



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Reverend Michael J. Cronin, student, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., and priest, Diocese of Winona, Minnesota, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, in Your great mercy, You have revealed Your glory to all the nations. Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress and shine forth in all these proceedings and laws framed for our government. May those who serve in this body be enabled by Your powerful protection to discharge their duties with honesty and integrity. May they seek to preserve peace, promote national happiness, and continue to bring us the blessings of liberty and equality. May all people in this great land be preserved in union and peace and, after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to those which are eternal. We pray to You, who are Lord and God, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed a bill and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 700. An act to establish a Federal inter-agency task force for the purpose of coordinating actions to prevent the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly known as "mad cow disease") and foot-and-mouth disease in the United States.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to further national security, foreign policy, and economic competitiveness, promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the involvement of the Government of Libya in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) "Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. MURRAY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-118, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-118, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

WELCOME TO REVEREND MICHAEL CRONIN

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to welcome the Reverend Michael Cronin today as our guest chaplain. Father Cronin was born and raised in Rochester, Minnesota, and graduated in 1988 from St. John's University in Collegeville. After graduation, Father Cronin came to Washington, D.C. to work as a staff assistant to my predecessor, Congressman Tim Penny.

In 1990, Father Cronin returned to Minnesota to begin his studies for the priesthood. Father Cronin was ordained in June of 1995 and went on to serve as assistant pastor at his home parish, the Church of St. Pius X in Rochester.

During this time, he also served as a chaplain and instructor at Lourdes High School. In 1998, Father Cronin was assigned to the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in Winona, Minnesota, where he also served as chaplain at the Newman Center of Winona State University.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1501

Last year, Father Cronin began full-time studies in the Department of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America here in Washington, D.C. Upon completion, he hopes to return to the Diocese of Winona.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to thank Father Cronin for serving as our guest chaplain today and for his service to the young people of the First District of Minnesota.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 9, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 9, 2001 at 9:43 a.m.

That the Senate PASSED without amendment H. Con. Res. 43.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

MARTHA MORRISON,
Deputy Clerk of the House.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO
UNITED STATES-CHINA SECURITY
REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1238(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 (PL 106-398) and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 4, 2001, the Speaker on Thursday, April 5, 2001, appointed the following members on the part of the House to the United States-China Security Review Commission:

Mr. Stephen D. Bryen, Maryland;
Ms. June Teufel Dreyer, Florida; and
Mr. James R. Lilley, Maryland.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF
MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE
JAMES A. LEACH, MEMBER OF
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jill Rohret, district scheduler to the Honorable JAMES A. LEACH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 5, 2001.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the District Court for Iowa, Johnson County.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

JILL ROHRET,
District Scheduler.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF
MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE
JAMES A. LEACH, MEMBER OF
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Rachel Schrepferman, staff assistant to the Honorable JAMES A. LEACH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 6, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the District Court for Iowa, Johnson County.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

RACHEL SCHREPFERMAN,
Staff Assistant.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE
BRAD SHERMAN, MEMBER OF
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRAD SHERMAN, Member of Congress:

BRAD SHERMAN,
24th District, California, April 18, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the Municipal Court for Los Angeles County, California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

BRAD SHERMAN,
Member of Congress.

MILLIONAIRE'S TRIP TO SPACE
STATION IS LATEST EXAMPLE
OF RUSSIANS TAKING NASA'S
MANAGEMENT TO CLEANERS

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today disappointed by the news that NASA has again acquiesced to inappropriate Russian demands to the Space Station program. Russia will be sending Dennis Tito, a 60-year-old American millionaire, as one of its contributions to this week's mission to the Space Station.

What unique characteristics does Mr. Tito possess that earned his place on this mission? Cold hard cash. \$20 million of it from Mr. Tito to the Russians is all it took for a rocket-powered trip to the Space Station. Unfortunately, this partnership based on a core scientific mission apparently is now the

next Club Med for those able to pony up millions of dollars to the Russian Government.

So how is it that the Russians, whose Station nonperformance cost the U.S. taxpayers at least 2 years' delay and over \$5 billion in cost overruns, can brazenly increase the safety risk of the entire mission? They can because NASA's management did not provide the necessary safeguards earlier in this so-called partnership. NASA's forced acquiescence to Russia regarding Mr. Tito is just the latest example of the Russians taking NASA's management to the cleaners.

AMERICA HAS BEEN BETRAYED
BY JANET RENO AND FATCATS
AT TOP, AND THERE HAS NOT
EVEN BEEN AN INVESTIGATION

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, why does China really need our spy plane? Think about it. John Huang and James Riady and the Lippo Group, they already bought and sold all the secrets. What they did not buy and spy, the former administration gave it to them outright.

That is right. Let us tell it like it is. I believe America has been betrayed by Janet Reno and fatcats at the top, and there has not even been an investigation. Beam me up. If there is one good thing about all this, China is not going to learn anything because most of the equipment probably in that spy plane was made in China like everything else.

I yield back the fact that Congress should rescind and cancel permanent trade relations with China until China looks Uncle Sam in the eye and starts to get truthful.

FURNITURE MARKET FACTS

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, High Point, North Carolina, is known far and wide as the furniture capital of the world. High Point is hosting this week the largest wholesale home furnishing show in the world, where approximately 80,000 industry professionals have come from 50 States and 110 countries to buy, sell, and discuss furniture.

The market was established in 1921 when 149 American companies organized their own show at a location central to the country's leading furniture manufacturers, and that is High Point, North Carolina.

We extend best wishes to those at High Point this week for a successful market and extend furthermore a cordial welcome for all to return to High Point in the fall, in October specifically, for the fall market.

AMERICA NEEDS A REAL ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome all my colleagues back to Washington, D.C. It is obvious that spring is here and that summer is just around the corner; and soon no doubt air conditioners will be going full force and the energy crisis that has gripped the West will only get worse.

Nevadans are well aware of the energy crisis which has overcome one of our neighbors, California. First there were rolling blackouts, now massive rate hikes, up to 46 percent for some 10 million homes and businesses.

As Californians work to solve its energy problems, this Congress must address the energy crisis looming over our entire Nation. For too long the U.S. has operated without a responsible energy policy, and now Americans are beginning to pay the price. We need a responsible and reliable energy policy. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century we expect the lights to go on and the air conditioning to work without fail. We must address the rolling blackouts, rate hikes, and consumer aggravation; and we must establish a real energy policy that meets the needs of modern America.

TUBERCULOSIS IS SPREADING RAPIDLY THROUGH THE DEVELOPING WORLD

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the threat of tuberculosis is spreading rapidly throughout the developing world, and ultimately in this country.

TB is the greatest infectious killer of adults worldwide. More than one-third of African AIDS victims actually end up, in the end, dying from tuberculosis. 1,100 people a day are dying from tuberculosis in India. It kills 2 million people worldwide per year, one person every 15 seconds.

We have a very small window of opportunity, during which stopping TB would be very cost effective.

□ 1415

In the developing world, the cost can be as little as \$20; \$20 can save generally a pretty young life. If we wait or go too slowly, more drug-resistant TB will emerge. It costs billions to control with no guarantee of success. Drug-resistant TB is at least 100 times more expensive in developing countries, and is 100 times more expensive in the United States to cure than nondrug-resistant TB.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to combat TB here and abroad. We have an opportunity to save millions of lives now and prevent millions of needless deaths, not just overseas, but ultimately in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider joining several dozen of us as cosponsors in our fight to eliminate tuberculosis.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 641

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 641.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 428) concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 428

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

SECTION 1. CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO).

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Good health is a basic right for every citizen of the world and access to the highest standards of health information and services is necessary to help guarantee this right.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in international health cooperation forums and programs is therefore crucial for all parts of the world, especially with today's greater potential for the cross-border spread of various infectious diseases such as AIDS.

(3) Taiwan's population of 23,500,000 people is larger than that of ¾ of the member states already in the World Health Organization (WHO).

(4) Taiwan's achievements in the field of health are substantial, including one of the highest life expectancy levels in Asia, maternal and infant mortality rates comparable to those of western countries, the eradication of such infectious diseases as cholera, smallpox, and the plague, and the first to be rid of polio and to provide children with free hepatitis B vaccinations.

(5) The United States Centers for Disease Control and its Taiwan counterpart agencies have enjoyed close collaboration on a wide range of public health issues.

(6) In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and tech-

nically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO.

(7) On January 14, 2001, an earthquake, registering between 7.6 and 7.9 on the Richter scale, struck El Salvador. In response, the Taiwanese government sent 2 rescue teams, consisting of 90 individuals specializing in firefighting, medicine, and civil engineering. The Taiwanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs also donated \$200,000 in relief aid to the Salvadoran Government.

(8) The World Health Assembly has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1974, the Order of Malta, and the Holy See in the early 1950's.

(9) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations.

(10) Public Law 106-137 required the Secretary of State to submit a report to the Congress on efforts by the executive branch to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations, in particular the WHO.

(11) In light of all the benefits that Taiwan's participation in the WHO can bring to the state of health not only in Taiwan, but also regionally and globally, Taiwan and its 23,500,000 people should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the WHO.

(b) PLAN.—The Secretary of State shall initiate a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual week-long summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2001 in Geneva, Switzerland, and shall instruct the United States delegation to Geneva to implement that plan.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a written report to the Congress in unclassified form containing the plan required under subsection (b).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation which would require the administration to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization during the May 2001 World Health Assembly meeting in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for initiating this resolution. I would like to stress that nothing in this bill implies a change in this country's one China policy, which has been based for over 30 years on three communiques and the Taiwan Relations Act; but care should be taken not to arbitrarily exclude the 23 million people of Taiwan from appropriate economic and humanitarian venues.

This legislation recommends a symbolic step underscoring that where sovereignty is not in question, Taiwan ought to be brought into as many international organizations as possible. It already is a member of the Asian Development Bank, as well as APEC. In this context, WHO is a constructive

and thoughtful avenue for international participation by the government and people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, disease and national disasters know no borders. Indeed, arguably the greatest international issue in the world today may be disease control, whether we are discussing the issue of HIV/AIDS, TB or other communicable diseases.

What the WHO issue symbolizes is a people-oriented concern for control of disease. Taiwan should not be excluded from such concern, and in fact has stepped forward to provide, in a number of instances, assistance and relief in other parts of the world, such as the recent earthquake circumstance in El Salvador.

Let me say this is a very modest step. It is a symbolic step, and it is a step towards achievement of observer status in a very appropriate humanitarian international organization. Other groups, such as the PLO and the Knights of Malta, have observer status at the World Health Assembly, and it would be very appropriate that Taiwan should accede to the same type of status.

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 thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for yielding me this time and for his leadership and assistance on this issue.

On May 20 of last year, Chen Shui-bian was sworn in as the President of Taiwan. This was a historic event, the first major transfer of power from one political party to a rival political party in Chinese or Taiwanese history. Mature democracies like ours take such political shifts for granted, but the peaceful exchange of power in many regions of the world is a rare legacy. Taiwan now shares in it.

Taiwan has evolved into a stable, prosperous nation governed by the rule of law. Taiwan's 40-year journey toward democracy is a success story, one which we should celebrate, one which we should acknowledge, and we should reward that process.

Mr. Speaker, to that end I introduced H.R. 428 requiring the State Department to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in this year's World Health Assembly. Ninety-two colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this bill. Fostering Taiwan's participation in the World Health Assembly is a modest step, but a meaningful one. Observer status in the World Health Organization does not require statehood. As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) said, the Knights of Malta, the Palestinian Liberal Organization, the Vatican, and Rotary International all share observer status at the WHO.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bill will be a significant victory for every Taiwanese citizen, and for every American who cares about human rights. Chil-

dren and families suffer from the effects of inadequate health care, whether they live in Washington or Geneva or Taipei or Beijing. With the high frequency of international travel and the increase in international trade, the risk of transmitting infectious diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis and AIDS within and across national borders is greater than ever.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago Taiwan suffered an outbreak of enterovirus 71, a potentially fatal disease that causes severe inflammation of muscles surrounding the brain, heart and spinal cord. Infants and children are particularly vulnerable to this highly contagious virus. Unfortunately, the Taiwanese doctors treating this virus did not have access to the medical resources because they do not have observer status at WHO. By the time the outbreak was under control, 70 Taiwanese children had died.

Mr. Speaker, had Taiwan been permitted to draw on WHO expertise, these children might still be alive. The fact that Taiwan remains handicapped in its effort to combat global illness is a tragedy. The fact that Taiwan remains handicapped in its efforts to save children is a crime, in some sense, in which we are all implicated. Our government's tacit support for the status quo, our unwillingness to fight for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization is not only shortsighted, it is unjustifiable.

Infectious diseases do not respect politically driven distinctions or politically drawn national borders. Infectious diseases travel. If there is TB in Taiwan, there will more likely be TB in the United States. If there is AIDS in South Africa, there will be, inevitably be, AIDS in Western Europe. Global illnesses are just that: Global. No country is immune when one country faces a health crisis.

This week, the administration decided to sell four KIDD Class destroyers to Taiwan, despite threats from China. If our commitment to Taiwan is strong enough to justify supporting its military defense, it is certainly strong enough to justify supporting access to global health resources for Taiwan's 23.5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan is a country with a strong medical community. They have good scientific research, have a good public health community; and with their participation in WHO, they will contribute to the WHO as WHO information contributes to Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strong support that H.R. 428 has received from both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to the bill's passage today.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), who is a physician and has practiced medicine around the world.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and agree with the intent of the sponsors in bringing it forward today.

As a family doctor who has worked in medicine in several different nations, including Africa and Asia, I know that health problems and disease do not wait for political divisions to be solved or for political problems to be overcome. Ten days ago during this recess, I visited Sierra Leone and Guinea. I had worked in Sierra Leone for 6 months in 1983 and 1984. For the last 10 years, there has been a civil war going on in Sierra Leone which is now going across the border into Guinea. I was helicoptered to the site of the hospital I worked at 10 years ago. The hospital had been burned to the ground several years ago by the rebels. Some of the villagers that were there told me that there were a number of people killed by the RUF, this rebel force, when they destroyed the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing up this issue on this resolution with Taiwan; because the rebels in Sierra Leone have been supported by Charles Taylor, the leader of Liberia. And Taiwan, unfortunately, contrary to every nation in the world, has been developing closer ties over this last decade with Charles Taylor in Liberia. The Taiwanese government has been very clear it is because Charles Taylor has expressed support for Taiwan in their efforts to be included in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, while the United States has been supportive of Taiwan, I hope that the government of Taiwan will be sensitive to the international community's efforts to end support for these rebels in Sierra Leone. From press reports, Taiwanese government officials have been quoted as praising Charles Taylor for promoting peace and dialogue in West Africa. Charles Taylor has not been promoting peace and dialogue, he has been promoting violence and a brutal civil war; and I encourage our friends in Taiwan to be a part of the international community, just like they want to be a part of the WHO and end their developing relationship with Charles Taylor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) who has fought for justice around the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to actually commend all of those who are sponsors of this bill. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and others have understood the tremendous developments that are taking place in Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune to be in Taiwan and meet with health officials, and they have developed serious movement towards high quality health care and health services. As a matter of fact, there is much that other countries could, in fact, learn from what they have been able to do; and so I would join with those who urge

that they be provided opportunity to enter into the dialogue at the World Health Organization in all of its actions and interactions so that not only will they benefit, but so that the rest of the world can benefit from what they have learned and what they are doing.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us, H.R. 428, which calls for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization (WHO). To facilitate this important goal, the measure requires the Secretary of State to undertake efforts to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at next month's summit meeting in Geneva of the World Health Assembly, and for the Secretary to submit the plan of action to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the author of the legislation, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHERROD BROWN, for his leadership on this issue. I further commend the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, and the Committee's Ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS, for bringing this matter to the floor. I am proud to join my colleagues as a co-sponsor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization (WHO) is the preeminent international health organization on the planet. In its charter, the WHO sets forth the crucial objective of attaining the highest possible level of health for all people, yet today the 23 million citizens of Taiwan are still denied appropriate and meaningful participation in the international health forums and programs conducted by the WHO. This is simply wrong and inexcusable, Mr. Speaker, and Congress has spoken out in the past that this should be corrected.

Access to the World Health Organization ensures that the highest standards of health information and services are provided, facilitating the eradication of disease and improvement of public health worldwide. The work of the WHO is particularly crucial today given the tremendous volume of international travel, which has heightened the transmission of communicable diseases between borders.

With over 190 participants in the World Health Organization, it is a travesty that Taiwan is not permitted to receive WHO benefits, especially when you consider Taiwan's 23 million citizens outnumber the population of three-fourths of the WHO's member states. This lack of access to WHO protections has caused the good people of Taiwan to suffer needlessly, such as in 1998 when a deadly, yet preventable, virus killed 70 Taiwanese children and infected more than 1,100 others.

Mr. Speaker, there is no good nor valid reason why Taiwan should be denied observer status with the World Health Organization. As a strong democracy and one of the world's most robust economies, Taiwan rightfully should participate in the health services and medical protections offered by the WHO. Conversely, the WHO stands to benefit significantly from the financial and technological contributions that Taiwan has offered many times in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our colleagues to adopt this worthy and important legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the initiative by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, concerning Taiwan's partici-

pation in the World Health Organization. I comment our Distinguished Chairman Mr. HYDE and our ranking Minority Member, Mr. LANTOS and the Subcommittee Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the International Operations and Human Rights and East Asia and the Pacific for crafting and bringing this resolution to the Floor at this time.

As Secretary Powell noted in testimony before our Committee, there should be ways for Taiwan to enjoy the full benefits of participation in international organizations without being a member. H.R. 428 only calls for the Secretary of State to initiate a U.S. plan to endorse and obtain observer status at the World Health Organization (WHO) for Taiwan.

In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO, but has not been able to render such assistance because Taiwan is not a member of the WHO.

The WHO has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Knights of Malta, and the Vatican.

Along with many of my colleagues, I am extremely disappointed that Taiwan is not a full member of the UN and all international organizations that its democratically led government wishes to join. Although this resolution does not absolutely address this concern it is nevertheless a first step in addressing the problem that confronts Taiwan.

Accordingly I strongly support H.R. 428.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 428, a bill concerning Taiwan and the World Health Organization (WHO), and commend Representative BROWN for his work on this issue. H.R. 428 would recognize that Taiwan and its 21 million people deserve an appropriate role in the WHO.

There are three things the bill seeks to promote. First, H.R. 428 puts the U.S. Congress on record, again, as strongly supporting Taiwan's request to play a more active role in international organizations. This support reflects the results of the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review conducted by the Clinton Administration which declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations and to make every effort to make sure that this important goal is accomplished.

Second, this legislation will move Taiwan toward membership in the WHO. Such membership could benefit Taiwan tremendously. For example, in 1998, the WHO was unable to assist Taiwan with an outbreak of a virus that killed 70 children and infected 1,100 more. WHO membership could have prevented needless deaths and sickness.

Third, the WHO could benefit enormously from Taiwan's more active participation in the WHO. Taiwan has made tremendous achievements in the field of health, and the WHO should have full access to Taiwan's technical and financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the bill requires the State Department to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly, next month in Geneva. I believe that this is an appropriate step for the United States to take in support Taiwan's participation in international organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step in the right direction. It requires the Secretary

of State to endorse and to work to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

The 24 million people of Taiwan are building a thriving Democracy.

It's the policy of the United States to support Taiwan's participation in International Organizations.

To lead the Free World, we must act on our responsibility by standing up for democracy and our democratic allies.

Taiwan is an island of freedom, but it is surrounded by the constant threat of Communist oppression from Mainland China.

Taiwan's participation in world organizations deserves recognition. They are one of our largest trading partners and they are a free and democratic nation that has recently undertaken a free, peaceful, democratic transition of power.

If we are going to support international organizations, we can't deny admission to free, democratic societies, with populations and economies that are larger than three quarters of the other participating nations. That would be unfair and it would constitute an abdication of American leadership.

Taiwan is a symbol of freedom and opportunity for the billion and a half Chinese held captive under communist rule.

Democracy, and the support for human rights that goes with it, is spreading throughout the world—we should reward and encourage it at every possible opportunity.

We should stand by our friends. We should stand up for freedom and democracy. We should never waver on matters of fundamental principle. And that means we must stand with Taiwan.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 428, which states that Taiwan should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the World Health Organization (WHO). The legislation also requires the State Department to initiate a U.S. plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2001 in Geneva. In particular, I would like to commend Representative SHERROD BROWN for his leadership on this issue.

In the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review Act, the U.S. declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations. We should abide by our intentions and support Taiwan's participation at the WHO.

The WHO is an organization dedicated to preventing the spread of disease and coordinating efforts on international health work. In a time when resources to fight global infectious diseases are scarce, we should encourage assistance and coordination from all sources. The global efforts to save lives should not take a back seat to China's global campaign against Taiwan.

Taiwan should be able to benefit from and contribute to the work of the WHO. As an official observer, Taiwan would assist in preventing the spread of global diseases. Taiwan's achievements in health are substantial, including high life expectancy levels and low maternal and infant mortality rates compared to other developed countries. Taiwan could assist both financially and technically in international aid and health activities benefiting people all over the world. Unfortunately, Taiwan has been unable to render such assistance through the WHO because it is not able to participate.

