials have since worked to ensure that the administration of justice continues in Chatham County. They also plan to restore the courthouse.

This resolution expresses condolences to the people of Chatham County and the town of Pittsboro for their historic loss. The resolution commends the heroic work of the firefighters and first responders, and it recognizes the significance of the courthouse to the community and to the administration of justice for more than a century. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and rise in support of H. Res. 1364, recognizing and remembering the Chatham County Courthouse in Pittsboro, North Carolina.

At 4:15 p.m. on March 25 of this year, the upper portion of the courthouse caught fire. The blaze eventually destroyed much of the building, taking with it over 130 years of history and a source of pride and appreciation for Chatham County residents and visitors.

The county the courthouse serves is divided between the Second and Fourth Congressional Districts, and I am

pleased to join my colleague, Representative BOB ETHERIDGE, and other North Carolina colleagues today in lamenting the serious damage to this landmark structure.

The Chatham County Courthouse dates back to September 1, 1881, when members of the Columbus Lodge 102 laid its cornerstone at the historic town center of Pittsboro. The building, which is known for its two-story classical portico, topped by a three-stage cupola, was designed by Thomas B. Womack, following the passage of legislation in the North Carolina General Assembly to provide the county with construction bonds of up to \$12,000.

The building was completed less than 1 year later, on Independence Day of 1882, and has served ever since as a landmark to visitors and residents alike and a symbol of constancy to the broader community.

Although the building will be rebuilt in time and many of the records lost will be recreated, I grieve with the Chatham County community today for the loss of this courthouse. County courthouses are the cornerstones of justice and the rule of law in our communities; but we know they attain a greater significance, a significance larger than their day-to-day role.

I also would like to recognize the local first responders who responded to the fire for their heroic action in controlling the blaze and ensuring the safety of court personnel. Thanks to their efforts and a working fire alarm system, there were no injuries or fatalities as a result of this fire.

I also commend the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts and the Chatham County and town of Pittsboro governments, which have worked tirelessly to ensure the continuity of judicial operations and to develop a plan to restore the courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ETHERIDGE, who represents the town of Pittsboro and the majority of Chatham County in Congress, for his leadership on this resolution. I join with him in extending condolences to the community and expressing our hope and expectation that efforts to rebuild the portions of the building that were destroyed and to restore the archives will be swift and successful.

□ 1545

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1364.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### KATIE SEPICH ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION ACT OF 2010

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4614) to amend part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for incentive payments under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program for States to implement minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4614

*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 "Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act of 2010".

#### SEC. 2. INCENTIVE PAYMENTS UNDER THE BYRNE GRANTS PROGRAM FOR STATES TO IMPLEMENT MINIMUM AND ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESSES.

Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) PAYMENT INCENTIVES FOR STATES TO IMPLEMENT MINIMUM AND ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESSES.—

“(1) PAYMENT INCENTIVES.—

“(A) BONUS FOR MINIMUM DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case of a State that receives funds for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2011) under this subpart and has implemented a minimum DNA collection process and uses such process for such year, the amount of funds that would otherwise be allocated under this subpart to such State for such fiscal year shall be increased by 5 percent.

“(B) BONUS FOR ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—In the case of a State that receives funds for a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2011) under this subpart and has implemented an enhanced DNA collection process and uses such process for such year, the amount of funds that would otherwise be allocated under this subpart to such State for such fiscal year shall be increased by 10 percent.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) MINIMUM DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—The term ‘minimum DNA collection process’ means, with respect to a State, a process under which the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is searched at least one time against samples from the following individuals who are at least 18 years of age:

“(i) Such individuals who are arrested for, charged with, or indicted for a criminal offense under State law that consists of murder or voluntary manslaughter or any attempt to commit murder or voluntary manslaughter.

“(ii) Such individuals who are arrested for, charged with, or indicted for a criminal offense under State law that has an element

involving a sexual act or sexual contact with another and that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 5 years, or an attempt to commit such an offense.

“(iii) Such individuals who are arrested for, charged with, or indicted for a criminal offense under State law that has an element of kidnapping or abduction punishable by imprisonment for 5 years or more.