Taiwan's WHO entry is clearly being held hostage to the Chinese government. Last year, Beijing successfully blocked Taiwan's observer status in the World Health Organization. China led nine other nations—including Cuba and Pakistan in striking down Taiwan's motion "due to international political realities and China's objections." It is time for the U.S. to honor its commitments and support the right of 21 million Taiwanese people to assist and benefit from WHO participation.

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

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

I would just like to conclude by again congratulating the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for this fine resolution.

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 Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, 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. LEACH. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 428.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

URGING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO SUPPORT EVENTS SUCH AS THE "INCREASE THE PEACE DAY"

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 113) urging the House of Representatives to support events such as the "Increase the Peace Day."

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 113

Whereas in order to promote non-violence, respect and responsibility, the students of Challenger Middle School in Lake Los Angeles, California, in conjunction with the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles, hold each year an "Increase the Peace Day" program on April 20; and

Whereas as part of the program, students signed the following pledge:

"I will honor the memory of the victims of school violence by committing myself to finding a peaceful solution to my own conflicts with others.

"I will not hit another person for any reason.

"I will not threaten another person, even as a joke.

"I will report all rumors of violence to the nearest adult and to all adults who will listen to me.

"I will smile at students I don't know when I make eye contact.

"I will talk to my parents about what takes place in school.

"I will remind myself and others that the diversity of the United States is one of our main strengths.

"I will be aware that I have choices in life and that I am responsible for my own actions.

"I will be considerate of other people and their feelings.

"I will not spread rumors.

"I will not call other people names that are hurtful to them.

"I will help make the world a better place one smile at a time.

"I will ask for help when I am confused or lonely.

"I will make others aware of these pledges in order to spread this message of peace.

"I will take the responsibility as a citizen of this great nation to make our country a more peaceful place by doing my own part to Increase the Peace Day." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives urges schools across the United States to participate in similar "Increase the Peace Day" events.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 113.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 113, which is an important resolution that urges the House of Representatives to support "Increase the Peace Day" events throughout the country.

Just last Friday, on April 20, students, teachers, parents and community leaders from the Antelope Valley in my congressional district held an "Increase the Peace Day." This was the second "Increase the Peace Day" and coincides with the anniversary of the Columbine High School tragedy. The program featured the formation of a human peace sign, presentations by representatives of the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance and the granting of "Increase the Peace" awards to youths who have prevented violence at their schools. One of the highlights of the day was when the students signed an "Increase the Peace" pledge, outlining how they could avoid similar acts of violence on their campuses.

Among the promises in the pledge were to find a peaceful solution to conflicts, to not hit another person, to not threaten another person, to report all rumors of violence to an adult, to celebrate diversity, and to seek help when feeling lonely or confused. I was proud to join the other supporters of "Increase the Peace Day" and be a part of this incredible event.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the outstanding efforts of teacher Bruce Galler at Challenger Middle School, who came up with the original idea for "Increase the Peace Day" because he believes that something can and should be done. Bruce uses a quote by Edward Everett Hale on literature to promote the event, and I believe it illustrates what was accomplished on "Increase the Peace Day." The quote is as follows: "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. I will not let what I cannot do interfere with what I can do."

At the first "Increase the Peace Day" last year, I promised to introduce a resolution in order to show that as one Member of Congress, I can do something to highlight this important event, to encourage all Americans to reject anger and hate, and to instead promote peace and community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Bruce and his students for hosting last week's events. The first event that they held last year was at Challenger Middle School and included the students from Challenger. This year they expanded it to include the whole community, and students were bused from many schools around the area. It was an exciting event.

At the end of the event, when the different resolutions had been presented, the students all came onto the field and formed this large peace symbol, and we had a helicopter from the local Marine base that flew over and took pictures of the event. It was exciting and a great thing to be part of.

It was wonderful to see what the youth did do of a positive nature. We hear so often of the negative things and we do not hear of the positive events, and there are many great wonderful, positive events happening around this country.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and to encourage their own local communities to institute a similar program.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a subject close to my heart, and that is promoting tolerance and diversity. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for introducing House Resolution 113, which urges us to recognize events such as

“Increase the Peace Day,” which promotes the kind and thoughtful treatment of all people.

As adults, we have a responsibility to show our children the importance of compassion and tolerance. It is up to us to set an example for all of our young people to show them how to consider other people’s feelings and how to be respectful of different points of view. We must take time to listen to our children and teach them to appreciate those who are different from us. Our children must learn that there is strength in diversity.

My home State of California and my congressional district are incredibly diverse, and I am proud to say that, where we have many Hispanic Americans, we have Asian Americans, and different people from all walks of life. Over 72 different languages are spoken and taught within our schools there. I cannot imagine Los Angeles or California without the incredible mix of people and backgrounds that we have. The State just would not be the same.

In addition to embracing our diversity, we must also teach our children how to solve conflicts peacefully. In a country as diverse as ours, there are bound to be differences of opinion. It is important that we teach young people how to express those differences without violence.

Many schools are already working to promote the benefits of diversity and the importance of peaceful conflict resolution. We know this is necessary because so many children across America dread going to school because of the harsh social pressures that they face simply by being themselves. Some students cannot talk to others for fear of being chastised by their peers. They feel embarrassed if they do not have the right clothes on or right colors or right shoes. If parents and schools work together, we can help young people feel good about themselves and show compassion for others.

A simple smile, a warm greeting, open communication, these are the things that help us live together peacefully. We must educate our parents about the importance of communicating one-on-one with their children, setting a good example, and promoting tolerance. Programs which help parents communicate with their children will truly be a good step in the right direction.

In Los Angeles, we have seen the tragedy of violent crimes committed against people simply because of the color of their skin. It is my hope that conflict resolution and parental involvement will help prevent this sort of tragedy in the future. If we can teach people when they are still young to embrace diversity and resolve their differences peacefully, we will increase our Nation’s strength and unity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to also support this resolution and support events like “Increase the Peace Day.”

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for introducing this resolution.

It seems to me that this resolution is an indication that we can, in fact, learn behavior. I have always been told that people have a tendency to learn what they live and live what they learn, and if we begin to focus seriously on conflict resolution, on the development of peaceful approaches to finding solutions to problems that people might have, then I think we can seriously reduce violence, and I think we can create for ourselves a saner, better world in which to live.

So I want to commend the University of Illinois for its violence prevention efforts and programs, the Chicago public school system, and also Prevention Partnership, a local community organization, and a program called Hands Without Guns, where children are taught that there are other things that they can do with their hands than put a gun in them. If one always has something else in one’s hands, then, of course, there is no room for a gun.

So I commend all of those, once again, who would promote this approach to curbing violence in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the resolution.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by also providing my support and urging other Members to support this House resolution.

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their comments and for their support on this issue. 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 California (Mr. McKEON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 113.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83 be instructed, within the scope of the conference:

- (1) to increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for the maximum feasible funding;
- (2) to provide that the costs of coverage for prescription drugs under Medicare not be taken from the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;
- (3) to increase the funding provided for Medicare prescription drug coverage to the level set by the Senate amendment; and
- (4) to insist that the on-budget surplus set forth in the resolution for any fiscal year not be less than the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXII, the proponent of the motion and a member of the other party each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to explain the motion.

Mr. Speaker, this motion has four purposes. First of all, it says to the conferees on the budget resolution, go as close as they can to what the Senate provided for education.

Basically, the House resolution endorses and puts forth the President’s budget. The President’s budget provides an increase in education next year, fiscal year 2002, of 5.8 percent. That is an increase, but it pales in comparison with last year where the increase was 18 percent and the last 5 years over which the increase in education has averaged 13 percent.

The Senate, given a choice, a choice we did not have here on the House

floor, between a higher tax cut and less for education, opted to do more for education on four different occasions. As a consequence, their plus-up for education over and above the President's baseline budget is nearly \$300 billion. We are simply saying go as far as they feasibly can toward the Senate on education.

Secondly, with respect to Medicare, and in particular with respect to Medicare prescription drugs, the President's proposal again was to put \$147 billion out for the next 10 years to provide for a temporary helping-hand benefit and eventually to have some kind of benefit possibly integrated with Medicare. Over 10 years the amount he provided for this purpose was \$147 billion, but when that proposal came from the House and to the Senate, Members in both bodies said it is totally unrealistic. It will not even get Medicare prescription drugs off the ground.

The Senate, once again, had a choice. They had an amendment on the Senate floor. The Senate plussed-up its allocation for Medicare prescription drugs to \$300 billion, a minimum amount that is realistic to provide for a decent benefit.

We say go to the Senate, be realistic, be faithful to their commitments about providing prescription drug coverage under Medicare; provide the full amount that the Senate allocates in its budget resolution.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we say with respect to funding that new benefit, this money should not come out of the Medicare part A trust fund. It is already obligated, over-obligated, scheduled to run short of funds in the second decade of this century. Rather than putting another obligation on funds that are already short and over-obligated, we think that the funding for the Medicare prescription drug benefit should come from the general fund of the Treasury and not from the hospital insurance trust fund of Medicare.

That is what this budget resolution provides. Take the money out of the general fund to pay for Medicare prescription benefits so that the HI trust fund is not made insolvent any sooner.

Finally, we say as to the HI trust fund, the hospital insurance trust fund generally, protect it. Go to the language that we passed here on the House floor, where we said that Medicare should be treated just the same as the Social Security surpluses; that is to say, it will be used only for benefits provided under those two programs, and in the meantime to buy up outstanding debt in which the trust fund surpluses will be invested.

This is not an idle concern. The President's budget came to us claiming that it had unprecedented reserve funds or contingency funds. In one place it says it is providing a contingency fund of a \$1.2 trillion. Towards the end, that contingency fund is whittled down to \$842 billion. When one looks more closely at the \$842 billion, they find that of that amount \$526 bil-

lion comes from the consolidation of what is left over with what is in the surplus, the surplus accumulating and the HI trust fund. Those two numbers add up to \$842 billion.

□ 1715

We say that the contingency fund should not include the Medicare trust funds. In keeping with the resolution that this House passed by an overwhelming margin, that money should be confined exclusively to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, these are the four principles that we raise in our motion to the conferees.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is good to have the opportunity to discuss some of the budget issues with the gentleman from South Carolina. I would have thought over the last couple of weeks some issues would have resolved themselves, but we find ourselves debating some of the same issues that we were debating prior to the Easter recess. It is good to engage in these discussions again.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the gentleman's motion to instruct conferees to some extent is asking for the second bite of the apple. What could not be won on the floor as an alternative is being requested as a motion to instruct. I have to reluctantly oppose the instruction. Most are non-controversial. Certainly motions to conferees are nonbinding on the conferees themselves. It gives an opportunity for Members to make a few points that they would like to make, and I certainly respect that opportunity; but let us go through the motion to instruct conferees.

First, to increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for maximum feasible funding. I do not think that there is much controversy there. If Members of Congress had the opportunity to hold meetings such as I did, for example I held a youth summit in Dubuque, Iowa, to talk about education and met with special educators, people involved in special education, people involved in college education and higher education, early childhood education, reading, teacher training, administrators, principals, they all tell us anything we can do to improve education in this country is something that we should go back to Washington and get working on. Certainly one of the areas where we can help in education is to increase funding. That is why we made those increases, 11 percent; and we will hold to those. We will cheerfully continue to support those major increases in funding for education.

Mr. Speaker, certainly people say we can do more. I might add in that chorus. While we added \$1.25 billion in special education in this resolution, I personally, as well as professionally, know

we should do more; but this fits within a balanced budget and a balanced approach towards making sure that our kids have the best education possible.

Number two says to provide that the cost of coverage for prescription drugs under Medicare not be taken from the surplus in Medicare.

What we are saying is even though we collect taxes to provide for a Medicare benefit, you cannot use those tax dollars to either modernize Medicare or provide a prescription drug benefit. I do not think I understand.

We ask the American people for their hard-earned money to pay for a Medicare benefit; and then we say even though there are some obvious reforms, we cannot use the surplus to reform Medicare or modernize Medicare or provide a prescription drug benefit, we have to find money elsewhere, which is a little bit suspicious because we know our friends on the other side do not support tax relief, and it is probably a juxtaposition of tax relief versus Medicare benefits when all of us know that we can provide those benefits from the surplus in Medicare as well as possibly adding additional funds as necessary.

It does not all have to come from the HI Trust Fund. We have made that very clear within our budget. We certainly do believe and we all voted on that as I believe one of the first resolutions of this year that we were going to lock away that money for Medicare and allow it for modernization and for adding the prescription drug benefits. So number two flies in the face of what the House has already done.

On three, it says to increase the funding provided for Medicare prescription drug benefit to the amount set by the Senate. I am not going to presuppose or prenegotiate this item today, but I think that is probably something that is at least a reasonable request. I think we had that debate on the floor here. While the President's proposal was 153, it probably is going to be scored slightly more than that; and, therefore, we may have to make an adjustment there. So number three is not that controversial.

Number four says to insist that the on-budget surplus set forth in the resolution for any fiscal year not be less than the surplus of the HI Trust Fund for that fiscal year. I think again this goes back to number two. What this is basically saying is that we are presupposing that you cannot use the trust fund that we collect the taxes from for Medicare in order to modernize or provide a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, two and four are really the controversy. One and three, I think, are easily supported or at least certainly not controversial on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I would oppose the instruction for those two reasons. We should be able to, as we have already voted almost unanimously in this House in a bipartisan way, be able to provide the surplus from Medicare to

provide a prescription drug benefit as well as to modernize Medicare. Those funds should be available. Since they are paid for Medicare, they should be allowed to modernize Medicare and improve Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Therefore, I believe it would not be a good idea for us to instruct our conferees just now appointed to hold that kind of position as we begin our negotiations with the Senate.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just in response, what we are trying to do here is make a decision as to which is better. The Senate had a choice. They could do more for tax cuts and less for education, or more for education and less for tax cuts. They decided to do substantially more for education. By the same token, they decided to adequately fund a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to talk about double counting and overobligation of the Medicare Trust Fund.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, and in particular the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I just returned from my district where I had a number of town meetings with my constituents. We talked about the budget, and we talked about the budget not just being a 1-year budget, but the decisions we might make this year would have implications far beyond the next fiscal year, implications far beyond the next 10 fiscal years.

What we are saying with respect to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, the Medicare Trust Fund, is it is not so simple that we can take that money today and spend it on something else and not have to make it up later. My colleague from Iowa uses the do-not-worry, be-happy defense, that we can add prescription drug benefits using this money, we can modernize Medicare and use this money, and it will all work out in the wash. But the fact is that it will not work out in the wash because the money that you want to use, the trust fund money, is already obligated. It is already obligated to pay Hospital Insurance Trust Fund benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the demand on that money is not declining, it is increasing as America ages. It is interesting because my colleagues some years back, in fact my first year in the House when we went through all of the debates over the budget and whether we were going to cut Medicare or not, and the Speaker of the House at that time said we needed to cut Medicare in order to save it because the trust fund was going bankrupt; and yet today the Republican Party has brought a budget to the floor that

would in fact shorten that trust fund, shorten the life span of that trust fund after all of the work we have gone to to extend the life span of that trust fund.

Legally and logically it is not correct that you can take Medicare Trust Fund moneys and spend them on anything, whether it is prescription drugs or highways or Howitzers or whatever. Those moneys are obligated to the beneficiaries currently and those in the future who will enjoy the benefits of the inpatient hospital trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, all we are saying is let us use some honest bookkeeping and set those funds aside. If we do not do that, what we are going to end up with in this budget, not just in fiscal year 2002, but for many years to come, is a budget which is borrow and spend. We are going to spend today, and then we are going to borrow tomorrow much deeper than we would otherwise.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and also thank the gentleman for the instruction to the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I want to understand the message. I think I heard the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, say that one of these points he had some problem with. I do not know why my colleagues would have any problem with any of the points.

First of all, we are trying to make sure that we have a minimal amount of moneys, and that is the same amount that the Senate put for Medicare. We are trying to make sure that at least that amount of money, which has been recognized by both Republicans and Democrats, on this floor as well as in the Senate bicamerally, that the 147 was an insufficient number, and that \$300 billion is closer.

Mr. Speaker, so first, it is to make sure that we have adequate amounts of money for prescription drugs. Is that what we are trying to achieve?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, that is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anyone in the House who would disagree with that. The Republicans say maybe they will do it.

The second one, there was a resolution at the beginning of the session that said we will not take any moneys out of the Social Security Trust Fund or the Medicare Trust Fund; so we are simply saying those dollars should not be financed out of the Medicare Trust Fund. The Medicare Trust Fund, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) said, has already been pledged. It has been obligated. You cannot obligate it two and three times.

Mr. Speaker, is that the second point?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, that is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, why should the Republicans disagree with that? We are on record as saying we do not want to raid the Medicare Trust Fund, and this simply says it cannot be raided to pay for the additional moneys needed for prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for putting forward a very practical and a very consistent bill. I must say I wish we had more money for education. I wish we would go all of the way to where the Senate is. The second point is to go as close as possible to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for a very practical motion to instruct, and I hope all of my colleagues vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his work all along, and for bringing up these instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed budget is really full of irresponsible tax cuts and fuzzy math; and it should be adjusted to match closely what has been reached in compromise in the other body.

As a teacher, I am particularly disappointed that the budget resolution fails to deal adequately with the many urgent needs for our children in public education. At a time when more is demanded of our schools through higher standards, annual assessments, "increased accountability" is the phrase we are using this year, we risk failing too many children by not providing greater resources to turn around low-performing schools.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed mark falls short of providing adequate help for teacher training, recruitment, for school construction and modernization, for meeting Federal obligations to assist local schools in providing excellent education for students with special needs. The average age of public schools in this country is 40 years old. We have to get the students and their facilities into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, estimates are quite clear that we will need 2.2 million new teachers over the next 10 years to keep up with attrition. This is not even to get smaller class sizes; this is just to keep up.

□ 1730

Too often, I hear stories of teachers with history degrees teaching science and math because the schools have trouble finding qualified teachers. Having spent a year on the National Commission on the Teaching of Mathematics and Science, the John Glenn Commission, I have offered a bill to help schools recruit and retain qualified science and math teachers.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do that. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget said a few moments ago that they have provided, at the President's

request, an 11 percent increase in education spending. No, it is about half that; it is 5.8 percent. The total increase in the President's budget, as in the House-approved budget, would not cover even half of the cost of meeting our needs in special education, of meeting our obligation, our Federal obligation to assist the local schools with special education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to engage the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget and perhaps also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) in a discussion of the situation we are facing with respect to the Medicare Part A Trust Fund.

We have had for some years in this body, although sometimes the political rhetoric would not indicate it, an agreement between the parties that the Social Security Trust Fund ought to be off limits, that we ought not to be using the Social Security surplus to cut taxes or to increase spending or for any other purpose, other than to reduce the debt and ensure the future of Social Security, to make certain that those benefits will be there when the baby boomers retire, when that program's cash flow reverses.

I would like to ask my colleagues if there is any principled reason why we should treat the Medicare Trust Fund any differently from the Social Security Trust Fund. If anything, the Medicare Trust Fund is facing even more severe problems, even earlier than we face with Social Security.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Trust Fund is currently slated to become insolvent in 2028 or 2029. Social Security, fortunately, could last until 2038, 2039, for 10 more years. So the Medicare Trust Fund is intended, for the same reason, to sequester these funds, to confine them for use for Medicare; and we have reached certainly an accord on both sides of the aisle, both Houses and the White House as to Social Security, and I think the same logic applies to Medicare. It is not an idle concern.

We have a handout, if anyone cares to see it, and they will see that under the House resolution, as early as 2005 by our calculation, that resolution will take us back into the Medicare Trust Fund. The Senate resolution is even worse. By our calculation, in 2002 the Senate resolution would lead us into the trust fund to the tune of \$11 billion, that soon, and we will be invading the trust fund in Medicare again.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are

at present running a slight surplus in Medicare, but the Medicare Trust Fund is accumulating assets which we will need to draw on later. If we, instead, take those funds and use them for prescription drug benefits, as badly as that is needed, would that not reduce our ability to meet our basic Medicare obligations, the prescription benefit aside?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will again yield, that is the very point we are trying to make. The fund as it is is overobligated from beneficiary expectations, so we are simply saying, do not overload another obligation on top of a fund that is already short of meeting its scheduled obligations.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, having sat on the Medicare Commission for a year and looked at the future of Medicare, and having realized that beginning in 2010, we are going to double the number of people on Medicare as the baby boomers move into that stage of their life, we cannot realistically argue against putting money in advance of that big deficit that is coming. Even more important, it is taken out of people's paychecks under the HI, the health insurance. If that money is not used for Medicare, it is breaking the trust with the workers who put it in.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to also thank him for all of his work on our behalf as the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

We all recognize that we have an urgent national need in this country to make a greater investment in our education system so that we can help a greater number of our children succeed within that system. I had the honor and the pleasure of meeting with President Bush before he was sworn in to talk with him and a number of our colleagues about education reform in this country. We talked about the things that needed to be done: to make schools more accountable, to make teachers more accountable, to improve the professional development of teachers, to make sure that we could direct the resources, as he said, to the poorest children in the poorest performing schools. But we also said in that meeting that it was very clear that those things would not happen unless we had the resources that were necessary to provide those schools the quality education that we all want.

I had an opportunity to meet several other times with him and with Senator

KENNEDY and Senator JEFFORDS and with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and again we talked about the kinds of reforms and the results that this President genuinely wants. We said again, Mr. President, if we are going to have testing and we are going to require all of the States to go about this, we are going to have to provide the resources. We are going to provide the resources so that, in fact, it can be done in the right way, not in the wrong way, not in a way that is harmful.

If we are really going to help these children and we are going to get qualified teachers in front of them on a daily basis, we are going to have to improve the quality of these teachers. It is going to take resources. He assured us that he recognized that and he understood that.

Now, when I see the budget, I am deeply disappointed, because a decision was made here between the times of those meetings and the times of this budget that those resources would be put off into the tax cut. Now we find that the amount of the tax cut that goes to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country is 13 times the amount we would spend on education in this budget, 13 times the amount on the richest 1 percent, and yet we have a huge number of children who are not getting access to a decent, first-class education, who are not having the kinds of reforms that the President wants, that I want, and that many of my colleagues in the Congress want, will not bring about the results that we want, that every parent wants for their child in the American education system.

Mr. Speaker, we urgently need these resources. We urgently need these resources because our schools are educating more children now than at any time in our history. They are educating more children with English as a second language, children with disabilities. These are expensive items, and we owe these children an education, and we have to make sure that they have an opportunity to participate in it.

That is not what this budget does. It is not an 11 percent increase, as is well documented by the minority on the Committee on the Budget and our committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. We are talking about a 5 percent increase. We are talking about the smallest increase in many years, and that is simply not adequate to get the results that the President says he wants and to get them for the children that he has quite properly focused on in his discussion of education, the children that are in most need of these resources so that they can get the same access to an education that children get in the wealthier schools and in the middle-class schools. But we cannot do it on this budget. We cannot do it on this budget.

This budget suggests that we are going to try to get first-class, world-

class standards in education attainment on behalf of America's children, but we are going to do it on the cheap, and that would be a horrible mistake, because that will lock us into another 5 years of spending without getting the results that the taxpayers deserve and that the children deserve in terms of their educational opportunity.

So I commend the gentleman for the motion to instruct, to say that we should move toward the figures that the Senate has talked about and has suggested in their budget resolution, figures that will, in fact, provide us the kind of resources that are necessary for special education, for Title I, for English as a second language, so that we can hire the 100,000 counselors that are necessary, so that we can finish hiring the 100,000 teachers that have allowed us to reduce class sizes. Those are the urgent needs of the American education system, but they cannot be met in this budget without going with the numbers that are suggested in the motion to instruct.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to read the motion to instruct to the gentleman from California when he is referring to numbers in the motion to instruct: "To increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for maximum feasible funding."

Now, the gentleman from California is a Member of the House who stands behind no one when it comes to his advocacy of education and education funding and for our students. He is a friend, he is someone who has always tried to responsibly put forward reforms and proposals on education. But to suggest that this motion to instruct somehow provides more money than what the House resolution provided is just simply not the case.

Let me review with the gentleman from California and others what is in the budget that has been passed that we are defending here today. The House-passed budget accommodates not only the President's "no child left behind" education reform, which links dollars to accountability. Simply throwing more money at the programs will not make them better. The gentleman from California even testified to that fact before me and the Committee on the Budget. It increases elementary and secondary education funding by 10 percent. It triples funding for reading programs. It improves by increasing IDEA by \$1.25 billion to ensure that every child, particularly children with special needs, have access to the best possible education. It increases education savings accounts from \$500 to \$5,000 and makes them available not only for their original intent, but expands them to K through 12 education. It provides a full tax exemption to students using qualified prepaid tuition for college, and it provides \$60 million to help older children in foster care transition to adulthood, including providing vouchers to cover tuition and vocational training costs.

Now, the gentleman says that we do not really have, if we take this out and we move this over and we minus this off the top, it is not really an 11 percent increase. One cannot do that. It is an 11 percent increase in this budget. One cannot say, if we do not include this, we do not include that; it is all part of the budget, it is all in here, that it is somehow some other percentage.

It is an 11 percent increase. We believe that is a responsible increase.

Are there more ways that we can improve education in this country? You bet. Is throwing money at it the only answer? No. That is why we need to move through this budget as quickly as possible, give these instructions to the committee, give these resources to the committees so that they can begin to reform our education programs in this country and begin to make sure that no child is left behind. Just simply to come in here and say, it is not enough money without the reforms, it is not enough money without proposals, it is not enough money just because somebody says it is not enough money does not mean it is not enough money.

Mr. Speaker, 11 percent over and above the huge increases we have provided for education has not necessarily solved the education concerns of America, and just providing a rhetorical response on the floor as a motion to instruct conferees, saying the maximum feasible funding, is not a way to do it either.

We believe this is a responsible budget, it is responsible in the context of overall reform of education. It will help us to ensure that no child is left behind.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to the gentleman before yielding to the gentleman from Florida.

Let me make clear that this budget passed by the House provided a 5.8 percent increase for fiscal year 2002 in education. In over 10 years, the President's budget, which was basically endorsed, provides just above the rate of inflation. Now, 5.8 percent is an increase, but it is less than half the increase of last year and less than half the increase of the last 5 years, and less than a third of the increase of last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the motion to instruct conferees with respect to the education increase that has been proposed.

The Senate has finally started to take us in the direction we need to go, an additional \$300 billion increase, supported by Democrats and Republicans, to begin to put our money where our mouth is. I applaud the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget putting emphasis on increased funding

for special education. But most of what we have said about doing that are promises. This is a chance for us today to put that into action and to begin to move in the direction of more funding for both special education and general education.

□ 1745

We know what works. We know what we need to do: we need to fix up some of our crumbling schools. We need to fix our schools that are overcrowded.

We have a class-reduction program at the Federal level that has paid huge dividends. In my community in Florida, in the Tampa Bay area, in Hillsboro County, \$8 million has gone into reducing class size in some of our most struggling schools. It has given control of the classroom back to the teacher to reach those kids in the back row like me that needed some special attention to get engaged in learning.

As the teaching shortage begins to grow, we are going to have to pay more attention to attracting qualified teachers.

The Senate recognized these things when they increased education spending on a bipartisan basis. There is no reason why we should not do the same thing here today.

We are about to debate finally the President's proposal to provide more accountability and more resources to education. Many of us applauded him during the campaign for taking that position, both on the accountability and on the spending.

Guess what: unless we take the step today of adopting this motion to recommit conferees, those are hollow words, because this is the spending blueprint. This is the way we begin to back up with actions the words of the President, the words of the Congress, that we all want to do more for education. So I would urge adoption of the motion to instruct conferees with respect to education as well as the other points that have been made today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman outlining some of the implications for elementary and secondary education on this budget.

Is it not true that President Bush campaigned on getting the Pell grants, in opening up opportunities for students on higher education, getting those Pell grants over \$5,000?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Yes, he did.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. This budget would keep the maximum Pell grant well under \$4,000. It is simply not adequate to do what we need to do to open the doors to opportunity in higher education.

We have been increasing Pell grants several hundred dollars a year for several years. This would increase the Pell grant, as I understand it; and this has been borne out by CBO, only by \$150.

That is totally inadequate. It really falls over \$1,000 short of what President Bush himself promised.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think the incredibly meager increase in the Pell grants cited by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is really a pitiful example of how little we are doing and how much more we can do.

I would urge that we adopt this motion to recommit conferees today. Let us begin to put our actions where our words have been. Mr. Speaker, let us start to live up to what we know are the Chair's intentions to do more for special education in Congress. Let us lay the floor for the groundwork that is going to be done in the House and Congress in the next several years to do more for our schools and to let them make their decisions at home, let them reduce class size, fix up the schools, hire qualified teachers, and make sure we leave no children behind.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just again refer the gentleman to the first paragraph. It is kind of hard for me to disagree with the first paragraph.

It says: "To increase the funding in the House Resolution to provide" not so much money for IDEA, not so much money for reading, not so much money for Pell grants, as has been argued on the floor here today, but just "maximum feasible."

We are all for that. My goodness, we go out and swing a dead cat and we could probably hit everybody who would be for maximum feasible everything in the budget. That is not what a budget is all about. A budget is putting numbers in here.

We put a number in here. I think our number is very responsible when looked at in the context of all of the numbers that are in the budget. So to come in here and say we want to instruct the conferees, here is a very specific instruction: get in there and do something really good for education. Okay, we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), the vice-chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure where to begin.

First and foremost, it is interesting to sit in the Chamber today, to sit in the Chamber today and hear so much happiness and joy over something that has been done in the other body. I do not think I have heard this much excitement about legislation in the other body since I have been a Member of Congress, though admittedly, that has been for only two terms.

There has been a lot of discussion about education. Education is important. The chairman of our committee just talked about the instruction here to provide the maximum feasible amount for education.

I am all for good and I am opposed to evil; and I think it is nice that we have

a motion to recommit conferees that says, let us provide more money for good things. They did not actually write in "less money for bad things," but they might as well have.

But the fact of the matter is, if we go through what we passed on the floor here, what came out of our Committee on the Budget, I think we do have a very strong budget resolution. That is one of the reasons, for anyone listening to this debate, that we see so many numbers being thrown around: \$1 billion here, \$1 trillion of this, \$10 billion here, 5 percent, 18 percent. Because when we are not really able to argue about good policy reform and good legislation, we try to blind people with numbers.

I make that comment as a former engineer who maybe tried once or twice to do the same, but I do not think it is appropriate for the floor of the House.

Let me talk a little bit about what is in the budget resolution that came out of committee. First, overall, we increase the size of the government by about 4 percent, increase discretionary spending 4 percent.

I think most Americans looking at this blueprint would say well, we are going to increase our household budget by about the level of inflation. We are not going to live beyond our means. There is no reason whatsoever that this Congress or any Congress should force Americans to live beyond their means, should collect more in taxes than we need, or should spend at 6 or 8 or 12 percent increases per year, because everyone here knows that is the quickest way to drive us into deficit.

A 4 percent increase in government, I certainly understand for a lot of people in this Chamber that is not enough government. Increasing spending 4 percent is not nearly enough government for some people here. But I think for most Americans to have the government grow by 4 percent or 5 percent would be plenty.

What do we do on the debt? We pay down \$2 trillion in debt over the next 10 years. Everyone wants to see us retire public debt. We are paying it down at a record level. We have not heard much discussion about debt repayment in the debate tonight, and that is because the focus is on more spending. We are not going to be able to pay down \$2 trillion in debt if we just start allowing the budget resolution to spend more and more and more.

We heard a discussion about education. We are increasing funding for education by 11 percent, as the chairman described, 10 percent for K through 12, tripling funding for literacy.

We have committed in the House budget resolution to a record increase in special education funds, which is the largest unfunded Federal mandate that I know of on the books.

But for some on the other side, it is never enough. It is all about resources, resources, resources. How many times did we hear that word tonight in talk-

ing about education? It is about resources, resources, resources.

If money was the answer to improving education, then we could go to those school districts in the country that were spending the most on education, some of them perhaps here in Washington, DC., some perhaps in New York City, and there we should find the best schools in the country; and we do not, because it is not all about resources. It is about how we deliver the education, it is about how we structure the competition, it is about the needs of the student and whether or not they are being met at the local level.

So much discussion has been held about resources; but there has been no discussion about reform tonight, no discussion about accountability and standards and all of the keystones that are in the President's reform bill, and certainly no discussion about the importance of giving those students in the failing schools in this country, so many of them in economically depressed areas of America, give those students a chance to get out of those failing schools, give them the economic power of a grant of school choice, and let their parents take them to a school that is safe, that is reliable, and that can deliver their children with the education that they deserve.

Education accountability and education choice is something the other side does not want to discuss because, one, it means empowering families to make a real decision; and two, because it means attacking a base, a status quo base that wants no competition in the public schools, no public school choice whatsoever.

I think that is outrageous. I think it is outrageous for people, certainly not all the opponents of school choice, but for many of them in the Senate and some here in the House who send their children to the best private schools in the country, to then come and say, well, we certainly do not want someone in a public school to have the power of choice, to take their child out of a failing school and give them an education and a safe setting that they deserve. But we hear about spending. It is all about spending.

That brings us to the other portions of this motion to instruct, to provide the cost of coverage for prescription drug benefits, not within the hospitalization trust fund; in other words, to pay for Medicare, but do not pay for Medicare with Medicare taxes.

That does not make sense to me. I do not think it makes sense to most Americans. I would love to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. I voted for legislation on the floor last year to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. But we have in the instructions here, if we add a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, we do not take it out of the Medicare Trust Fund.

Why would anyone want to do that? I think there is one answer that I can think of. It is because they do not want

to cut taxes. It is because they want to increase the size of government. It is because they want to find any excuse not to have to support tax relief.

Three years ago, 4 years ago, when I first came to Congress, they said, we cannot cut taxes until we balance the budget. We enacted balanced budget legislation in 1997.

Then they say, well, we cannot support cutting taxes because we have not started paying down the debt. And we started paying off the Federal debt.

Then they said, we cannot support any tax cuts until we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. We did that.

Now tonight we are hearing, well, if we set aside the Social Security surplus, let us also set aside the Medicare Trust Fund surplus.

We have actually done that in this budget, so now they are trying to find ways to force spending even higher, to drive us back to a point where, for some reason, we are not giving back that tax surplus to Americans.

I think that is unfortunate. Some people will look for any opportunity to vote against the tax cut. In the end, that is because there are some for whom this is not nearly enough government, and only by keeping all of the revenues that are coming into Washington in Washington will they have the resources to increase the size and scope of government to an untenable level.

I think that is unfortunate. Taxes today are higher than they have been at any point since World War II. Almost 21 percent of our economy is consumed in taxes. We wake up, we are paying energy taxes; we go to work, we are paying gasoline taxes; we make a phone call, we are paying 3 percent in telecommunications taxes that were put in place in 1899 to fund the Spanish-American war; of course, we pay income taxes; we pay Medicare taxes; we pay Social Security taxes.

There is very little in our life that is not taxed today, and when we are collecting more in taxes than in our history, and after we have paid for all of the essential operations of government, expanded discretionary spending 4 percent, invested in education and national defense, added \$2.8 billion to the National Institutes of Health, if we have money left over, we ought to give it back to the American taxpayer by letting them keep more of what they earn every week.

We do not say it nearly enough, but the reason we have record tax collections is because Americans are working more productively and harder and more efficiently, earning more. We ought to send a little bit of that back.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct. It is all about the size of government. It is all about trying to keep it here in Washington. But I say when we take money out of Washington and give it back to families, we are making Washington a little less important and we are making

those families and those American workers more important. That is what I came here to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

□ 1800

Let me say in response to the gentleman's statement about the bite the government is taking out of our economy. In 1984, 1985, the peak of the Reagan years, the government was consuming 23.5 percent of the national pie known as GDP, gross domestic product. Peak of the Reagan years, 23.5 percent of GDP being consumed by the government.

Today, under this budget, the budget we have this year, which is the Clinton administration budget, less than 18½ percent of our GDP is devoted to government spending. That is five full percentage points, five full percentage points less than in the peak of the Reagan years.

In addition, let me clarify where we are with respect to education. The President came here to this House and made his State of the Union. He said the account plussed-up by the most in our budget will be education, 11.4 percent. Our spirits were lifted.

We got the budget and started looking at it, started dissecting it; and we saw that he was claiming for his increase for next year \$2.1 billion that the House appropriated last year for 2002. When we back that out, because he is not providing, it was previously provided, when we back that out, we saw that the increase was 5.8 percent. As I have said, 5.8 percent is an increase; I will grant one that. But it is nothing compared to last year, 18 percent. It is nothing compared to the last 5 years, 13 percent.

Furthermore, when the Senate had an opportunity, amendment by amendment, to add to education, they added through four amendments \$300 billion. When we say in this motion to instruct conferees provide the maximum feasible funding for education, we also say within the scope of conference, the text of the resolution. What does that mean? Get as close to that \$300 billion increase as you possibly can. We will not dictate it in numerical terms. But within the scope of conference, that means you can go up to \$300 billion plus-up in education, provide the maximum feasible funding for education.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question; and it will be a short one.

Mr. SPRATT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina indicated that the Federal spending is 18.3 percent of GNP today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, we are collecting almost 21 percent in taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, what is the justification for collecting so much

more in taxes than the Federal Government is spending?

Mr. SPRATT. The difference is, the surplus is—

Mr. SUNUNU. I know what the difference is. What is the normal justification for collecting so much more in taxes than we spend in government?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, it is this: From 1982 to 1992, we increased the national debt of this country, which we will leave to our children, by more than \$4 trillion. It is time we paid some of that off, and the budget we brought to the floor would have done that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his motion to instruct because it is clear that the massive tax cut package pushed through the House earlier this year was financed by cutting much-needed programs, particularly as it regards to education.

There are devastating cuts in education spending affecting areas where continued progress relies on at least maintaining current levels of funding. Where the President proposes an increase in funds to disadvantaged students and programs, he proposes major cutbacks in educational technology programs and a decrease in funds for vocational educational programs.

This budget does not provide the necessary increases to the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program or the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, programs which have been proven to work and be successful. This is a major blow to all urban and rural communities. These programs are vital to providing a safe and stimulating academic environment for students, both while they are in school and during after-school hours. We need these programs, and we need them at full funding, which covers real operating costs.

Despite campaign promises to increase the average Pell grant to \$5,100, this budget proposes approximately \$3,800, a \$100 increase per student. The President then freezes all other critical student aid programs, making it almost impossible for working families and students to finance the higher education, to keep us moving on and keep us ahead of the curve.

The elimination of the budget line for school renovation is ill-advised and absolutely devastating to restoring and modernizing our schools and bringing them up to the 21st century standards. This must be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents need each and every dollar of this Nation's education budget to provide a safe and competent educational experience. The President's budget stops short of providing real educational relief.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) says he does not know why we could possibly have ever seen anything good about the other body. The fact is that even a stopped clock is right twice a day. The question is: Do you know when it is? In this instance, their budget makes more sense.

I went back to my district for 2 weeks, and I had four community meetings with an average of 150 people in each meeting; 600 people. Seventy-five percent of them, after you go through the budget and explain what the tax cut does to all of it, said we do not want the tax cut. We would rather have you pay down the debt. We would rather you protect Social Security and protect Medicare. They understand.

Now, my colleagues say, well, you are from Seattle. You are from that liberal district out on the Left Coast. The district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) right on the border between Texas and Louisiana was reported in the New York Times as having exactly the same result.

The people understand that education is the future of this country, that also the future is the security that comes with Medicare and Social Security.

Now, for us to say that we cannot support the Senate, they in fact are much more in tune with the people than are the House of Representatives who rammed this budget through with very little discussion about what it actually does in the long-term.

This resolution supports what the people support. They are not asking for tax relief. They are not begging. When one explains in the meetings who gets the tax cut and where it goes and what it means when we do not pay down the debt and we have to pay an extra \$500 billion in interest, they say: Why do not you just keep the money, pay the debt down and save the interest. You can use that on education.

People, they do not need to be rocket scientists. If one can add and subtract, one can see what the Senate did. If my colleagues allowed us to have the kind of amendments over here that they had in the other body, we would have a much different resolution on the floor, because they would have found there is much more support in this body for education. But they would not allow it. So that is why they have to have this resolution passed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 1 minute remaining and the right to close. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 9½ minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to close our portion of the debate.

Let me just reiterate that certainly we have tried and we will continue to try and reform our education system. Part of that reform requires us to con-

sider new funding. Part of that reform requires us to consider that we are not paying the bills that have been promised under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Part of that is to recognize that, as people continue a lifetime of learning, that we have to find new ways to pay for higher education; that we recognize that reading programs in this country need additional assistance.

But in part, that is the reason why our budget lays out for education those many different priorities we believe so succinctly and with so much of a priority.

I think it is wrong to assume that because we have over the course of our appropriations passed some advanced appropriations that all of a sudden now that that should not be included as a priority for this year's budget or beyond. We have increased budgets for education in the past. We will do so in the future. This year's is 11 percent. We are proud of that. If there are ways that we can help improve that in the future with reform, we will consider that.

As far as reform and modernization of Medicare, we believe based on the 407 to 2 vote earlier this year that the House of Representatives is clearly on record that not one penny of Social Security or Medicare ought to be used for anything else except Social Security or Medicare. Finally we have done that.

I do not want to recall history, but the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my good friend, knows that this is a very brief history involved in any side coming forth with a budget that does not touch the trust funds and the surpluses for Medicare and Social Security. Finally, in a bipartisan way, this year, we were able to say do not touch it, only use it for its intended purpose.

But this is its intended purpose. If one cannot use Medicare Trust Fund dollars for Medicare, for modernization of Medicare, for improving Medicare and providing Medicare recipients more Medicare, what is one going to use the money for? I mean, I do not quite understand that.

This desire to run to the floor and to say every penny you use from the Medicare Trust Fund automatically takes a penny away from its solvency in the future is just not factually correct. Modernization is intended for and we will pass modernization that needs to extend the life of Medicare.