“(B) ENHANCED DNA COLLECTION PROCESS.—The term ‘enhanced DNA collection process’ means, with respect to a State, a process under which the State provides for the collection, for purposes of inclusion in the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of DNA samples from the following individuals who are at least 18 years of age:

“(i) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of murder or voluntary manslaughter or any attempt to commit murder or voluntary manslaughter.

“(ii) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that has an element involving a sexual act or sexual contact with another and that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year, or an attempt to commit such an offense.

“(iii) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of a specified offense against a minor (as defined in section 111(7) of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911(7)), or an attempt to commit such an offense.

“(iv) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of burglary or any attempt to commit burglary.

“(v) Such individuals who are arrested for or charged with a criminal offense under State law that consists of aggravated assault.

“(3) EXPUNGEMENT OF PROFILES.—The expungement requirements under section 210304(d) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14132(d)) shall apply to any samples collected pursuant to this subsection for purposes of inclusion in the Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(4) REPORTS.—The Attorney General shall submit to the Committee of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee of the Judiciary of the Senate an annual report (which shall be made publicly available) that—

“(A) lists the States, for the year involved—

“(i) which have (and those States which have not) implemented a minimum DNA collection process and use such process; and

“(ii) which have (and those States which have not) implemented an enhanced DNA collection process and use such process;

“(B) describes the increases granted to States under paragraph (1) for the year involved and the amounts that States not receiving an increase under such paragraph would have received if such States had a minimum or enhanced DNA collection process; and

“(C) includes statistics, with respect to the year involved, regarding the benefits to law enforcement resulting from the implementation of minimum and enhanced DNA collection processes, including the number of matches made due to the inclusion of arrestee profiles under such a process.

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2015, in addition to funds made available under section 508, such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed the amount that is 10 percent of the total

amount appropriated pursuant to such section for such fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act of 2010, otherwise known as Katie's Law, will help prevent violent crime, help exonerate the innocent, give our police access to cutting-edge forensic techniques, and reduce the cost of criminal investigations. More importantly, Katie's Law will help victims of violent crime and their families get answers and the closure that they need.

Katie's Law encourages the States to adopt effective DNA collection procedures. States that meet the minimum standards set by the bill are entitled to a 5 percent bonus in Byrne/JAG funding for State and local law enforcement. States that adopt the enhanced standards are entitled to a 10 percent bonus. These funds are in addition to funds awarded through Byrne/JAG. States that do not adopt collection procedures that meet the new Federal standards are not penalized in any way. Katie's Law also directs the Attorney General to report to Congress once a year on the progress made by the States in adopting new collection procedures.

Katie's Law is named for Katie Sepich, who is remembered as a vibrant young woman and a graduate student at New Mexico State University. In the summer of 2003, Katie was brutally raped and murdered just outside her home. Katie's parents, Jayann and Dave Sepich, waited for 3 long years as the investigation continued, without producing any strong leads. In January, 2006, thanks to the efforts of the Sepich family, the New Mexico State legislature passed a measure to require the collection of DNA evidence in the investigation of certain felonies. Months later, investigators linked a DNA sample from Katie's attacker to a sample taken from a repeat violent offender who had been in and out of police custody for years. Confronted with the evidence, the suspect pled guilty to the crime and is now serving 69 years in prison without parole.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the law enforcement officers who solved this crime. But consider the fact that Katie's assailant was arrested for ag-

gravated burglary just weeks after attacking Katie. If a DNA sample from that individual had matched evidence from the crime scene, the case might have been solved years earlier; police officers could have saved thousands of dollars and hundreds of man hours; and Katie's family might not have spent 3 painful years in investigatory limbo.

Katie's Law provides the resources necessary to solve crimes sooner. This measure passed the House with overwhelming support last Congress, and has cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. I commend my colleagues, HARRY TEAGUE and ADAM SCHIFF, for their tireless work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4614.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4614, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of. The Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act authorizes incentive grants to States that implement programs to collect DNA samples from felony arrestees. DNA arrestee programs provide an important law enforcement tool to identify the perpetrators of open and unsolved cases. DNA arrestee programs can also prevent crime by linking suspects to crimes and locking them up before they have a chance to strike again.

Katie Sepich's case clearly demonstrates the value of collecting DNA from felony arrestees. Just 3 months after brutally raping and murdering Katie in 2003, Gabriel Avilla committed an aggravated burglary for which he was convicted in 2004, absconded from his sentencing, and was apprehended again in 2005. His DNA was finally taken and matched to Katie's case—a match that could have been obtained just 3 months after Katie's murder, saving valuable law enforcement resources and providing some closure to Katie's families and friends.

New Mexico's DNA arrestee law was passed in 2006. Twenty-one other States now have similar laws, including my home State of Florida. Florida's DNA arrestee program solved a 25-year-old murder when the suspect was arrested last May—and his DNA collected—on felony drug charges. In New York, DNA collected following a drunk-driving arrest linked a suspect to three rape/homicides dating back over 20 years.

By collecting DNA samples from arrestees and uploading them into a national DNA data base, or CODIS, States can empower police and prosecutors not only to solve cold cases but hopefully apprehend violent criminals before more innocent people are victimized and precious lives are lost. H.R. 4614 provides incentive grants to States that implement and use DNA arrestee programs.

The amended version of this bill before us today makes several important improvements to the bill. First, it removes the provision that would have penalized States that do not have arrestee programs by deducting 5 percent

of their Federal grant money. Second, it creates a two-tiered system for incentive grant awards based upon whether the State has a "minimum" or "enhanced" arrestee program, which I hope will provide greater flexibility to States receiving those grants. Third, the amended bill places a cap on the authorization level, limiting it to 10 percent of the amount appropriated for the Byrne/JAG grant program.

I support these improvements to the bill. However, I also recognize there are other areas where the bill could also be improved. A significant hurdle to States implementing DNA arrestee programs is the cost. In Georgia, for instance, where legislation was introduced earlier this year to require DNA collection from arrestees, it would cost as much as \$7 million a year to operate the program. Unfortunately, Georgia will not be eligible for an incentive grant under H.R. 4614 until it fully implements a DNA arrestee process. A possible solution would be to allow States, such as Georgia, to use grant funding to implement their DNA arrestee law, where the costs are arguably their highest.

In addition, H.R. 4614 awards incentive grants to States with DNA arrestee programs not just once, but year after year after year. Perhaps the emphasis should be on those States that have not yet enacted or implemented a DNA arrestee program. Because this grant increase is compulsory under this bill, the Justice Department will be required to administer the additional bonus to States even if Congress does not appropriate additional funds for the program. There is concern that this may ultimately result in depleting Byrne/JAG funds from certain States, thus creating a penalty to States without the DNA arrestee law. I hope to work with all concerned parties and resolve the lingering issues as this legislation moves forward.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Katie Sepich Enhanced DNA Collection Act, or Katie's Law. First of all, I want to thank my colleagues, Representative SCHIFF and Representative REICHERT, for all their hard work on this important piece of legislation. Most of all, I want to thank Jayann and Dave Sepich, constituents of mine from Carlsbad, New Mexico, for bringing this important issue to my attention and for crusading tirelessly to help pass arrestee DNA laws nationwide.

This bill is named for their daughter, Katie Sepich, who was brutally raped and murdered in Las Cruces, New Mexico, in 2003, at the age of 22. Jayann and Dave have bravely taken this devastating and horrific experience that

most people, including myself, could never imagine, and have turned it into something that will save lives and help families across the country. If this law had been on the books in New Mexico at the time of Katie's murder, her case would have been solved 3 months after her death when her killer was arrested for breaking into the home of two women after watching them through a window. Instead, Katie's killer was not identified until over 3 years after her murder and was left to roam the streets for much of that time.

Since Katie's murder in 2003, New Mexico has passed a State law allowing law enforcement to collect DNA from those arrested for certain felonies. Twenty-two other States as well as the Federal Government have passed similar laws. I have introduced my version of Katie's Law at the Federal level to make sure that this life-saving law that is in effect in my home State of New Mexico and 22 others is the standard for every State.