I just say the following: If one cannot use Medicare Trust Fund dollars for Medicare, if one cannot use Medicare surpluses for Medicare, what can one use it for? We believe we have finally arrived at a bipartisan principle on that issue. We believe that is embodied in this budget that has already passed the House.

I believe it would be a grave mistake to change that tact now and to instruct our conferees, albeit it is not binding, I realize that, and maybe we should not make a controversy out of it, but I be-

lieve it is a mistake for us to bind our conferees or instruct our conferees by suggesting to them that now, all of a sudden, we are going to reverse that 407 to 2 vote and say that one cannot use Medicare now for anything, one cannot use it for prescription drugs, one cannot use it for modernization. I believe that would be a mistake.

Therefore, I urge Members not to adopt the motion to instruct offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, basically this is what this motion to instruct does: The Senate has added \$300 billion to education. We say go as far as you can, conferees, as far as feasible in the direction of the Senate's plus-up for education.

Secondly, the Senate has provided \$147 billion to the \$153 billion provided in the House for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. That is the minimum amount that will actually provide the benefit. We say adopt the Senate provision.

Thirdly, we say as to Medicare, do not double count. Do not take these overobligated underfunded trust funds and use them for new obligation. Take the money out of the general fund to provide for the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

If one is for education, if one is for Medicare prescription drugs, if one is for making Medicare sound and solvent far into the future, one should vote for the motion to instruct conferees because that is what it does.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 207, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—200

Ackerman	Baca	Baldwin
Allen	Baird	Barcia
Andrews	Baldacci	Barrett

Becerra Holt
 Bentsen Honda
 Berkley Hooley
 Berman Hoyer
 Berry Inslee
 Bishop Israel
 Blagojevich Jackson (IL)
 Blumenuauer Jackson-Lee
 Bonior (TX)
 Borski Jefferson
 Boswell John
 Boucher Johnson, E. B.
 Boyd Jones (OH)
 Brady (PA) Kanjorski
 Brown (OH) Kaptur
 Capuano Kennedy (RI)
 Cardin Kildee
 Carson (IN) Kilpatrick
 Carson (OK) Kind (WI)
 Clay Kleczka
 Clayton Kucinich
 Clement LaFalce
 Clyburn Lampson
 Conyers Langevin
 Costello Lantos
 Coyne Larsen (WA)
 Cramer Larson (CT)
 Crowley Lee
 Cummings Levin
 Davis (FL) Lewis (GA)
 Davis (IL) Lipinski
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowey
 Delahunt Lucas (KY)
 DeLauro Luther
 Deutsch Maloney (CT)
 Dicks Maloney (NY)
 Dingell Markey
 Doggett Mascara
 Dooley Matheson
 Doyle Matsui
 Edwards McCarthy (MO)
 Engel McCarthy (NY)
 Eshoo McCollum
 Etheridge McDermott
 Evans McGovern
 Farr McIntyre
 Fattah McNulty
 Ford Meehan
 Frank Meek (FL)
 Frost Meeks (NY)
 Ganske Menendez
 Gephardt Millender-
 Gonzalez McDonald
 Gordon Miller, George
 Green (TX) Mink
 Gutierrez Mollohan
 Hall (OH) Moore
 Harman Moran (VA)
 Hastings (FL) Morella
 Hill Murtha
 Hilliard Nadler
 Hinchey Napolitano
 Hinojosa Neal
 Hoeffel Oberstar

NAYS—207

Aderholt Coble
 Akin Collins
 Arney Combest
 Bachus Condit
 Baker Cooksey
 Ballenger Cox
 Barr Crane
 Bartlett Crenshaw
 Barton Cubin
 Bass Culberson
 Bereuter Cunningham
 Biggert Davis, Jo Ann
 Bilirakis Davis, Tom
 Blunt Deal
 Boehlert DeLay
 Boehner DeMint
 Bonilla Diaz-Balart
 Bono Doollittle
 Brady (TX) Dreier
 Brown (SC) Duncan
 Bryant Dunn
 Burr Ehlers
 Burton Hefley
 Buyer Emerson
 Callahan English
 Calvert Everett
 Camp Ferguson
 Cannon Flake
 Capito Fletcher
 Castle Houghton
 Chabot Fossella
 Chambliss Frelinghuysen

Obey Hyde
 Oliver Isakson
 Ortiz Issa
 Owens Jenkins
 Pallone Johnson (CT)
 Pascrell Johnson (IL)
 Pastor Johnson, Sam
 Pelosi Jones (NC)
 Peterson (MN) Keller
 Phelps Kelly
 Pomeroy Kennedy (MN)
 Price (NC) Kerns
 Rahall King (NY)
 Rangel Kingston
 Reyes Kirk
 Rivers Knollenberg
 Rodriguez Kolbe
 Roemer LaHood
 Ross Largent
 Rothman Latham
 Rush LaTourette
 Sabo Leach
 Sanchez Lewis (CA)
 Sanders Lewis (KY)
 Sandlin LoBiondo
 Sawyer Lucas (OK)
 Schakowsky Manzullo
 Scott McCrery
 Serrano McInnis
 Sherman McKeon
 Shays Miller (FL)
 Skelton Miller, Gary
 Slaughter Moran (KS)
 Smith (WA) Nethercutt
 Snyder Ney
 Solis Northup
 Spratt Norwood

Abercrombie Istook
 Brown (FL) Linder
 Cantor McHugh
 Capps McKinney
 Davis (CA) Mica
 Filner Moakley
 Holden Myrick
 Hunter Payne

NOT VOTING—24

Roybal-Allard
 Schiff
 Smith (TX)
 Stark
 Taylor (NC)
 Vitter
 Weller
 Whitfield

□ 1835

Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Messrs. OXLEY, GOSS, WATTS of Oklahoma, SKEEN, HOBSON, WALDEN of Oregon, and NEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 85, I was unavoidably detained due to flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:
 Messrs. NUSSLE, SUNUNU, and SPRATT.

There was no objection.

CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 428, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]
 YEAS—407

Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Souder
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stump
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tancredo
 Taurin
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Toomey
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Watkins
 Watts (OK)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

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

Dooley
 Doollittle
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 Engel
 English
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Flake
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Fossella
 Frelinghuysen

Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kerns
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Largent
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Luther
 Maloney (CT)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzanillo
 Markey
 Mascara
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Mink
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)

Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Terry
Petri	Scarborough	Thomas
Phelps	Schaffer	Thompson (CA)
Pickering	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)
Pitts	Schrock	Thornberry
Platts	Scott	Thune
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Thurman
Pomeroy	Serrano	Tiahrt
Portman	Sessions	Tiberi
Price (NC)	Shadegg	Tierney
Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Toomey
Putnam	Shays	Towns
Quinn	Sherman	Traficant
Radanovich	Sherwood	Turner
Rahall	Shimkus	Udall (CO)
Ramstad	Shows	Udall (NM)
Rangel	Simmons	Upton
Regula	Simpson	Velazquez
Rehberg	Skeen	Vislosky
Reyes	Skelton	Walden
Reynolds	Slaughter	Walsh
Riley	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Rodriguez	Smith (WA)	Watkins
Roemer	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Rogers (KY)	Solis	Watts (OK)
Rogers (MI)	Souder	Waxman
Rohrabacher	Spence	Weiner
Ros-Lehtinen	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Ross	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Rothman	Stenholm	Wexler
Roukema	Strickland	Wicker
Royce	Stump	Wilson
Rush	Stupak	Wolf
Ryan (WI)	Sununu	Woolsey
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wu
Sabo	Tancredo	Wynn
Sanchez	Tanner	Young (AK)
Sanders	Tauscher	Young (FL)
Sandlin	Tauzin	
Sawyer	Taylor (MS)	

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie	Hunter	Roybal-Allard
Berman	Linder	Schiff
Brown (FL)	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Cantor	McKinney	Stark
Capps	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Davis (CA)	Moakley	Vitter
Filner	Myrick	Weller
Holden	Payne	Whitfield

□ 1845

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 86, I was unavoidably detained, due to flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcall Nos. 85 and 86. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 85 and "yes" on rollcall No. 86.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to cast my vote on rollcall Nos. 85 and 86.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 85, a motion to instruct conferees with respect to House Concurrent Resolution 83, and "aye" on rollcall No. 86, H.R. 428, Concerning the Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

□ 1845

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 41, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 118) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 503, UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 119) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1310

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1310.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

GAINESVILLE-HALL COUNTY JUNIOR LEAGUE CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County, Georgia as that group celebrates its 50th anniversary of service to our community. The Junior League is an organization of women committed to promoting volunteerism, developing the potential of women, and improving the community; and the women of Gainesville and Hall counties have certainly demonstrated during the past half century that hard work and good spirits can make a powerful difference in the community that we live in.

The Gainesville-Hall County chapter of the Junior League was founded by Ms. Idalu Haugabook Slack and chartered on May 21, 1951. The group began making a strong impact then, and I am proud to report that their work has not only continued but has intensified since that time. In 1951, the 21 charter members donated some 515 hours of community service. This year's membership donated over 8,000 hours, all while raising some \$80,000 in a single year.

Early projects from the Gainesville-Hall County Junior League included services to the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, a story hour for children at the Hall County Library, and school lunches for less fortunate children. In 1952, this strong group of women began two permanent projects as well, the Green Hunter Homes Nursery, and the Charity Ball. Their list of accomplishments continued through the years, and in 1954 the first "Fall Thrift Sale" began.

The Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County has a special tradition of helping children with speech problems. After spending 4 years transporting children to the Atlanta Speech School, the members retained a speech correctionist to allow the children of Gainesville and Hall counties to get help closer to home. In the early 1970s, the Northeast Georgia Speech and Hearing Center was opened, and I had the honor of serving on that first board of directors. The Junior League also donated money for newborn intensive care equipment.

In recent years, the Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County underwrote a \$30,000 grant to help open a new child advocacy center and has participated in the massive restoration of the Gainesville Civic Center. Joining with the Association of Junior Leagues International, health concerns emerged as major initiatives and projects were begun, including the creation of a mobile health van and the hosting of a Child Welfare Forum. History shows that the women of Gainesville-Hall County Junior League are able to continue old projects even as they engage in new endeavors that help our community.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems of the Junior League is demonstrating the effectiveness of trained volunteers, and they are certainly doing a great job at it. League members have a strong history as State and community leaders, and I commend the Gainesville-Hall County Junior League for their continuing legacy of service and achievement.

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier today tens of thousands of Armenian

mourners gathered on the hilltop over the city of Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, to remember the Armenian genocide.

Here in the United States, in the Capitol, we also are remembering. It often seems that the world has not learned the crucial lessons of the past. We have witnessed awful genocides in nearly every corner of the globe, including the Holocaust of the Jews in Europe, and genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia.

We must pause today and say, "Never again." We must, because the cost of the alternative is too high.

Eighty-six years ago in 1915, 1.5 million Armenians were killed; 300 Armenian leaders, writers, thinkers and professionals in Constantinople, modern day Istanbul, were rounded up, deported and killed. 5,000 of the poorest Armenians were butchered in the streets and in their homes.

Most Armenians in America are children or grandchildren of those survivors although there are still many survivors amongst us today. I sometimes hear voices that ask, "You know, after all of these years, why do we need to keep addressing this?" After all, some of the skeptics say, this was something that ended back in 1915 and the 1920s.

I suppose that someone who thinks of genocide with that kind of detachment, as if it were just something in a textbook, some distant memory, as something that happened far away and long ago to a people that they never knew, that argument might sound reasonable. But the reason we are here today with my colleagues is because we know better, because we know that 1.5 million men, women and children who were murdered in the genocide are not some abstraction, are not some number in a textbook. To those who survived them, they were beloved family members and dear friends. They were our fathers and mothers and grandparents and uncles and aunts and confidants and neighbors. They were individuals who were robbed of their dignity, they were robbed of their humanity; and finally, they were robbed of their lives.

While time has made the events more distant, the pain is no less real today than it has ever been. How can it be otherwise when we hear the stories of the survivors. How can it be when we are haunted by the words of women like Katharine Magarian. Just listen. Three years ago she said, "I saw my father killed when I was 9 years old. We lived in an Armenian enclave in Turkey in the mountains. My father was a businessman. The Turks, they ride in one day, got all of the men together and brought them to the church. Every man came out with hands tied behind them. They slaughtered them, like sheep, with long knives.

"They all die. Twenty-five people in my family die. You cannot walk, they kill you. You walk, they kill you. They did not care who they killed. My husband, who was a boy in my village but

I did not know him then, he saw his mother's head cut off," and she goes on describing the atrocities that befell her and her family.

To most Americans these stories are things that, maybe, you have heard about or read about. But anyone who grew up in an Armenian American family will tell you they knew about these stories their whole life. They may not have always known the specifics, but they always knew about the pain and hurt and tears. They know there were members of their family who died. Why did they die? Because they were Armenian.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we commemorate the genocide. It is not because we cannot let go of history, it is because history will not let go of us. We know that silence does not bind up wounds, it only leaves those wounds to fester. Because we understand if Turkey is never held accountable for the crimes it committed in the past, it only becomes more certain that those crimes will occur again in the future.

Some in Congress and the White House believe that by speaking out on the genocide, America would be betraying the Turkish government. By failing to speak out, we are betraying our own principles as a free people. We cannot sit idle. We cannot let Turkey hide within a fortress of lies.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we will be introducing our resolution on the Armenian genocide. I would like to share an old Armenian saying with you. The saying is: "Many a molehill thinks it is a mountain. But the mountain? Mountains are too busy being mountains, doing mountain-type things and thinking mountain-type thoughts to worry about what being a mountain means."

I think of America as sometimes being a bit like that mountain. We are a Nation that is so busy with our economy, our culture and politics, we sometimes forget what it is like to be really an American, what it means to be an American. And the way I see it, America means standing up for justice. America means speaking out against injustice.

□ 1900

That is what I urge all of my colleagues to do, and join me in recognizing the Armenian genocide and supporting the resolution.

Recognizing inhumanity is the first step toward healing and understanding. The current tensions between Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Armenia are deeply rooted in his history, and achieving a just and lasting peace and cooperation will only be possible if the past is acknowledged. But it will not happen on its own. That's why congressional action on the Armenian Genocide resolution is so important.

I believe that those of us who stand for human rights and dignity have a responsibility to remember the victims and the survivors. We have a responsibility to speak out and to make sure that tragedies like this are never allowed to happen again.

In remembering the Armenian Genocide, we are making a commitment against genocide

and discrimination. We are making a personal commitment to speaking out against injustice wherever we see it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here this evening to honor my Armenian friends, particularly on the eve of the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

The 20th century was one of historic progress, but also horrible brutality. Throughout the century, America has also been the source of this progress, as well as the nation of first resort to combat brutality around the world. The first great American diplomatic and humanitarian initiative of the 20th century was in response to the attempted extermination of the Armenian people.

As I did last year on this date, I want to associate my comments with the comments of the Jerusalem Post which said, "The 1915 wholesale massacre of the Armenians by the Ottoman Turks remains a core experience of the Armenian nation. While there is virtually zero tolerance for Holocaust denial, there is tacit acceptance of the denial of the Armenian Genocide, in part because the Turks have managed to structure this debate so that people question whether this really did happen."

It is fact that the death of 1.5 million Armenians by execution or starvation really did happen, and we must not tolerate this denial.

Mr. Speaker, I say we must affirm history, not bury it. We must learn from history, not reshape it according to the geostrategic needs of the moment, and we must refuse to be intimidated or other states with troubled pasts will ask that the American record on their dark chapter in history be expunged.

As Members of this body, we have an obligation to educate and familiarize Americans on the Armenian Genocide.

In fact, we must assure that the genocide is remembered so that this human tragedy will not be repeated.

As we have seen in recent years, genocide and ethnic cleansing continue to plague nations around the world and, as a great nation, we must always be attentive and willing to stand against such atrocities. We must do the right thing and call upon our human decency to commemorate the Armenian Genocide. We must take our role as the leader of the Free World seriously and educate people on the systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1.5 million Armenians. We must characterize this as genocide.

A key element of the record of the American response to this crime against humanity consists of the reports of our ambassador and his consular officials throughout what are now central and eastern Turkey. This record is a priceless tool in the hands of any American concerned with or responsible for our Nation's ongoing global role to prevent genocide and ethnic cleansing. Therefore, I will tomorrow will be introducing a strong bipartisan resolution to bring together all of the U.S. records on the Armenian Genocide and to provide this collection to the House Committee on International Relations, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Armenian Genocide Museum in Yerevan, Armenia.

U.S. Archives contain extensive documentation of the widespread opposition to Ottoman Turkey's brutal massacres and deportations. They also contain records of the unprecedented efforts of the American people to bring relief to the survivors of the 20th century's first genocide. In introducing this legislation, we challenge those who will deny the genocide, past or present. I urge my colleagues to please add their names as an original cosponsor.

Finally, I would like to close by expressing my sincere hope that we will have President Bush's support on this initiative. During his campaign he pledged to properly commemorate the Armenian Genocide. I have every reason to believe that he will honor that pledge and do what is right for both the Armenian people and for our historical record.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating one of the most appalling violations of human rights in all of modern history—the eighty-sixth anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

I want to commend my colleagues Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG of Michigan and Representative FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, the co-chairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, for sponsoring this special order.

Today, I want to acknowledge this dark moment in history and remember the Armenian people who tragically lost their lives. We must always remember tumultuous moments in history when people suffered because they were different.

The Armenian genocide lasted over an eight-year period from 1915 to 1923. During

this time, the Ottoman empire carried out a systematic policy of eliminating its Christian Armenian population. The Armenian genocide was the first of the 20th century, but unfortunately, not the last.

The atrocious acts of annihilation against the Armenian people were denounced by Paris, London and Washington as war crimes. Even the Germans, the Ottoman Empire's ally in the First World War, condemned these heinous acts. Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to Constantinople at the time, vividly documented the massacre of 1.5 million Armenians.

Winston Churchill used the word "holocaust" to describe the Armenian massacres when he said: "in 1915 the Turkish government began and ruthlessly carried out the infamous general massacre and deportation of Armenians in Asia minor . . . [the Turks were] massacring uncounted thousands of helpless Armenians—men, women, and children together; whole districts blotted out in one administrative holocaust—these were beyond human redress."

This orchestrated extermination of a people is contrary to the values the United States espouses. We are a nation which strictly adheres to the affirmation of human rights everywhere and cannot dispute a horrendous historical fact by ignoring what so many witnessed and survived.

Recognition and acceptance of any misdeed are necessary steps towards its extinction. Without acceptance there is no remorse, and without remorse, there is no catharsis and pardon.

Even as recently as the last year of this millennium, the United States, together with many European nations, took active part in putting a stop to the genocidal events in Kosovo. It demonstrates that we are willing to risk our lives in order to remain true to our long tradition of intolerance to tyranny and injustice. We cannot remain silent and turn our face away from similar events that took place against the Armenian people.

Of course, we all want to forget these horrific tragedies in our history and bury them in the past. However, it is only through painful process of acknowledging and remembering that we can keep similar dark moments from happening in the future.

At the end of my statement, I have included several quotes from prominent world leaders and political figures, including several U.S. presidents, who describe and sadly affirm what happened to the 1.5 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire eighty-six years ago.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that as we take a moment to reflect upon the hardships endured by the Armenians, we also acknowledge that in the face of adversity the Armenian people have persevered. The survivors of the genocide and their descendants have made great contributions to every country in which they have settled—including the United States, where Armenians have made their mark in business, the professions and our cultural life.

QUOTES REGARDING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE FROM VARIOUS WORLD LEADERS AND PROMINENT POLITICAL FIGURES

"The twentieth century was marred by wars of unimaginable brutality, mass murder and genocide. History records that the Armenians were the first people of the last century to have endured these cruelties. The Ar-

menians were subjected to a genocidal campaign that defies comprehension and commands all decent people to remember and acknowledge the facts and lessons of an awful crime in a century of bloody crimes against humanity. If elected President, I would ensure that our nation properly recognizes the tragic suffering of the Armenian people."—George W. Bush Jr., June 2, 2000, letter to the members of the Armenian Assembly.

"[We join] Armenians around the world [as we remember] the terrible massacres suffered in 1915–1923 at the hands of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire. The United States responded to this crime against humanity by leading diplomatic and private relief efforts."—George W. Bush Sr., April 20, 1990, speech in Orlando, Florida.

"Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it, . . . the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten."—Ronald Reagan, April 22, 1981, proclamation.

"It is generally not known in the world that, in the years preceding 1916, there was a concerted effort made to eliminate all the Armenian people, probably one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell any group. And there weren't any Nuremberg trials."—Jimmy Carter, May 16, 1978, White House ceremony.

"The association of Mount Ararat and Noah, the staunch Christians who were massacred periodically by the Mohammedan Turks, and the Sunday School collections over fifty years for alleviating their miseries—all cumulate to impress the name Armenian on the front of the American mind."—Herbert Hoover, *The Memoirs of Herbert Hoover*, 1952.

". . . the Armenian massacre was the greatest crime of the war, and the failure to act against Turkey is to condone it . . . the failure to deal radically with the Turkish horror means that all talk of guaranteeing the future peace of the world is mischievous nonsense."—Theodore Roosevelt, May 11, 1918, letter to Cleveland Hoadley Dodge.