The Katie's Law I have introduced will incentivize States to, at the very least, match certain arrestees to the national DNA bank, the Combined DNA Information System, or CODIS, by providing the States that comply with a 5-percent increase in their Byrne/JAG funds. There is no requirement for retention of the DNA record after it is checked against CODIS. Katie's Law will also further incentivize those States which not only match arrestees but also contribute to the CODIS with a 10-percent increase in Byrne/JAG funds. Not only do these incentives encourage States to implement arrestee DNA laws, but they provide much needed support to local law enforcement as they work to keep our streets safe.

DNA has rightly been called the fingerprint of the 21st century. By simply swabbing a person's cheek and then coding junk DNA with only 13 indicators, law enforcement can accurately identify perpetrators of a crime without regard to race or criminal history. This practice protects the privacy of arrestees, since any identifying information, such as genetic predisposition to disease, is not coded for use by law enforcement. In addition, my bill contains an expungement clause to make sure there is a way for DNA to be removed from CODIS should a person not be convicted of the crime for which they were arrested.

The full potential of DNA as a crime-solving tool cannot be realized if we're not collecting DNA from those arrestees for certain violent crimes. Statistics show that 70 percent of America's crimes are committed by 6 percent of America's criminals. This means many of those who have committed some of the most heinous crimes in our society are repeat offenders.

□ 1600

One study conducted in Chicago tracked the known criminal activity of

eight individuals and determined that 60 violent crimes, including 53 murders, would have been prevented if the eight individuals' DNA had been taken on their first felony arrest. Similarly, a serial killer and rapist from California named Chester Turner raped and murdered at least 12 women between 1987 and 1998, during which time he was also arrested a total of 18 times. Had Turner been swabbed for DNA when he was arrested on January 26, 1987, he would have been linked to his first victim, and 11 women would still be alive today. These women are not just names in a police report. They are real people with aspirations, with families, with husbands, with people who love them, and they didn't have to die. Worse still, an innocent man named David Jones was wrongfully convicted of three of the Turner murders and served 11 years in prison before he was finally absolved.

Considering the potential for false identification and the number of repeat offenders in our criminal justice system, it's only common sense that if someone is arrested for a crime like rape, murder, or kidnapping, we make sure we identify them fully before we release them back onto the streets. We use fingerprints for this very purpose, and we should use the modern equivalent, junk DNA.

Katie's Law simply allows law enforcement to treat DNA evidence left at the scene of a crime as they do fingerprints. The fact is that the science has advanced, and we should allow law enforcement to use all of the technology available to them, including the fingerprints of the 21st century, to reduce expensive and unjust false convictions, bring closure to victims by solving cold cases, better identify criminals, and keep those who commit violent crime from walking the streets.

Jayann and Dave have experienced something that no parent should ever have to, the loss of a child. We have the power through advanced DNA collection to make one less parent grieve for a child, one less husband grieve for a wife, or one less child lose a parent.

I ask that you support this legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), a former sheriff and cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to join with Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. SCHIFF to fight for Katie's Law. Think about what I just said, "Katie's Law." We have a bill named after a young lady, a 22-year-old woman whose life was ripped away from her, so we name a law, and her name will live on. Katie Sepich from Carlsbad, New Mexico, 22 years old. Her life was ripped away from her by a monster.

I think most Members of Congress know that I had a full career as a police officer, a sheriff's deputy, SWAT

commander, homicide detective, hostage negotiator, a street cop for 33 years, and finally as the sheriff before I left the Sheriff's Office. I know firsthand what DNA does.

In 1982, I was a 31-year-old homicide detective standing by the riverside, collecting the bodies of three young women, 16 years old, dead. No DNA then. All we had was blood-typing. We were fortunate, though, that we had some bodily samples that we could take that we froze and we saved for 19 years. In 1987, the team of detectives that were together on that case had an opportunity to search the home of a suspect and take body fluids from him. He chewed on a piece of gauze. We put it in a test tube, and we froze that. In 1987, "CSI" of course had not been heard of, but we were still using science—entomology, biology, archaeology, forensic pathology, et cetera. No computers. No DNA. Still blood-typing.

In 1998-99, the first DNA science became known to law enforcement, so we sent our sample to the only two labs that were dealing with DNA at that time. They said, Your samples were too fragile, too small. We might destroy them if we tested them further, so come back in a couple of years. In 2001, we submitted the samples, and we came back with a DNA match on three of the bodies. With that DNA match, out of 40,000 tip sheets, 10,000 items of evidence, we solved 48 murders. We closed 50 cases. He pled guilty to 48 murders because of DNA.

I can't tell you how important Katie's Law is to saving lives. That person who committed these 48 crimes and many, many more took the deaths of these young women, ended their lives tragically and ruined the lives of their families for the rest of their lives. There can never be closure for those families and never be closure for their friends. There can only be answers to questions, Who killed my daughter? Who took her life and why? That's what DNA does. But it also protects the innocent, as most of you know. There have been some over the past several years that have actually been released from prison because they found the guilty person.

So there are all kinds of reasons why this law needs to be passed today, and I hope every Member votes "yes" to pass Katie's Law in honor of the tragedy, the loss of Katie's life, and in honor of all those who have been taken so senselessly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how many further speakers the floor manager has remaining?

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield for as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

DNA is perhaps the most powerful and most reliable tool at the disposal

of criminal investigators today. As a former Federal prosecutor during the early days of the DNA revolution, I have seen firsthand the power of DNA to prove the guilt or innocence of a suspect.

In 2008, I proposed an amendment to the Debbie Smith Act reauthorization that would have put in place a 10 percent bonus in Byrne/JAG grants for States to collect DNA profiles from anyone arrested for certain serious felonies. It passed the House with a strong bipartisan vote, but the clock ran out in the Senate. I could not be more pleased that Congressman HARRY TEAGUE has taken up the banner on this issue. I hope this year we can finally get it across the finish line.

You have heard the tragic story of Katie Sepich, for whom this bill is named. Katie was a bright, vivacious 22-year-old from New Mexico who was murdered in 2003. Police were able to extract the DNA profile of her attacker from beneath Katie's fingernails, but they got no match to anyone in the offender database. When they finally did get a hit on the attacker's DNA, they discovered that the murderer had been arrested repeatedly for burglaries after 2003, but because he was never convicted, he was not required to submit a DNA sample for the database. Had New Mexico had arrestee testing at the time, Katie's killer would have been taken off the streets years earlier.

There are 23 States, including my home State of California, that have now adopted DNA collection upon arrest or indictment for at least some violent felonies. By doing so, these States increase the power of the national database to solve crimes. The bonus in Federal law enforcement grants provided by Katie's Law will encourage additional States to adopt arrestee testing law. The legislation preserves civil liberties protections by requiring the FBI and the States to expunge the DNA of suspects who are acquitted.

We know the power of this technology. We also know the cost of delay, the cost of an inadequate database, and it is simply this: that as we wait to run these samples or if we miss the opportunity to test the samples of those arrested for violent felonies, we know with a virtual statistical certainty that people we could take off the street, people that have committed rape or committed murder, will, in the interim between the time we do take the sample of the arrestee or between the time we do erase the backlog, will go on to murder others, to rape others. And what a tragedy it is when we have this tool not to utilize it to its full extent.

I want to thank my colleagues for their leadership on this issue. HARRY TEAGUE has been a great champion. Congressman REICHERT has been a great champion, and we are indebted to their leadership on this. This legislation is the product of years of work and debate in Congress. It will help law en-

forcement use DNA to solve crimes, and it will keep in place existing civil liberties protections. So hats off to Representatives TEAGUE and REICHERT for their leadership on this issue and to Chairman CONYERS and to Chairman SCOTT for their support as well. I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, I want to personally thank Mr. TEAGUE from New Mexico and Mr. REICHERT from Washington for their leadership on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4614, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROONEY. Madam 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.

#### MICHAEL C. ROTHBERG POST OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5099) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 South Main Street in Sharon, Massachusetts, as the "Michael C. Rothberg Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5099

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

#### SECTION 1. MICHAEL C. ROTHBERG POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 South Main Street in Sharon, Massachusetts, shall be known and designated as the "Michael C. Rothberg Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any references in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Michael C. Rothberg Post Office".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.