"When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact. . . . I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."—Henry Morgenthau, Sr., U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, 1919.

"These left-overs from the former Young Turk Party, who should have been made to account for the millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse, from their homes and massacred, have been restive under the Republican rule."—Mustafa "Ataturk" Kemal, founder of the modern Turkish Republic in 1923 and revered throughout Turkey, in an interview published on August 1, 1926 in *The Los Angeles Examiner*, talking about former Young Turks in his country.

"Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"—Adolf Hitler, while persuading his associates that a Jewish holocaust would be tolerated by the west.

"It was not war. It was most certainly massacre and genocide, something the world must remember . . . We will always reject any attempt to erase its record, even for some political advantage."—Yossi Beilin, Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister, April 27, 1994 on the floor of the Knesset in response to a TV interview of the Turkish Ambassador.

"Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotions we mark the 50th anniversary of the Turkish

genocide of the Armenian people. In taking notice of the shocking events in 1915, we observe this anniversary with sorrow in recalling the massacres of Armenians and with pride in saluting those brave patriots who survived to fight on the side of freedom during World War I.”—Gerald Ford, addressing the U.S. House of Representatives.

“Turkey is taking advantage of the war in order to thoroughly liquidate (grundlich aufzaumen) its internal foes, i.e., the indigenous Christians, without being thereby disturbed by foreign intervention.”—Talat Pasha, one of the three rulers of wartime in the Ottoman Empire in a conversation with Dr. Mordtmann of the German Embassy in June 1915.

“What on earth do you want? The question is settled. There are no more Armenians.”—Talat said this after the German Ambassador persistently brought up the Armenian question in 1918.

“In an attempt to carry out its purpose to resolve the Armenian question by the destruction of the Armenian race, the Turkish government has refused to be deterred neither by our representations, nor by those of the American Embassy, nor by the delegate of the Pope, nor by the threats of the Allied Powers, nor in deference to the public opinion of the West representing one-half of the world.”—Count Wolff-Metternich, German Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, July 10, 1916, cable to the German Chancellor.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus and the representative of a thriving community of Armenian-Americans, I join many of my colleagues today to recognize the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

This terrible human tragedy must not be forgotten. Like the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide stands as a tragic example of the human suffering that results from hatred and intolerance.

One and a half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from their ancestral homeland. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

It would be an even greater tragedy to forget the Armenian Genocide. To not recognize the horror of such events almost assures their repetition in the future.

Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish government still refuses to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide. The truth of this tragedy can never and should never be denied.

I would like to commend the Armenian-American community as it continues to thrive and provide assistance and solidarity to its countrymen and women abroad. The Armenian-American community is bound together by strong generational and family ties, an enduring work ethic and a proud sense of ethnic heritage. Today we recall the tragedy of their past, not to place blame, but to answer a fundamental question, “Who remembers the Armenians?”

Our commemoration of the Armenian Genocide speaks directly to that, and I answer, we do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of one of history’s unacknowledged tragedies—the Armenian Genocide. Today marks the 86th anniversary of this tragedy that lasted from 1915 to 1923.

April 24, 1915 is remembered and commemorated each year by the Armenian com-

munity and by people of conscience throughout the world. On this day, the rulers of the Ottoman empire began the systematic and ruthless extermination of the Armenian minority in Turkey. By the end of the Terror, more than a million Armenian men, women, and children had been massacred and more than half a million others had been expelled from the homeland that their forbears had inhabited for three millennia.

The Armenian Genocide is a historical fact. The Republic of Turkey has adamantly refused to acknowledge that the Genocide happened on its soil but the evidence is irrefutable. In 1915, England, France and Russia jointly issued a statement charging the Ottoman Empire with “a crime against humanity.” Professor Raphael Lemkin, a holocaust survivor, is the key historical figure in making genocide a crime under international law. He coined the term “genocide” and was the first to characterize the atrocities of 1915–1923 as the “Armenian Genocide.”

We understand that there is a difference between the Turkish people and the government of the Ottoman Turks. In fact, we know that during the massacres there were Turks who tried to save Armenians at the cost of their own lives. But our alliance with Turkey should not deter us from learning the lessons of past mistakes.

If we ignore the lessons of the Armenian Genocide, we are destined to repeat those same mistakes. The horrible conflicts in Sudan, Sierra Leone, and East Timor remind us that we must do more to prevent the systematic slaughter of innocent people. We must learn from the past and never forget the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn memorial to the estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children who lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide. As in the past I am pleased to join so many distinguished House colleagues on both sides of the aisle in ensuring that the horrors wrought upon the Armenian people are never repeated.

On April 24, 1915, over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were brutally executed by the Turkish government in Istanbul. Over the course of the next 8 years, this war of ethnic genocide against the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire took the lives of over half the world’s Armenian population.

Sadly, there are some people who still deny the very existence of this period which saw the institutionalized slaughter of the Armenian people and dismantling of Armenian culture. To those who would question these events, I point to the numerous reports contained in the U.S. National Archives detailing the process that systematically decimated the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire. However, old records are too easily forgotten—and dismissed. That is why we come together every year at this time: to remember in words what some may wish to file away in archives. This genocide did take place, and these lives were taken. That memory must keep us forever vigilant in our efforts to prevent these atrocities from ever happening again.

I am proud to note that Armenian immigrants found, in the United States, a country where their culture could take root and thrive. Most Armenians in America are children or grandchildren of the survivors, although there

are still survivors amongst us. In my district in Northwest Indiana, a vibrant Armenian-American community has developed and strong ties to Armenia continue to flourish. My predecessor in the House, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage, and his distinguished service in the House serves as an example to the entire Northwest Indiana community. Over the years, members of the Armenian-American community throughout the United States have contributed millions of dollars and countless hours of their time to various Armenian causes. Of particular note are Mrs. Vicki Hovanessian and her husband Dr. Raffi Hovanessian, residents of Indiana’s First Congressional District, who have continually worked to improve the life in Armenia, as well as in Northwest Indiana. Three other Armenian-American families in my congressional district, Dr. Aram and Seta Semerdjian and Sonya Doumanian, and Ara and Rosy Yeretsian, have also contributed greatly toward charitable works in the United States and Armenia. Their efforts, together with hundreds of other members of the Armenian-American community, have helped to finance several important projects in Armenia, including the construction of new schools, a mammography clinic, and a crucial roadway connecting Armenia to Nagorno Karabagh.

In the House, I have tried to assist the efforts of my Armenian-American constituency by continually supporting foreign aid to Armenia. This past year, with my support, Armenia received over \$90 million of the \$219 million in U.S. aid earmarked for the Southern Caucasus. In addition, on April 6, 2001, I joined several of my colleagues in signing the letter to President Bush urging him to honor his pledge to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian people have a long and proud history. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. During World War I, the Ottoman Empire was ruled by an organization known as the Young Turk Committee, which allied with Germany. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire’s eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation and execution of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had either been killed or deported.

While it is important to keep the lessons of history in mind, we must also remain committed to protecting Armenia from new and more hostile aggressors. In the last decade, thousands of lives have been lost and more than a million people displaced in the struggle between Armenia and Azerbaijan, over Nagorno-Karabagh. Even now, as we rise to commemorate the accomplishments of the Armenian people and mourn the tragedies they have suffered, Azerbaijan, Turkey, and other countries continue to engage in a debilitating blockade of this free nation.

On March 28th of this year, I testified before Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee on the important issue of bringing peace to a troubled area of the world. I continued my support for maintaining of level funding for the Southern Caucasus region of the Independent States (IS), and of Armenia in particular. I also stressed the critical importance of retaining Section 907 of the Freedom

Support Act that restricts U.S. aid for Azerbaijan as a result of their blockade. Unfortunately, Armenia is now entering its twelfth year of a blockade, and Section 907 is the one protection afforded it by the Congress. The flow of food, fuel, and medicine continues to be hindered by the blockade, creating a humanitarian crisis in Armenia. A repeal of Section 907 would only serve to legitimize Azerbaijan's illegitimate acts of aggression. I stand in strong support of Section 907, which sends a clear message that the United States Congress stands behind the current peace process and encourages Azerbaijan to work with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Minsk Group toward a meaningful and lasting resolution. In the end, I believe Section 907 will help conclude a conflict that threatens to destabilize the entire region and places the Armenian nation in distinct peril.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOE KNOLLENBERG and FRANK PALLONE, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 86th Anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Their efforts will not only help bring needed attention to this tragic period in world history, but also serve to remind us of our duty to protect basic human rights and freedoms around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we do every year, I rise to mark April 24, the somber anniversary of one of the great crimes of modern history: the beginning of the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire. During and after World War I, a government-orchestrated campaign to eliminate the Armenians under Ottoman rule led to the slaughter of about one and a half million people. Entire communities were uprooted, as survivors fled their homes and were forced into exile.

Fortunately for them, the United States offered a haven. In turn, Armenian refugees gave this country the best they had to offer. Their contributions in many fields of endeavor have energized and enriched American culture and politics. Surely Turkey's loss has been America's gain, as Armenian refugees in the early part of the 20th century and their progeny have become an inspiring success story.

Turkey has lost in another way: its long-standing campaign of denial that the atrocities perpetrated during 1915–1923 were a genocide has not convinced anyone. More and more representative institutions across the world have openly declared their recognition of the genocide, and their number will grow. By refusing to acknowledge what the rest of the world sees, Turkey has stunted its own development and complicated its ability to come to terms with its own past, present, and future.

As we soberly mark April 24 this year, there is at least reason to hope for progress on a front important to all Armenians. The OSCE-brokered negotiations over Nagorno-Karabakh finally seems to be making headway. Though the details remain confidential, the recent meeting between Armenia's President Kocharian and Azerbaijan's President Aliiev in Key West, Florida apparently went well enough for the OSCE Minsk Group to prepare a new peace proposal that will be presented to the parties in Geneva in June. Much hard bargaining surely lies ahead. Nevertheless, for the first time in years, we can allow ourselves of bit of optimism about the prospects for peace in a very troubled and important region.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can compensate for the loss of so many Armenians last century.

But a prospering Armenia, at peace with its neighbors, and giving free rein to the natural abilities of this talented people, would mitigate the pain and sorrow we feel today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, to lend my voice to this important debate remembering the Armenian Genocide. While Turkey's brutal campaign against the Armenian people was initiated almost a century ago, its impact lives on in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. That is why we must continue to speak about it. We must remind the American people of the potential for such atrocities against ethnic groups, because history lessons that are not learned are too often repeated.

The Armenian Genocide, conceived and carried out by the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923, resulted in the deportation of 2 million Armenians from their homeland and the ultimate slaughter of 1.5 million of those people. The continued tensions in the Caucasus region are rooted in this history, and until they are forthrightly acknowledged among world leaders, the prospects for resolution remain dim.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize history, and to demonstrate that history is unkind to that abuse either rules of war or basic human dignity. I have fought in a war and understand each side feels compelled for its own reasons to fight. When that fight extends to civilian populations it is justifiable to both examine and condemn such occurrences.

The U.S. has some of the most extensive documentation of this genocide against the Armenian people, and there has been no shortage of corroboration by other countries. The Armenian genocide has been recognized by the United Nations and nations around the globe, and the U.S. came to the aid of the survivors. But perhaps we were not vociferous enough in holding the perpetrators of this genocide accountable, and for shining the light of international shame upon them. For it was only a few decades later that we saw another genocide against humanity: the Holocaust. That is why we must continue to tell the story of Armenian genocide. It is a painful reminder that such vicious campaigns against a people have occurred, and that the potential for such human brutality exists in this world. We must remain mindful of the continued repression of Armenians today, and challenge those who would persecute these people. If we do not, future generations may be destined to relive such horrors against humanity.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues in commemoration of the 86th anniversary of beginning of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, under the direction of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, a campaign of Armenian extermination began. Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul were arrested and exiled—silencing the leading representatives of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire. From 1915 until 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered, with another 500,000 forced into exile in Russia, ending a period of 2,500 years of an Armenian presence in their historic homeland. Today we remember this terrible period in human history, and commend the Armenian people for their ongoing struggle to live peacefully in their historic homeland.

Like the Jewish and Cambodian holocausts, and more recently, the Serbian ethnic cleans-

ing in Kosovo, the Armenian genocide stands out as one of the world's most morally reprehensible acts. Unfortunately, some American Presidents have chosen not to recognize this atrocity as what it truly was—the attempted extermination of an ethnic group. Continuing our good relationship with Turkey has repeatedly been cited as the reason not to use the word genocide. Mr. Speaker, there is no word other than genocide to describe the systematic murder of a million and a half people.

Earlier this month, I joined 107 of my colleagues in asking President Bush to properly recognize the Armenian Genocide by using the word genocide, and I hope that Mr. Bush will become the first American president in 20 years to do that.

On this day, we remember those Armenians who died 86 years ago and send a message to the world that we will never forget what happened during that terrible period in history and that we reaffirm our resolve to ensure that no nation will ever again have the opportunity to participate in mass genocide.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, 2001, we solemnly mark the 76th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. On this day in 1915, three hundred Armenian leaders, writers, thinkers and professionals in Constantinople (present day Istanbul) were rounded up, deported and killed on the orders of the Ottoman Imperial Government. By 1923, one and a half million Armenians had been killed and roughly two million deported.

Our country was one of the first major powers of the day to condemn the acts of the Ottoman Empire. Other nations lent their voices to the outcry. Nations allied to the Ottoman Empire, such as Germany and Austria, and those who found themselves politically opposed to the Empire, like Great Britain, France, and Russia, expressed their consternation at the clear policy of genocide.

Today, the United States should reassert its condemnation of the ignominious acts of over three quarters of a century ago. The Armenians Genocide has an infamous place in history as the first mass genocide of the 20th century. Tragically, it was not the last act of genocide the world witnessed that century. Had the Armenians Genocide been fully investigated and condemned in the years after its duration, perhaps, citizens of the world would have reacted sooner to the mass ethnic cleansings that followed.

I am sure that the victims of the Armenian Genocide would want us to not simply remember the historic travesty that befell them, but would want us to learn from these lessons of xenophobia and inhumanity. We remember the Armenian genocide, today, and we affirm its historical existence, not to inflame the passions of our friends in the modern day Republic of Turkey, but to remind all Americans of the horrible consequences of ethnic violence. Turks of all backgrounds heroically fought against the policy of genocide adopted by extremist elements controlling the Ottoman government during World War I. We commemorate their heroism and humanity just as firmly in our act of remembrance today.

Mr. Speaker, we must hope and pray that genocide never again is visited upon the human race. As we grow closer in commerce and communication, may we also grow wiser in our understanding of world history. May we heed the lessons that are there to be learned. And may we never forget the worst aspects of

that history, so that tomorrow's history may be all the better.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, for the third consecutive year, to commemorate a people who despite murder, hardship, and betrayal have persevered. April 24, 2001, marks the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide; unbelievably, an event that many still fail to recognize.

Throughout three decades in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, millions of Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of three thousands years and deported or massacred. From 1894 through 1896, three hundred thousand Armenians were ruthlessly murdered. Again in 1909, thirty thousand Armenians were massacred in Cilicia, and their villages were destroyed.

On April 24, 1915, two hundred Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arbitrarily arrested, taken to Turkey and murdered. This incident marks a dark and solemn period in the history of the Armenian people. From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire launched a systematic campaign to exterminate Armenians. In eight short years, more than 1.5 million Armenians suffered through atrocities such as deportation, forced slavery, and torture. Most were ultimately murdered.

I have had the privilege of joining my colleagues in a letter to the President asking that the U.S. officially commemorate the victims of the Armenian Genocide and honor its 1.5 million victims. As a cosponsor and proponent of H. Res. 596 during the 106th Congress, I was deeply disturbed by the decision that prevented the House of Representatives from considering this resolution last October. This resolution recognized the suffering of nearly two million Armenians from 1915 through 1923, as the Ottoman Empire strove to wipe out an entire race of men, women, and children. Those who were not murdered were effectively removed from their homes of 2,500 years in what is now modern day Turkey.

The resolution called upon the President of the United States to do three things: (1) Ensure that U.S. foreign policy reflects consideration and sensitivity for human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in U.S. records relating to the Armenian Genocide and the consequences of the Turkish court's failure to enforce judgments against those responsible for committing genocide; (2) recognize, during his annual commemoration of the Armenian Genocide on April 24th, that this was a systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1.5 million people, and reflect upon the United States' effort to intervene on behalf of Armenians during the genocide; and (3) in his annual commemoration of the Armenian Genocide, emphasize that the modern day Republic of Turkey did not conduct the Armenian Genocide, which was perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire. This was the second time H. Res. 596 had been pulled from consideration, despite pledges by the leadership that the U.S. would go on record to affirm their support for the Armenian genocide.

We should exhibit the same support as many of our friends in the international community who have refused to be bullied into silence. The European Parliament and the United Nations have recognized and reaffirmed the Armenian genocide as historical fact, as have the Russian and Greek parliaments, the Canadian House of Commons,

the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies, and the French National Assembly. It is time for America to venerate Armenians who suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. And let me stress that I am not speaking of the government of modern day Turkey, but rather its predecessor, which many of Turkey's present day leaders helped to remove from power.

As I have in the past, as a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I will continue to work with my colleagues and with the Armenian-Americans in my district to promote investment and prosperity in Armenia. And, I sincerely, hope that this year, the U.S. will have the opportunity and courage to speak in support of the millions of Armenians who suffered because of their heritage.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take part in an important annual event in the House of Representatives, the commemoration of the Armenian Genocide. I am proud that dozens of Members gather each year to mark this dark chapter in human history. Such devotion to memory is not a trivial matter. We know this to be true because, even today, there are those who would vainly try to deny the past, in order to influence the future.

We, as a moral people, cannot allow such wicked efforts to prosper. Even passive acceptance of such lies would be tantamount to participating in a second genocide. As we all know, surely and irrefutably, the first Armenian Genocide, occurred between 1915 and 1923, and resulted in the deliberate death of 1.5 million human souls, killed for the crime of their own existence. The second Armenian Genocide, which every year we must struggle against, is the ongoing effort by some to deny reality, to deny history, to deny one of humanity's darkest hours.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide marked a critical point in history. We can look back now, with the wisdom of hindsight, and see in the deaths of a million and a half Armenians the first signs of the breathtaking cruelty of the last century. We can see technology and hatred converging toward the creation of a new phenomenon in human history, the apotheosis of evil, the creation of genocide, the organized attempt to annihilate an entire people.

The Ottoman Empire's campaign to eliminate the entire Armenian population existing within its borders was no accident, no mistake made by a bureaucrat. Genocide was official policy and 1.5 million Armenians died as a result. They were starved and shot, deported and humiliated. They were old and young, innocent and blameless. They were killed, not for what they had one, but for who they were.

Mr. Speaker, when we assemble here, in the House of Representatives, and remember the Armenian Genocide, we stand as witnesses to humanity's worst potential and promise to do better. To not stand by, impassive and confused in the face of horror. We commit ourselves to our common humanity and the precious rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. Genocide is incomprehensible, but not unstoppable.

For genocide to be removed from our world and banished forever, we must begin with teaching our children what has happened, and recalling, publicly and clearly, the unprecedented slaughter of the innocent in the 20th century; first in Armenian and then throughout Europe. As a just and honorable nation, we

must do more than shrug our shoulders at atrocities. We must bear witness, year after year, and in doing so, commit ourselves to preventing history's repetition.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here today for one simple reason: to remind our nation that eighty-five years ago one-third of the Armenian people, 1.5 million men, women and children, were put to death for the crime of their own birth. To deny this reality is to deny that genocide can happen again.

I want to thank America's citizens of Armenian descent for their unfailing commitment to their people's history and their unwavering struggle to ensure that the memory and history of their peoples' darkest hour is never lost. Thanks to them, the Armenian Genocide and its lessons will not be forgotten in our time and in our nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't thank and commend my colleagues, Congressmen JOE KNOLLENBERG and FRANK PALLONE, the co-Chairmen of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues. Thanks to their leadership, this House will again honorably fulfill America's commitment to memory and justice.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this commemoration of the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. Each year, I join Members of Congress from both sides of the political spectrum to take part in this commemoration. We join together to raise awareness of a chapter in history so brutal and violent that it sadly deserves the horrific title of "Genocide."

Each year, as I rise to pay tribute to over 1.5 million Armenians who were killed in this tragedy, I am amazed at how the news of the Armenian Genocide was suppressed at the time and then shrouded from public view for generations. We all remember the question posed by Adolf Hitler at the beginning of World War II—he said "who remembers the Armenians?" Today, for the sake of justice and human rights, we answer: "We do."

The events that took place between 1915 to 1923, when Armenian men, women and children were systematically mistreated and killed, represent one of the darkest chapters of human history. Armenians were tortured, had their property confiscated, and died from malnutrition and starvation during long, forced marches from their homeland in Eastern Turkey.

When tragedies of this magnitude take place, we must ensure that they are not forgotten. Let us teach our children that attempted systematic annihilation of a people must be a fixture of the past. Let us teach our children to value diversity and promote peace and understanding. There can be a better world than the world of the Armenians between 1915 and 1923—but only if they truly understand the cruelty that humankind can wreak upon its own.

There are survivors of the Armenian Genocide in my district, and the horror of this ordeal is forever etched in their collective memories. Every year, survivors participate in commemoration ceremonies in Boston, Lowell, and other parts of Massachusetts' Merrimack Valley. The commemoration offers participants an opportunity to remind the media and citizens around the world of the tragedy suffered by the Armenians at the hands of the Turkish empire.

I represent a large and active Armenian community in my Congressional district. They

are hard-working and proud of their heritage. With great respect for them and for Armenians throughout the world, let us renew our commitment here today that the American people will oppose any and all instances of genocide.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, we join here today to honor the memory of the Armenians who were massacred and the Armenian survivors who fled into exile during the Ottoman Empire's genocide from 1915 to 1923. On April 24th 1915, the Ottoman Empire began what can be called nothing less than a policy of ethnic cleansing. The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, stated that he was confident the treatment he observed of the Armenian people from 1915 to 1923 was the greatest atrocity the human race had ever seen. "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this," Morgenthau stated.

We are very fortunate and blessed to have so many Armenian people connected to our Nation. In my home state, the Armenian community is great, and so too are the gifts and talents they bring to Rhode Island. Our Nation must continue to take the time to educate and remember the atrocities suffered by over one and a half million Armenians during the Armenian Genocide. Future generations must understand what the community has been through to truly appreciate and honor all the talents they share with our Nation.

Over eighty-six years later after the tragedy began, Turkey still denies the Armenian Genocide despite overwhelming documentation of these atrocities. We cannot allow such ethnic violence and genocide to simply be covered up or ignored. Continued Congressional support to provide assistance to the people residing in Nagorno-Karabagh and upholding section 907 of the Freedom Support Act sends a strong, powerful message to Turkey that we will not allow Armenian communities to be threatened again.

The Armenian Genocide serves as a reminder to us all that we must do more to protect peace and human rights for all those around the world.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join voices with my colleagues today to recognize the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

Between 1894 and 1923, approximately two million Armenians were massacred, persecuted, and exiled by the Turk government of the Ottoman Empire. Despite all the facts, eyewitness accounts, recognition by countries throughout the world, and the findings of their own post-war courts, the government of Turkey still refuses to acknowledge the genocide ever occurred. We cannot allow such blatant disregard and denial to go on. Earlier this year, France's National Assembly passed legislation labeling the Armenian Genocide as genocide. We in the United States should do no less.

I will remember a speech made by Elie Wiesel at the White House in which he described the perils of indifference to suffering: "In a way, to be indifferent to that suffering is what makes the human being inhuman. Indifference, after all, is more dangerous than anger or hatred. Anger can at times be creative. One writes a great poem, a great symphony . . . because one is angry at the injustice that one witnesses. But indifference is never creative. Even hatred at times may elicit a response. You fight it. You denounce it. You

disarm it. Indifference elicits no response . . . Indifference is always the friend of the enemy, for it benefits the aggressor—never his victim, whose pain is magnified when he or she feels forgotten. The political prisoner in his cell, the hungry children, the homeless refugees—not to respond to their plight, not to relieve their solitude by offering them a spark of hope is to exile them from human memory. And in denying their humanity we betray our own.

Let us all take a moment to reflect on the anniversary of the genocide of the Armenian people. We have a duty to those who have died and to those who survived to help preserve this memory forever. We must raise our thoughts and our voices on behalf of those who have suffered and died, and pray that such suffering is never again visited on any people anywhere on the Earth.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and remember the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian genocide, who were systematically slaughtered solely because of their race. While there is never a justification for genocide, in this case there also regrettably has never been an apology, and the criminals were never brought to justice. Such an unconscionable act, however, can never be forgotten. It is our duty to remember.

I also rise in tribute to the Armenian people who have fully recovered from this atrocity by maintaining their proud traditions and culture, becoming an integral part of America, and nine years ago, forming the Republic of Armenia.

The Ottoman Empire's last, desperate act was one of profound cruelty, tragic and gruesome beyond description. During World War I—a tumultuous, revolutionary time of great societal transformations and uncertain futures on the battlefields and at home—desperate Ottoman leaders fell back on the one weapon that could offer hope of personal survival. It is a weapon that is still used today, fed by fear, desperation, and hatred. It transforms the average citizen into a zealot, no longer willing to listen to reason. This weapon is, of course, nationalism. Wrongly directed, nationalism can easily result in ethnic strife and senseless genocide, committed in the name of false beliefs preached by immoral, irresponsible, tyrannical leaders.

Today I rise not to speak of the present, but in memory of the victims of the past, who suffered needlessly in the flames of vicious, destructive nationalism. On April 24, 1915, the leaders of the Ottoman government tragically chose to systematically exterminate an entire race of people. In this case, as in the case of Nazi Germany, nationalism became a weapon of cruelty and evil. Let us never forget the 1.5 million Armenians who died at the whim of wicked men and their misguided followers.

The story of the Armenian genocide is in itself appalling. It is against everything our government—and indeed all governments who strive for justice—stands for; it represents the most wicked side of humanity. What makes the Armenian story even more unfortunate is history has repeated itself in all corners of the world, and lessons that should have been learned long ago have been ignored. We must not forget the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, or Bosnia. It is our duty that by remembering the millions who have been victims of genocide, we pledge ourselves to preventing such acts from repeating themselves.

It is an honor and privilege to represent a large and active Armenian population, many who have family members who were persecuted by their Ottoman Turkish rulers. Michigan's Armenian-American community has done much to further our state's commercial, political, and intellectual growth, just as it has done in communities across the country. And so I also rise today to honor to the triumph of the Armenian people, who have endured adversity and bettered our country.

The Armenian people have faced great trials and tests throughout their history. They have proved their resilience in the face of tragedy before, and I have no doubt that they will endure today's tragic occurrence, recognize that a madman's bullet can never put an end to a people's dreams, and keep moving forward on the path of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, let no one, friend or foe, ever deny that the Armenian genocide occurred. Let us not forget the heinous nature of the crimes committed against the Armenian people. Let us promise to the world, as American citizens and citizens of the world, that we will never again allow such a crime to be perpetrated, and will not tolerate the forces of misguided nationalism and hate.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memories of those who perished in the Armenian Genocide.

April 24, 1915 is remembered and solemnly commemorated each year by the Armenian community. On this date, eighty-six years ago, a group of Armenian political, religious, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, sent further inland, and killed. In the following years, Armenians living under Ottoman rule were deprived of their freedom, property, and ultimately, their lives. By 1923, over a million Armenians had been massacred, and another half a million more people had been deported.

This genocide, which was preceded by a series of massacres in 1894–1896 and in 1909 and was followed by another series of massacres in 1920, essentially dispersed Armenians and removed them from their historic homeland. The persecution of the Armenian people left psychological scars among the survivors and their families. No person should have to endure the trauma and horrors that they did.

On May 2, 1995, I had the honor of meeting the former Armenian Ambassador to the United States, Rouben Robert Shugarian, at a Congressional reception commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Ambassador Shugarian introduced me to several survivors of the 1915 genocide. This experience was a deeply moving and personal reminder of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished during the systematic extermination by the Ottoman Empire.

It is important that we not only commemorate the Armenian Genocide, but also honor the memory of others who lost their lives during this time. We must remember this horrific and shameful period in world history so that it will never be repeated again.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. I rise today to commemorate this terrible chapter in human history, and to help ensure that it will never be forgotten.

On April 24, 1915, the Turkish government began to arrest Armenian community and political leaders. Many were executed without

ever being charged with crimes. Soon after the government deported most Armenians from Turkish Armenia, ordering that they resettle in what is now Syria. Many deportees never reached that destination.

From 1915 to 1918, more than a million Armenians died of starvation or disease on long marches, or were massacred outright by Turkish forces. From 1918 to 1923, Armenians continued to suffer at the hands of the Turkish military, which eventually removed all remaining Armenians from Turkey.

The U.S. Ambassador in Constantinople at the time, Henry Morgenthau, stated "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

We mark this anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide because this tragedy for the Armenian people was a tragedy for all humanity. It is our duty to remember, to speak out and to teach future generations about the horrors of genocide and the oppression and terrible suffering endured by the Armenian people.

Sadly, we cannot say that such atrocities are history. We have only to recall the "killing fields" of Cambodia, mass killings in Bosnia and Rwanda, and "ethnic cleansing" in Kosovo to see that the threat of genocide persists. We must renew our commitment never to remain indifferent in the face of such assaults on humanity.

We also remember this day because it is a time for us to celebrate the contribution of the Armenian community in America—including hundreds of thousands in California—to the richness of our character and culture. The strength they have displayed in overcoming tragedy to flourish in this country is an example for all of us. Their success is moving testimony to the truth that tyranny and evil cannot extinguish the vitality of the human spirit.

The Armenian struggle continues to this day. But now with an independent Armenian state, the United States has the opportunity to contribute to a true memorial to the past by strengthening Armenia's democracy. We must do all we can through aid and trade to support Armenia's efforts to construct an open political and economic system.

Adolf Hitler, the architect of the Nazi Holocaust, once remarked "Who remembers the Armenians?" The answer is, we do. And we will continue to remember the victims of the 1915–23 genocide because, in the words of the philosopher George Santayana, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating the Armenian Genocide.

Today we solemnly remember the April 24, 1915 onslaught of the Ottoman Government's eight-year campaign of terror against its Armenian population. We mourn the systematic destruction of Armenian communities, the murder of one and a half million men, women, and children, and the forced deportation of over nearly one million others.

This somber anniversary, however, also bears a stark warning. Eighty-six years ago, the world's willingness to ignore the bloodshed against Armenians set the stage for its complacency during Hitler's attempt to annihilate the Jews. Today, the world's resolve against

historical revisionism of the Armenian Genocide will be a key determinant of our ability to stand against similar attempts at Holocaust denial.

I am proud to acknowledge the Armenian Americans in my district and across the country who have dedicated themselves to preserving the memory of those who were persecuted, and to publicizing the United States records documenting this period. I join them and my colleagues in renewing our commitment to stand against governments that persecute their own people, and to insuring that no act of genocide will ever again go unnoticed or unmentioned.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in commemorating the Armenian Genocide, one of the great tragedies of the twentieth century. I also want to thank Representatives Pallone and Knollenberg for calling special orders tonight to remember this terrible event.

Eighty-six years ago, in the Ottoman Empire, the Armenian Genocide began with the arrest and murder of many of the Armenian community's religious, political, and intellectual leaders. Their deaths would be followed by the massacre of one and a half million men, women, and children, and the displacement and deportation of hundreds of thousands more.

Today, we pause to remember and mourn their loss. As we enter a new century, we carry with us, seared into our memories, the bloodshed of the last hundred years. That century added a new and terrible word to our vocabularies—genocide, the attempt to wipe out not merely a life, but a people and a culture. The Armenian Genocide stands as the first chilling example of that crime against humanity.

History matters. It must be remembered, and it must be acknowledged. If our past is a blank slate, we have no identity, no sense of place or of self, and nothing from which to learn. Failure to remember, acknowledge, and learn from the Armenian Genocide would only increase the scope of this terrible tragedy. The murders of a million and half people must not be compounded by the erasure of their memory. That would be one more act of genocide, and that we can never allow.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the Armenian victims of the genocide brought upon them by the Ottoman Turkish Empire and to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman FRANK PALLONE, and the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JOE KNOLLENBERG, for organizing this special order today so that Members of the House may take the time to remember this solemn occasion.

April 24th marks the beginning of the systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turkish Empire in 1915. Over the following 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians were tortured and murdered, and more than half a million were forced from their homeland into exile. Regrettably, in the years since, the Turkish Government has refused to apologize for these atrocious acts, or even acknowledge the Armenian Genocide, despite overwhelming documentation.

By recognizing the victims of the genocide, we commemorate both those who perished and those who were able to begin a new life in communities like my home State of Rhode Island, where many Armenian families con-

tinue to thrive today. I hope that recognition of this atrocity will help erase the remnants of an era in which propaganda and deceit held precedence over truth and human dignity. Our nation must never allow oppression and persecution to pass without condemnation.

Armenians are a strong, resilient people, struggling to heal the wounds of the past. However, until the Armenian genocide is officially acknowledged, these wounds will remain. We should not deny the Armenian people their rightful place in history. To do so would dishonor them, and blight our understanding of the past. It is the best interests of our nation and the entire global community to remember the past and learn from history.

Even as we remember the tragedy and honor the dead, we also honor the living. Out of the ashes of their history, Armenians all across the world have clung to their identity and have prospered in new communities. The State of Rhode Island is fortunate to be home to such an organized and active community, whose members contribute and participate in every aspect of civic life.

As an ardent supporter of the Armenian-American community throughout my public service career, I am proud to honor the victims of the genocide by paying tribute to their memory, showing compassion for those who have suffered from such heinous prejudice, and never forgetting the pain that they have endured. Let us never forget their tragedy, and ensure that such crimes are never repeated.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our two distinguished cochairs of the Caucus on Armenian Issues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for arranging this special order today. I also want to extend my concerns to the Armenian-American community on this somber occasion.

Armenian-Americans have every reason to be proud of their heritage and their accomplishments in this country as well as their efforts in preserving their culture their attention to the memory of their martyrs. I join Armenians and their friends throughout the world who gather this week to honor the memories of the countless men, women, and children who perished 86 years ago in the Armenian Genocide.

Future generations should not be around to forget such horrible crimes, much less to deny their existence. Moreover, we can not say with any certainty that the atrocities of the American Genocide are left to history. We only have to recall the Holocaust, the killing fields of Cambodia, the massacres in Rwanda, and the ethnic cleansing in Bosnian and East Timor. That is why, in addition to never forgetting the first genocide of the 20th century, we must make certain that the fate that befell the Armenian people will never again be repeated.

Yet there are many governments which fail to acknowledge the existence of the Armenian Genocide which is a great disservice to all peoples who have suffered persecution and attempted annihilation. It is important therefore that our nation recognizes the Armenian Holocaust as an historical fact and history is preserved.

Accordingly, it is fitting that we pause and join in this commemoration, and asking all Americans to join in it. We must understand the lessons of the tragedies of this century such as the Armenian Genocide, and most important to resolve to prevent their repetition.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of one of history's most terrible tragedies, the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian community commemorates this atrocity each year on April 24, the day in 1915 when 300 Armenian leaders, intellectuals, and professionals were rounded up in Constantinople, deported, and killed. From 1915 through 1923, one and a half million Armenians had been massacred, 500,000 more had been deported, and the survivors were systematically deprived of their property, freedom, and dignity.

In my district, there is a significant population of Armenian survivors and their families that showed heroic courage and will to survive in the face of horrendous obstacles and adversities. These survivors are an important window into the past. It is through their unforgettable tragedy that we are able to share in their history and strong heritage.

Mr. Speaker, in the Armenian consciousness, the events of 1915 through 1923 are a vivid and constant presence. I am pleased my colleagues and I have the opportunity to pay tribute to the Armenian community in order to ensure the legacy of the genocide is remembered.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today, we remember April 24, 1915 as one of the darkest days of the 20th century. It was on this day that 300 Armenian leaders, writers, religious figures and professionals in Constantinople were gathered together, deported, and brutally murdered. In addition, thousands more Armenian citizens were dragged out of their homes and murdered in the streets. Remaining citizens were taken from their homes and marched off to concentration camps in the desert, where many died of starvation and thirst. Following the horrific events of April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire systematically deprived Armenians of their homes, property, freedom, and ultimately, their lives. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenian citizens had been murdered, while half a million had been deported.

Today, we must overcome the obstacle of denial. To this day, the Turkish Government continues to deny that the Armenian genocide ever took place. It is the responsibility of the United States and the international community to overcome this denial and recognize the horror that took place between 1915 and 1923. In addition, it is the duty of all nations of the world to ensure that such atrocities are never repeated.

The Armenian people have spent the last 10 years courageously establishing an Independent Republic of Armenia. These efforts are a testament to the strength and character of the Armenian people. The United States will continue to work with Armenia to ensure the establishment of a safe and stable environment in the Caucasus region. Recently, President Robert Kocharian met with Azerbaijani President Heydar Aliyev and international mediators from France, Russia and the United States to discuss peace options on the Karabagh conflict. I am confident that Albania will work towards a positive outcome in the Nagorno Karabagh Peace Talks.

Today, I join my colleagues in recognizing the Armenian Genocide of 1915, and while this is indeed a day of mourning, we must also take this opportunity to celebrate Armenia's commitment towards democracy in the face of adversity.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

On this day I call on my colleagues and on the President to remember the words of author, Holocaust survivor, and Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel, ". . . to remain silent and indifferent is the greatest sin of all . . ."

While few would disagree with these words, we in the U.S. Government have failed to heed the warning contained within. It is time for the Government of the United States to do what it failed to do 86 years ago and to officially recognize the slaughter of more than 1.5 million Armenians by the Ottoman-Turkish Empire from 1915 to 1923 as a deliberate and systematic attempt to destroy the Armenian people, their culture and their heritage, as genocide.

It began with the killing of the community leaders and intellectuals 86 years ago today. That was followed by the disarming and murder of Armenians serving in the Ottoman-Turkish army. And this was followed by attacks on Armenian men, women and children, whom the Ottoman-Turks drove into the desert where they were left to either die of dehydration or starve.

This deliberate and systematic assault on the Armenian population would continue for 8 years. Then-U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman-Turkish Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., witnessed these events first hand and reported them back to Washington. Later he would write that "the great massacres and persecutions of the past are insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

Despite reports such as this, the United States failed to intervene. As horrible as not coming to the aid of the Armenian people in 1915 was, what strikes me today is that the United States, 86 years later, still fails to recognize these events for what they were, genocide.

Last year I joined with 143 of my colleagues in sponsoring H. Res. 398, which would have acknowledged the events in Turkey of 1915 to 1923 as genocide and called on the President to do the same. Yet this resolution was not allowed to come to a vote on the floor. Even today, when President Bush issued a statement to commemorate what he called "one of the great tragedies of history," he did not use the word genocide.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to acknowledge these events for what they truly were, we are, as Elie Wiesel has said, "committing the most dangerous sin of all." In Turkey, Germany, Yugoslavia and Rwanda, we have either acted too slowly or failed to act at all. How many more genocides are going to occur before we raise our own awareness of these events and condemn them for what they truly are.

Mr. Speaker, finally I would like to thank Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. PALLONE, the co-chairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, for organizing this special order tonight. Recognition and acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide is an important step toward defeating that indifferent spirit which has allowed events such as these to occur again and again. I am glad that I am joined by so many of my colleagues who share this view tonight.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues tonight in somber remembrance of

the Armenian Genocide. Early in the 20th century, during World War I and its aftermath, the Ottoman Empire attempted the complete liquidation of the Armenian population of Eastern Anatolia.

We must come down to the House floor tonight not only to remember this tragic event, but we must also proclaim that the Armenian Genocide is an historical fact. There are many who deny that this first genocide of the 20th century actually took place.

The American Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in 1919 was an eyewitness. In his memoirs, he said, "When the Turkish authorities gave the order for these deportations they were merely giving the death warrant to an entire race. They understood this well and in their conversations with me made no particular attempt to conceal this fact."

He went on to describe what he saw at the Euphrates River. He said, as our eyes and ears in the Ottoman Empire, "I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which they, the Armenian men and women, are victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, whatever refinements of persecution and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortune of the Armenian people."

We can never forget that 8 days before he invaded Poland, Adolf Hitler turned to his inner circle and said, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?" The impunity with which the Turkish Government acted in annihilating the Armenian people emboldened Adolf Hitler and his inner circle to carry out the Holocaust of the Jewish people.

It is time for Turkey to acknowledge this genocide, because only in that way can the Turkish Government and its people rise above it. The German Government has been quite forthcoming in acknowledging the Holocaust, and in doing so it has at least been respected by the peoples of the world for its honesty. Turkey should follow that example rather than trying to deny history.

It is also time—indeed it is far overdue—for our Congress to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I again call on my colleagues to recognize the Armenian Genocide and to urge my fellow Americans to remember this tragic event.

EARTH DAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to acknowledge Earth Day. We have made great strides in protecting our treasures, protecting our natural resources, and in protecting our environment. So, Mr. Speaker, since the first Earth Day in 1970, Americans have found many ways to promote the preservation of our environment and to focus a great deal of attention on the work that is left to be done.

Earth Day has always been a day to celebrate the environment and our natural heritage. It has also served to

mark the importance of environmental protection and responsible living. As the leaders of this great Nation, we must collaborate in a bipartisan fashion to promote environmental policies that make sense to this country. We do not want to continue to drink water that is contaminated and polluted. We do not want to breathe smoke-filled air. We do not want to develop life-threatening diseases from water, air, and other environmental hazards. Poor environmental management affects everyone, and environmental justice does, in fact, matter.

We ask, how many children must develop lead poisoning before we get serious about that issue. Do we want the Nation's most precious animals to perish from the Earth? Do we want to live in neighborhoods that are surrounded by nuclear power plants? Do we want to breathe a thick layer of smog from contaminated air before we feel that a clean air policy is important? Will there come a time when we must go to the local grocery store and purchase bottled air?

Many of our urban communities are currently in serious unrest due to many different environmental problems. Today we must make a new dedication toward bringing a more proper balance to the widening gap between community standards based upon their economic status. People in our poorest communities are struggling for environmental justice, from Louisiana's "Cancer Alley" to the Native American reservations' nuclear problems to the people along the border in the maquiladora region, and for the communities where I live on the south and west sides of Chicago.

Furthermore, millions of people live in housing surrounded by physical environments that are overburdened with environmental problems and hazards untold, waste, toxins, dioxins, incinerators, petrochemical plants, polluted air and unsafe drinking water. These factors all combine to pose a real and grave threat to the future of our Nation's public health.

So, as we mark the 31st anniversary of the first Earth Day, we glory in the progress that has been made, but must strive to continue to develop strong environmental policies that help protect our Earth.

COMMEMORATION OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor on this very special and important day to join my colleagues and individuals throughout the world in commemorating the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. We must never forget the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide, and this commemoration makes an important contribution to making sure that we never do.

When most people hear the word "genocide" they immediately think of Hitler and his persecution of the Jews during World War II. Many individuals are unaware that the first genocide of the 20th century occurred during World War I and was perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenian people.

Concerned that the Armenian people would move to establish their own government, the Ottoman Empire embarked on a reign of terror that resulted in the massacre of over 1.5 million Armenians, men, women and children. This atrocious crime began on April 15, 1915, when the Ottoman Empire arrested, exiled, and eventually killed hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders.

Once they had eliminated the Armenian people's leadership, they turned their attention to the Armenians that were serving in the Ottoman army. These soldiers were disarmed and placed in labor camps where they were either starved or executed. The Armenian people, lacking political leadership and deprived of young, able-bodied men who could fight against the Ottoman onslaught were then deported from every region of Turkish Armenia. The images of human suffering from the Armenian Genocide are graphic and as haunting as the pictures of the Holocaust.

Why, then, it must be asked, are so many people unaware of the Armenian Genocide? I believe the answer is found in the international community's response to this disturbing event or, I should say, lack of response. At the end of World War I, those responsible for ordering and implementing the Armenian Genocide were never brought to justice, and the world casually forgot about the suffering and pain of the Armenian people, and that proved to be a grave mistake. In a speech that is now recorded, a speech made by Adolf Hitler just prior to the invasion of Poland in 1939, he justified his brutal tactics with the infamous statement, "Who remembers the extermination of the Armenians?"

Tragically, 6 years later, the Nazis had exterminated 6 million Jews. Never has the phrase, "those who forget the past will be destined to repeat it" been more applicable. If the international community had spoken out against this merciless slaughtering of the Armenian people instead of ignoring it, the horrors of the Holocaust might never have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, I believe it is time to give this event its rightful place in history. This afternoon and this evening, let us pay homage to those who fell victim to the Ottoman oppressors and tell the story, the story of the forgotten genocide. This, for the sake of the Armenian heritage, is certainly a story that must be heard.

ARMENIAN ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA

Washington, DC.

The Armenian Assembly of America, Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide

On April 24, we remember and mourn the victims of the Armenian Genocide of 1915. Not a single family went untouched; none were spared the pain of that brutal slaughter. Because its victims and witnesses were ignored and its lessons unlearned, the Genocide set the stage for the Holocaust and the genocides that followed. The 20th century's first genocide continues to cast its dark shadow over the 21st century.

The Turkish people and the Republic of Turkey should recognize that it is in their own best interest to come to terms with the role their Ottoman predecessors played in the Armenian Genocide and reject denial. No other country in the world should support Turkey's indefensible position. There is a growing awareness and understanding of this fact, even within Turkey itself. We were encouraged this year by reports from Turkey that public discussion of the topic has increased significantly.

It is our hope that the Turkish people, confronted with international recognition and spurred by desire to finally join the European family of nations, will reconcile with their past. Such reconciliation will lay the groundwork to build a better future.

HIRAIR HOVNANIAN,
Chairman, Board of
Trustees.

VAN Z. KRİKORIAN,
Chairman, Board of
Directors.

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

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

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend those who join me tonight in educating the world about the Armenian Genocide. I think I bring some special province to this occasion in that I am the grandson of Oscar Chaderjain, a first-generation Armenian American, and the son of Mary Chaderjain. So therefore, this is an issue that is near and dear to my heart.

Mr. Speaker, for those who question whether the genocide ever occurred in the first instance, I must say that I have no doubt that it did. My grandfather was a first-hand witness to the bloodshed. He often told us of his experience of holding his uncle's arms, with his cousin, as Turkish soldiers executed that grammar school teacher. He also told us that the world first took notice of the genocide on April 24, 1915, when 254 Armenian intellectuals were arrested by Turkish authorities in Istanbul and taken to the distant provinces of Ayash and Chankiri, where many of them were later massacred.

Throughout the genocide, Turkish authorities ordered the evacuation of

Armenians out of villages in Turkish Armenia and Asia Minor. As they were evacuated, the men were often shot immediately. Prisoners were starved, beaten, and murdered by unmerciful guards.

This was not the case for everyone, though. Not everyone was sent to concentration camps. For example, in Trebizond, many innocent people were put on ships and then thrown overboard into the Black Sea.

The atrocities of the Armenian Genocide were still being carried out in 1921 when Kemalists were found abusing and starving prisoners to death. In total, as has been pointed out, over 1.5 million Armenians were killed. This does not include the half a million or more who were forced to flee their homes and flee to foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, together with Armenians all over the world and people of conscience, I would like to honor those who lost their homes, their freedom and their lives during this dark period. Many survivors of the genocide came to the United States seeking a new beginning, my grandfather among them. The experiences of his childhood so fueled his desire for freedom for his Armenian homeland that in the first world war he returned there where he was awarded two medals of honor for bravery in his fight against fascism.

It is important that we do not forget about these terrible atrocities because, as other speakers have said and as Winston Churchill said, "Those who do not learn from the past are destined to repeat it."

For those in America who think this is only a sad story, and it certainly is a sad story, they need to take note that Armenia has taken great strides in achieving its independence over the past 8 years.

□ 1915

Once it was a captive nation struggling to preserve its centuries-old customs. Today the Republic of Armenia is an independent, freedom-loving nation and a friend to the United States and to the democratic world.

Let us remember today, April 24, 2001, marks the 86th anniversary of one of the most gruesome human atrocities of the 20th century. Sadly, it was the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children.

Let us remember that prior to his invasion of Poland in 1939 and subsequent Nazi oppression, Adolph Hitler attempted to justify his own actions by simply stating, "After all, who remembers the Armenians?" As we do not ignore the occurrence of the Nazi Holocaust, we must not ignore the Armenian genocide.

I believe many people across the world will concede this is a very tender and difficult event to discuss. What we do tonight is not to condemn the Turkish people. Rather, it is to recognize the actions of the past and past wrongs in order to ensure that we do not repeat them.

However, as a strong, fervent supporter of the Republic of Armenia, I am alarmed that Turkish Government officials still refuse to acknowledge what happened, and instead are attempting to rewrite history.

It is vital that we do not let political agendas get in the way of doing what is right. I will continue to call upon the Turkish Government to accept complete accountability for the Armenian genocide. To heal the wounds of the past, the Turkish Government must first recognize its responsibility for actions of past leaders.

Nothing we can do or say, Mr. Speaker, will bring back those who perished; but we can honor those who lost their homes, their freedom, and their lives by teaching future generations the lessons of the atrocities.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THOSE LOST IN THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, as my colleagues and I do every year at this time, in a proud but solemn tradition to remember and pay tribute to the victims of one of history's worst crimes against humanity, the Armenian genocide of 1929 through 1933.

The genocide began 86 years ago today. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported legislation that would put the U.S. House of Representatives officially on the record in recognizing the Armenian genocide.

Last fall, the bipartisan Armenian genocide bill was approved by the Committee on International Relations by a vote of 24 to 11. On October 19 of last year, the legislation was finally scheduled for a vote on the House floor. I am confident that if the vote had ever occurred, the Armenian genocide legislation would have passed with overwhelming bipartisan support.

In a last-minute effort to ensure the legislation never came to the floor for a vote, the Turkish Government sent a threat to President Clinton that American soldiers stationed in the region would be in jeopardy if a vote ever took place. This threat was enough for President Clinton to send a letter to the Speaker of this House requesting that the legislation be pulled from the schedule.

Essentially, the Speaker and President Clinton, and therefore the government of the United States, both executive and legislative, succumbed to the threats of the Turkish Government. I believe this was shameful. Italy and France did not give in to the Turkish Government last year when both these nations approved an Armenian genocide resolution.

I am also proud that State and local governments here in the United States are stepping out in front of the Federal

Government on this issue. Earlier this month, Maryland approved an Armenian genocide resolution, becoming the 27th State to make such a recognition.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, should not be forced by a foreign government to deny or ignore the U.S. record and response to the events that took place in the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923. Those of us who have been fighting for this recognition will not give up. We are committed, and we will not quit fighting until this Nation finally recognizes the Armenian genocide as genocide.

President Bush had a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the genocide today in annual statements made by the President. From statements that candidate Bush made, one would have believed as President he would use the word "genocide" today. But sadly, today, the President chose not to use the word "genocide," thus minimizing the events from 1915 to 1923 that we commemorate this evening.

I know many Armenian-Americans will feel betrayed because of President Bush's inaction today. In public statements and letters to Armenian organizations and individuals during his Presidential campaign, Bush said, "The 20th century was marred by wars of unimaginable brutality, mass murders, and genocide. History records that the Armenians were the first people of the last century to have endured these cruelties."

Bush went on to say, "If elected President, I would ensure that our Nation properly recognizes the tragic suffering of the Armenian people." But it is unfortunate that the President did not stand by these words today.

I am trying not to be partisan here, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I am disappointed with President Bush, as I was disappointed with President Clinton before him.

For anyone who has any doubts about the truth of the Armenian genocide, they can just go down the street to the National Archives, where volumes of historical records prove what really happened. Five years from now, we will have the opportunity to visit a genocide museum here in Washington. The museum, which will be located at 14th and G streets in the Northwest area of our Nation's Capital, will be a permanent reminder of the atrocities of 1915 to 1923.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the remarks of my friend, Ross Vartian, the director of planning for this new museum, who discussed this issue.

The statement by Mr. Vartian is as follows:

STATEMENT BY ROSS VARTIAN, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, ARMENIAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE, KNIGHTS OF VARTAN TIMES SQUARE MARTYR'S DAY EVENT, APRIL 22, 2001

The Armenian National Institute, or ANI, extends its deep appreciation to the Knights of Vartan for once again organizing this year's Martyr's Day Commemoration. We recognize the leadership of Grand Commander Robert Barsam, this event's Chairman Sam Azadian, Martyr's Day Committee

members Hirant Gulian & Leon Nigogosian, and all the other dedicated volunteers who made it possible for us to be here today to remember our losses, celebrate our survivors and commit to a future without Genocide.

I am here today to talk about the future Armenian Genocide Museum and memorial. When complete, this complex in our nation's capital just two blocks from the White House will be the first ever Museum and Memorial about the Armenian Genocide anywhere in the Diaspora.

On behalf of the Armenian National Institute, I am pleased to outline our vision for what will be in the not too distant future a state of the art museum and memorial complex dedicated to Armenian Genocide remembrance, research and education, as well as serving as another powerful voice for Genocide prevention.

Washington is justifiably renown for the quality of its museums, and we have set as our standard to match the best that our nation's capital has to offer. Therefore, we warmly welcome the solidarity and support of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, whose superb exhibits and programs have inspired and empowered millions.

In all candor, we have just begun our work. The acquisition of this marquee property in the heart of Washington, DC has served as the catalyst to undertake a comprehensive, multi-year planning, design and development process. We are currently reviewing proposals from competitive teams or architects, museum designers and property developers to recommend the best space utilization option for the properties we have acquired. We are aware that only the best professional talent will suffice for our purposes.

The Armenian National Institute accepts the privilege and responsibility of creating a physical complex second to none and of creating exhibits and programs that will be as inspirational and empowering as those in the Holocaust Memorial Museum and other leading interactive museums around the world.

ANI is also aware of the special responsibility of completing the first ever Armenian Genocide Museum and Memorial outside Armenia. Fully recognizing that the entire community will wish to engage, ANI will seek the active participation of our incredibly diverse Armenian Diaspora and ancestral homeland. This is, after all, a presentation about all Armenians for humankind. No organization would have the right to present the modern Armenian saga without first seeking out the resources and perspectives of the entire community.

The museum and memorial complex will be a permanent place for generations of visitors that will be made possible by all Armenians, joined by others of good will who appreciate its universal moral implications.

Our project is timely. Those who would deny the Armenian Genocide are now limited to Turkish officials and those beyond Turkey who invoke political and economic rationales for their support.

In the academic arena, the uncontested fact of the Armenian Genocide has been overwhelmingly affirmed. Similarly, in secondary schools and universities throughout the western world, students of Holocaust and Genocide studies routinely examine the case of the Armenian Genocide to learn its specific and universal lessons.

Nevertheless, the struggle continues between remembrance and denial—and remembrance and indifference.

It is our hope that this center will serve as the nexus to broaden awareness of the Armenian Genocide throughout the academic and educational communities whose focus is human rights, the responsibility of majorities towards minorities, and the horrific consequences for peoples and groups at risk in the absence of safeguards.

But it is also our hope that this place will provide public officials with a greater degree of moral conviction, courage and vision so that they summarily reject the incessant threats that emanate from Turkish officials to sever diplomatic and economic relations when any government dares to affirm the Armenian Genocide. The public officials with you today have demonstrated by their presence and other official actions that they reject Turkey's denials and threats.

Ladies and gentlemen . . .
Through this facility, we will remind the world of Hitler's chilling cynicism on humankind's predilection to forget.

Through this facility, we will enthusiastically support collaborative work between turks and Armenians. We have seen in this great country the redemptive value of facing history squarely, and we will promote a dialogue to secure the same benefits for our two peoples.

Through this facility we will promote international condemnation of and action against any government of people that attempts to do what was done to our people at the beginning of the last century.

We must succeed in this unprecedented effort in the name of our martyred millions, in tribute to those who survived and established new Armenian communities throughout the world, and in honor of countless non-Armenians who protested this crime against humanity and who saved tens of thousands from oblivion.

Finally ladies and gentlemen, we will succeed not only to remember the past but also to enhance the security of the people of Armenian and Karabagh—and to help insure that the world never forgets the cataclysmic price of indifference and inaction.

We look forward to this historic challenge and we welcome all who wish to join us. Thank you in advance for your generous support.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide is a painful subject to discuss for me and others. We must never forget, though, what happened, and never cease speaking out. We must overcome the denials and the indifference, and keep alive the memory and truth of what happened to the Armenian people in the past, as we work to see in this tragic history that it never be repeated.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also rise here this evening to speak of one of the great horrors of our century, and that is the Armenian genocide. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I once again join a large number of colleagues in recognizing the great tragedy of the Armenian people.

As we all know and has been stated here several times tonight, this geno-

cide occurred in 1915 when the Ottoman Empire began to force Armenians from their homeland, and it lasted until 1923. These 8 years saw the deaths of 1.5 million innocent victims and 500,000 exiled survivors.

Despite the tremendous magnitude of the genocide, the world stood by as families were torn asunder and millions of lives were taken. Therefore, today, as we stand in recognition of the victims of this Armenian genocide, we also stand in recognition of the guilt of complicity of all nations that turned away when faced with this great tragedy.

There is no doubt that calling events by their rightful name, genocide, is an important element of this recognition of responsibility.

Had we heeded the lessons that emerged from the massacre, perhaps we could have avoided other great tragedies in this century. In quietly letting the sorrow of the Armenian people go unresolved, however, we allow their tragedy to repeat itself over and over again in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, in Rwanda in the 1990s, and elsewhere throughout the world.

Today, as we once again honor the victims of the Armenian genocide, on behalf of the Sixth District of Massachusetts, I also honor the commitment and perseverance of Armenian-Americans who have tirelessly struggled to ensure that the great sorrow of their people becomes known to all people.

As we in Congress continue to confront issues of international peace and security, we would do well to remember this message: never forget.

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

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

HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the Armenia caucus for bringing us together to honor the memory of the greatest tragedy of Armenian history. This tragedy holds a valuable historical lesson for all of us.

I myself in California growing up got to know several Armenian families. One man, one elderly man in one of the families that I knew, he was the sole survivor of the Armenian genocide. So the lessons are not just for those that were directly involved; it is for all of

us. It is for all of us to know it is important that we as Americans acknowledge this genocide. That is what we are talking about today.

Some 56 years ago, my father entered Dachau concentration camp in Germany with the Seventh Army. He took photographs there that day of those surviving that genocide, those starving people that the American troops fed and liberated.

He remembers the quote from Adolph Hitler when Hitler was cautioned by the German chiefs of staff about his genocidal plans. Of course, as we have heard tonight, Hitler's retort was, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Well, 86 years ago today, the Ottoman Empire set out on a well-orchestrated campaign to exterminate a race of people. On that day, they began the campaign by focusing on the Armenian religious and political and intellectual leaders that they arrested in Constantinople, and they murdered them.

In the years that followed, Armenians living under Ottoman rule were systematically deprived of their property, their individual rights, and ultimately, of their lives. As we have heard, between 1915 and 1923, the number of deaths was horrific. Some 1.5 million Armenians were murdered and 500,000 were deported from their homeland; and at the end of these 8 years, the Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia was virtually eliminated.

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time, characterized this as a death warrant to a whole race. Morgenthau recognized that this campaign was ethnic cleansing. It is unfortunate that the Turkish Government to this day does not recognize this. Willful ignorance of the lessons of history all but ensures that those mistakes can be made again.

In the last Congress, I joined 143 of my colleagues to cosponsor a congressional resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide. The resolution expressly differentiated between the Ottoman Empire and the modern day Republic of Turkey. We understand these are not the same governments.

Unfortunately, despite hard-fought efforts, the resolution was never able to come to the House floor last Congress because of concerns, in my mind concerns without merit, with Turkey's reaction. I believed then, as I do now, that it remains important for the Congress to go on the record.

Beyond affirming the U.S. record on the Armenian genocide, the resolution encouraged awareness and understanding of what genocide is, and this crime against humanity has been compounded to this day by those who refuse to recognize it. The victims and their families, many of whom live in the United States, are owed this recognition. That is why we must have this resolution pass this floor.

In my home State of California, the State Board of Education has incor-

porated the story of Armenian genocide in the social studies curriculum. California is doing the right thing.

As of last September, California law now permits victims of the Armenian genocide and their heirs to use California courts to pursue unpaid insurance claims. The tentative settlement reached between heirs of Armenian genocide victims and New York Life Insurance over claims that New York Life failed to honor are an estimated 2,500 valid insurance claims. That is a good start.

The Armenian genocide is not simply a problem of the past; it has implications for the future. Our actions now will lay the groundwork for addressing genocide whenever it threatens to erupt again.

Many of the survivors of the genocide and their descendants now live, as I say, in the United States, many in California. This 85-year-old tragedy is more than an event in history. By recognizing and learning about the crime against humanity, we can begin to honor the courage of its victims and commemorate the strides made by its survivors.

□ 1930

HIV AND AIDS PANDEMIC HAS DEVASTATED MANY COUNTRIES IN AFRICA

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues to talk about the HIV and AIDS pandemic. The AIDS pandemic has devastated many countries in Africa, leaving few men and women and children untouched. Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely infected by AIDS than any other part of the world. In 16 countries, all in sub-Saharan Africa, more than 1 in 10 adults is affected by the HIV virus.

According to a joint report issued by the United Nations Program on HIV and AIDS, one-half or more of all 15 year-olds will eventually die of AIDS in some of the worst areas affected such as Zambia, South Africa, and Botswana. Over 34 million HIV/AIDS cases are in the world, and 24 million or 70 percent are in Africa.

I recently visited Botswana to see up close the destruction this disease has caused. Approximately 35 percent of Botswana's adult population is affected by HIV. AIDS has cut the life expectancy in Botswana from 71 years to 39, according to Karen Stannecki of the United States Census Bureau during an appearance at an international AIDS conference held in South Africa in July of 2000.

The visit that I made strengthened my conviction to do my part in bringing the awareness to this issue and to work with my colleagues in Congress, national governments, State and local

governments, and activists around the world to do more for the people who have the virus and to do more to stop the spread of the disease.

Soon after I returned from Botswana, I sponsored an HIV/AIDS roundtable discussion in my district that consists of public health officials, community activists, HIV/AIDS case managers, community health providers, doctors, individuals suffering from HIV/AIDS. I sponsored this roundtable because my district in eastern North Carolina has a high incidence of HIV/AIDS.

Eastern North Carolina, which includes more than my district, all on the south side of 95 North, the Interstate, about 25 counties indeed have 30 percent of the State's HIV disease. That only represents, by the way, only 20 percent of our population. Clearly this is an issue that is affecting us both domestically as well as internationally.

Given the loss of lives AIDS has caused, the destruction of entire communities, the long-term impact of economic growth, we must step up our effort to fight the devastating disease. With children dying at the age of 15 and the life expectancy in most of Africa of 45 years for children born in some countries, something must be done. Indeed, children being born in these countries cannot expect to live long. There is very little future.

To ignore the problem is to our own peril, but to know the impact of AIDS and then to ignore it is to our own shame.

I applaud the pharmaceutical companies for dropping the lawsuit to prevent South Africa from importing cheaper anti-AIDS drugs and medicines. Now we must increase efforts to provide affordable anti-AIDS drugs to all who need them. I challenge the pharmaceutical industry, countries worldwide, and the United States government to engage in a collected effort to get the necessary drugs to people infected with HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD two publications on this issue, one from The New York Times and the other from The Washington Post, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 2001]
DESPITE LEGAL VICTORY, SOUTH AFRICA
HESITATES ON AIDS DRUGS
(By Rachel L. Swarns)

JOHANNESBURG, April 20.—With the Champagne consumed and the celebration over, advocates for AIDS patients today turned their attention from the South African government's legal victory over the drug industry and looked to the future.

With sinking hearts, many concluded that the next big barrier to expanding access to AIDS drugs might well be the government itself.

The drug industry conceded South Africa's right to import cheaper brand-name medicines, but the governing African National Congress was not aggressively charting the way forward.

Instead, in its online newspaper, the party was ticking off countless reasons why the country should think twice about providing lifesaving AIDS cocktails.

In this, the ruling party was echoing the health minister, Dr. Manto Tshabalala-Msimang, who dashed the hopes of her allies on Thursday when she made it clear that providing AIDS drugs was not a government priority, even though the drug industry had just dropped its objections to a law that allows South Africa to import brand-name drugs at the lowest prices available.

When pressed about her plans for treating the nation's 4.7 million people infected with H.I.V., Dr. Tshabalala-Msimang insisted that the government was already offering adequate care without costly AIDS drugs.

Mark Heywood, a lawyer who helped organize the street protests that applied pressure on the drug industry to drop its lawsuit against South Africa, said today that the minister's remarks felt "like a stab in the back." And her comments and those from the A.N.C. have revived concerns about the government's commitment to providing the medicines in a country with more people infected with H.I.V. than any other.

This morning, Mr. Heywood and other advocates for AIDS patients gathered to consider a new campaign to pressure drug companies to lower prices of AIDS drugs in the private sector. But they also decided to focus on the government, and to turn up the heat if necessary, to persuade health officials to work harder to bring the AIDS drugs readily available in the West to the poor in South Africa.

"Our work on the court case shows our willingness to enter into partnership, but we will not shirk from very difficult engagements with the government," Mr. Heywood said. "Yesterday was an important and empowering victory. But we're measuring success by bringing real medicines to real people."

On Thursday, 39 drug companies agreed to drop a lawsuit intended to block a law that would expand access to cheaper medicines. Among other things, it would allow the government to buy brand-name drugs that advocates say are sold more cheaply in India and Brazil than in South Africa.

But the law, which will take effect in several months, is unlikely to expand access significantly. The drugs are still expensive for South Africa, and the health care system here, particularly in rural areas, is still largely unprepared to administer such complicated medicines and to monitor patients.

Advocates for AIDS patients acknowledge those obstacles. Still, many had hoped to hear a sense of urgency from the government about addressing them.

Other African countries that are poorer than South Africa and that have even weaker health systems have already moved ahead with pilot programs that provide anti-retrovirals at a low cost. The countries include Ivory Coast, Uganda and Senegal.

Botswana, a relatively wealthy African country, hopes to provide the medicines to all of its citizens who need them by the end of the year.

Many people here hoped South Africa would be next. AIDS activists want the government to consider financing plans, to start training nurses and doctors and upgrading local hospitals and to put together a national treatment plan.

Other activists are pressuring the government to apply for special permission to import cheap generic versions of the patented AIDS drugs, which would finally bring the "cocktails" within reach.

But the government is clearly reluctant to take the preliminary steps to get those drugs to the dying.

Some suspect this reluctance may come from President Thabo Mbeki, who has publicly questioned the safety of the drugs and whether H.I.V. causes the disease. After

being assailed here and abroad for his stance, Mr. Mbeki withdrew from the AIDS debate last year.

And in recent months, the government has taken positive steps, announcing a pilot program to distribute anti-retrovirals to pregnant women to prevent transmission to newborn; accepting a drug company donation to treat opportunistic infections; and developing guidelines for the proper use of anti-retrovirals in the private sector.

But Dr. Thabalala-Msimang emphasized that programs to provide anti-retrovirals for adults were not coming anytime soon.

"For the moment, the best advice is to treat opportunistic infections," she said on Thursday. She added that such treatment, along with improved diet and counseling, would "allow people with H.I.V. to manage their lives and participate adequately."

"We are indeed treating people who are H.I.V. positive," Dr. Thabalala-Msimang continued, in response to repeated questions about when anti-retroviral programs might be available. "It is not correct to say that just because we do not provide anti-retrovirals that we are not treating people."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 2001]

GLOBAL AIDS STRATEGY MAY PROVE ELUSIVE; MORE FUNDS AVAILABLE, BUT CONSENSUS LACKING

(By Karen DeYoung)

After a string of victories in the long battle for lower-priced AIDS drugs in poor countries, health care experts, AIDS activists and major donors are facing what might be an even tougher challenge—agreeing on a unified strategy to fight the pandemic.

"Now is when the hard part starts," said Johnathan Quick, head of the essential medicines division of the Geneva-based World Health Organization.

One debate among health experts and activists concerns whether to concentrate new resources on sophisticated treatment—even at newly reduced prices—to improve and prolong the lives of those in advanced stages of the disease, or on AIDS prevention, less expensive treatment of AIDS-related diseases and basic health programs aimed at stopping the disease's spread. More than 36 million people worldwide, the vast majority of them in sub-Saharan Africa, are infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which causes AIDS.

Resolving this and other differences has taken on new urgency as donors have indicated willingness to provide substantial new funds for a global AIDS campaign. Uneasy about a lack of coordination, some donors, led by Britain's Department for International Development, this month issued what some described as an ultimatum to UNAIDS—the consortium of U.N. agencies and the World Bank that oversees international AIDS efforts.

"They told us they want something put on the table," said a senior representative of a UNAIDS member. "They challenged us to have a common view."

At a meeting in London today, members of UNAIDS are scheduled to present a broad proposal for an international AIDS trust fund administered by both contributing and recipient countries. Participating in the meeting will be delegates from the United States, Britain and other members of the Group of 8; the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands; and major private donors, including the Gates Foundation. Questions about how to spend the money would be decided by a joint governing committee formed of donors and aid recipients.

Getting various organizations and countries in line for a common approach has not been easy. The United Nations was thrown

into an uproar late last month when Carol Bellamy, executive director of the U.N. Children's Fund, declared in a New York Times op-ed article that "UNICEF is prepared to step forward as the lead United Nations agency in the procurement of anti-retroviral drugs on behalf of individual countries."

That offer, reportedly not cleared with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, upset WHO Director General Gro Harlem Brundtland, who saw it as a premature policy proposal, as well as a public challenge to WHO's primacy on AIDS. U.N. agencies in charge of development and population, among others, voiced disapproval, even as they, too, clamored to claim a share of money that is not yet available.

"They are sort of like sharks when there's blood in the water," said one close observer of the U.N. process. "There is money in the air."

Apart from the United Nations, others have proposed uses for new funding. Early this month, Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs proposed establishment of a massive global AIDS fund to purchase anti-retroviral drugs for Africa. AIDS activists criticized the proposal, which would involve patent-holding pharmaceutical companies, for not favoring generic producers who have offered even cheaper prices.

Two days later, Microsoft founder Bill Gates called a news conference to warn that the treatment emphasis risked undermining prevention efforts. Gates's family foundation has given hundreds of millions of dollars to the international fight against AIDS—the most of any single donor.

After years of being shamed by international pressure, the major pharmaceutical companies are now offering the three-drug anti-retroviral AIDS "cocktail" to some poor countries for less than a tenth of the developed world's \$10,000 per patient per year starting price. Patent-busting generic producers have offered even lower prices.

Nongovernmental activists riding high after humbling the pharmaceutical industry on the price issue are calling on African governments to immediately start positioning themselves to provide the drugs. They point to Brazil, whose government produces its own anti-retrovirals and distributes them for free.

"I think the big decisions are not with the co-opted northern bureaucrats," said James Love of the Washington-based Consumer Project on Technology, a Ralph Nader-affiliated group that analyzes drug pricing. Love, who along with other activists advocates bypassing the big companies and going straight into import and production of generic drugs, called on African governments to "have the guts" to move forward with new authorizing laws.

But some have warned that such a strategy is ultimately counterproductive. They point out that Africa has neither the health infrastructure nor the personnel to support widespread use of the complicated treatment regime. There are currently 14 anti-retroviral drugs, patented by a handful of major companies, used in various combinations to compose the three-drug cocktail. New drugs will be needed as existing compounds become less effective, and many companies are involved in the search for a vaccine.

The companies have argued that generic producers do not pay for research and development, and unless the world trade system can guarantee that future patents will be protected, research funds will be diminished.

Many Africans say they don't want to be pushed. "We wouldn't like any further delay" in caring for South Africa's more than 4 million HIV-infected people, Foreign Minister Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma said last week as the major pharmaceutical companies withdrew from a three-year lawsuit to

prevent her government from authorizing import and production of generic drugs. "But regulations have to be done before any laws can be implemented. We'll do what we can, not because of pressure, but because we think it's right."

Other African seemed caught between their desire to get to the front of the line for new funding and early resentment of the expected new onslaught of advice and dictates from developed countries. "A Ugandan colleague told me that the biggest epidemic lately is the epidemic of initiatives," one European aid official said.

The proposal that was to be outlined today in London leaves open the question of how much should be spent on drugs. UNAIDS has estimated that a minimum of \$3 billion a year is needed to establish basic HIV prevention and non-anti-retroviral treatment in sub-Saharan Africa alone. Adding the anti-retroviral drugs, even at bargain-basement prices, would bring that total to about \$10 billion.

International contributions currently total less than \$1 billion a year. According to a General Accounting Office report released last month, Africa expenditures in the fight against HIV/AIDS in fiscal 2000 by the U.S. Agency for International Development—the largest national donor—totaled \$114 million. The GAO report noted that amount "translated into per capita expenditures for 23 sub-Saharan African countries" ranging from \$0.78 in Zambia to \$0.03 in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

In its budget resolution passed this month, the Senate voted to increase total international AIDS spending to \$1 billion over the next two years, although President Bush's budget proposes only a small fraction of that amount.

The European Union, as well as its individual members, and Japan have said they are prepared to provide major new funds.

But nobody believes that \$10 billion is a realistic expectation for the near or middle term, and choices will have to be made.

"The exclusive focus on the issue of patent rights and prices of drugs really has overridden the much more fundamental question of how you actually get these services out and how you blunt the epidemic itself," said one international health official who asked not to be identified. "If all of these resources go to treating the terminally ill, then we can in fact see this process turn into one that's really negative for the development of effective prevention programs.

"It's so politically incorrect to say, but we may have to sit by and just see these millions of [already infected] people die," he said, acknowledging that this was an option that would be considered unacceptable in the developed world. "Very few public health professionals are willing to take on the wrath of AIDS activists by saying that. But a whole lot of them talk about this in private."

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the life expectancy of some in Africa of 45. To continue to watch this disease shorten the lives of most people, again, is a challenge to us morally; and it is to our peril if we do not understand the implication it has, not only on global trade, but also in national security.

South African government also now has an opportunity and also a challenge. They must respond to the victory of the pharmaceutical companies withdrawing their lawsuit by seeking medications for the 4.3 million people. They cannot stand by and do nothing.

In the United States, people have been living longer with HIV virus and

with AIDS. While not a cure for AIDS, certainly the drugs have allowed many American citizens and citizens living in developing countries to live longer. These drugs are out of reach to most in Africa. Until we find a cure for AIDS, treatment must be affordable and accessible. Treatment can prolong life, indeed give substantially more quality of life. In the United States, we now have AIDS-related treatments and that has added to the mortality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to act on this.

TRIBUTE TO WEST POINT CADET JOHN HEINMILLER

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Eden Prairie, Minnesota are in mourning today as they grieve the loss of a favorite son, West Point Cadet John Heinmiller.

There are no words to adequately convey our sympathy to Cadet Heinmiller's family. Our hearts and prayers go out to John's father John, his mother Julie, and younger brothers and sister Joe, Jimmy and Sue, on Cadet Heinmiller's tragic death early Sunday in Garrison, New York.

John's loving family and countless friends are in shock over the passing of this remarkable young man who "left an indelible mark on friends, coaches and teachers," to quote from today's front page article in the Star Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, John's death is not only a great tragedy for his wonderful family, but also a great tragedy for Eden Prairie High School and the United States Military Academy. John was loved and respected by everyone who knew him. Of the several hundred service academy nominations that I have made over the past decade, John truly stands out for his remarkable personal qualities.

John was not only a star in hockey, football and the classroom, John was a star in the way he conducted his life. As I said, when I nominated John to West Point: "John Heinmiller is destined for success at the Military Academy and beyond because he has it all: highly intelligent, a great student athlete, personally charming, a quick wit and, most importantly, integrity and character that we need in our future leaders."

It is not easy to stand out, Mr. Speaker, the way John Heinmiller did at a high school renowned for its athletics with more than 3,000 students. An honors student, John was so highly respected for his leadership qualities that his teammates at Eden Prairie High School voted him senior captain of both his football and hockey teams. He also earned his school's highest athletic honor the Scott Ryski Award.

As his Eden Prairie High School football coach Mike Grant put it best, "John was a good football player, but

above that, he was an outstanding person. This is a devastating loss to our school, our community and our city. This is a kid who would have been leading our country someday."

Eden Prairie's boys' hockey coach, Lee Smith, also coached John and said, "He was also the kind of person that if you spent 2 minutes around, you would see dedication, love, charisma and energy. John was one of the greatest role models who has ever gone through our high school."

At West Point, John was a freshman hockey player and was called up to play with the varsity this past season. From all reports by West Point officials and coaches, John had already distinguished himself and was headed for great success.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, John Heinmiller loved his family very dearly. His younger brothers and sister were his best friends. As John's dad told me yesterday, "His mother and I could not have asked for a better son in every way."

Mr. Speaker, my prayer today is that Cadet John Heinmiller's legacy will inspire all of us to greater heights. We thank God for the way John lived his life and the wonderful role model he was. We are also grateful to John for his service to country at West Point.

May John Heinmiller's spirit continue to live in each of us and may God bless his family and friends.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to once again reflect on the atrocities suffered by the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Turks 86 years ago.

Little did anyone know that, on this very day, April 24, 1915, that day would forever signify the beginning of a Turkish campaign to eliminate the Armenian people from the face of this Earth.

Over the following 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians perished. Hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were massacred. More than 500,000 were exiled from their homes. Armenian civilization, one of the oldest civilizations, virtually ceased to exist.

Sadly, little attention is paid to this tragic episode of 20th century history. But that is why I join my colleagues, as I have each year since I was elected to Congress, to remember one of the most tragic events that humankind has ever witnessed.

But, unfortunately, as time wears on, so much of it has faded into memory, and people begin to forget what occurred during that horrific time. Even worse, as time passes, and people are distracted from the atrocities, naysayers and revisionists have the opportunity to change this generation's understanding of the Armenian genocide.

Just as outrageous is that this genocide has gone unpunished, and an international court has yet to condemn the massacre of an entire nation. In part, this is because the current leaders in Istanbul will not acknowledge the crime committed.

That is why it is imperative that the United States House of Representatives becomes a voice in the campaign to recognize and acknowledge the Armenian genocide. That is why we must support the Bonior-Radanovich resolution.

Mr. Speaker, despite the unspeakable tragedy, Armenians remain a compassionate, proud, and dignified people. An Armenian civilization lives on and thrives. In fact, every proud Armenian that walks the Earth worldwide is the product of generations of perseverance, courage and hope. Thankfully, this Armenian spirit lives on within our own borders, especially in my home State of California.

On behalf of Armenia and on behalf of all of our Armenian friends, neighbors, and colleagues, I urge the House of Representatives to recognize our responsibility to learn from the past and to speak out in order to prevent similar atrocities in the future.

This could well be the most important lesson each of us takes away from such an atrocious global experience.

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

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

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Armenian Congressional Caucus here in Washington, and we have over 90 members, and as a representative of a very large and vibrant community of Armenian Americans, I rise today to join many of my colleagues in the sad commemoration of the Armenian genocide.

Today we remember the tragedy where more than 1.5 million Armenians were murdered at the hands of the Turks and more than 500,000 others were deported.

□ 1945

Unfortunately, there were others included in this massacre, including Assyrians and Pontic Greeks, bringing the number to well over 3.5 million lost lives.

Today, April 24, marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of the genocide. It was on this day in 1915 that more than 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were gathered together and murdered in

Constantinople. This was the beginning of an organized, brutal campaign to eliminate the Armenian presence from the Ottoman Empire. This campaign lasted for over 8 years. During this time, Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of over 3,000 years and eliminated through massacres or deportation. But Armenians are strong people, and their dream of freedom did not die. More than 70 years after the genocide, the new Republic of Armenia was born as the Soviet Union crumbled.

Today, we pay tribute to the courage and strength of people who would not know defeat. I was privileged to meet with many of these people this past weekend on Sunday in my district where Sam Azadian along with Archbishop Barsamian and many others held a meeting where we remembered the massacres. One of the survivors, Sano Halo, was there. Her daughter has written a book about her life entitled "Not Even My Name." It tells the story of Ms. Halo who, at the age of 10, was uprooted with her family with thousands of Pontic Greeks and forced by the Turks on a brutal death march. Ms. Halo saw her entire family die of starvation and disease in front of her eyes, or assault and murder by the Turks. Through circumstances, she was able to survive and has come to the United States and now lives in my district.

Unfortunately, even with the truthful, thoughtful accounts from people who experienced the genocide such as Ms. Halo, there are those who question the reality of the Armenian slaughter. That is why it is so important that in this Congress we must finally pass the resolution documenting the Armenian genocide. We must follow the moral leadership of France and Italy whose national assemblies unanimously passed a bill that officially recognizes the genocide of 1.5 million Armenians in Turkey during and after World War II. And we must follow the leadership of many of our State legislatures. Over 27 legislatures have passed proclamations, resolutions, bills recognizing the genocide.

For the people of Armenia, the fight still continues today, particularly for the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh, who are impacted by modern day Turkey and Azerbaijan's aggression toward Armenia in the continued blockade. I am hopeful that the recent talks in Key West between the Armenian and Azerbaijan presidents will move them one step closer toward peace. A peaceful solution is important to United States interests.

We have supported Armenia with direct assistance and with confidence-building allocations. I strongly support the efforts of the Armenian community to dedicate a museum and memorial commemorating the victims of the Armenian genocide. This year, their dream became a reality with the purchase of a building near the White House. Nothing we can say will bring

back those who perished, but we can honor their memories with everlasting meaning by teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to the next generation.

As the great philosopher George Santayana once said, "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Let us learn our lesson and never forget the Armenians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

There was no objection.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to add my voice and join my colleagues in remembering and paying tribute to those Armenians who lost their lives and national identity during one of the 20th century's tragic examples of persecution and intolerance, the Armenian genocide of 1915-1923.

Many Armenians in America, particularly Indiana, are the children and grandchildren of survivors. In fact, tonight I may represent the fewest number here. I think I have either two or six Armenians in my district. But some 20 years ago my friend, Zohrab Tazian, did a presentation to a Rotary Club as I watched the historical film in the background of how the Armenians were destroyed and chased, and listened to his personal story of how his family fled down to Lebanon; and eventually he made his way to the United States. It touched me, as do other human rights tragedies such as this.

We commemorate this tragedy because it marks the beginning of the persecution, ethnic cleansing of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Turks on April 24, 1915. Armenian political, intellectual and religious leaders were arrested, forcibly moved from their homeland and killed. The brutality continued against the Armenian people as families were uprooted from their homes and marched to concentration camps in the desert where many would eventually starve to death.

In 1919 when recalling the event, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr. said, "I

am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915." As we heard Hitler say when he moved into the Holocaust period, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

By 1923, the religious and ideological persecution by the Ottoman Turks resulted in the murder of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children and the displacement of an additional 500,000 Armenians.

The 20th century has borne witness to many acts of brutality and savagery by despotic regimes who sought to deny people human rights and religious freedoms. Examples abound, such as Stalin against the Russians, Hitler against the Jews, Mao Tse-tung against the Chinese, Pol Pot against the Cambodians, and currently Bashir against the Sudanese.

Genocide has devastating consequences for society as a whole because of the problems created by uprooting entire populations. It is bad enough to see the persecutions that we see in Tiananmen Square, where governments do not acknowledge the shooting of civilians; but when you uproot entire subgroups based on their background, as has happened in Bosnia, as Serbia was trying to do, and clearly on a massive scale in Turkey vis-a-vis the Armenians, it is tragic. The survivors become the ones who carry the memory of the suffering and the realization that their loved ones are gone. They are the ones who no longer have a home and may feel ideological and spiritual abandonment.

Part of the healing process for any victims of genocide, including Armenian survivors and families of survivors, involves acknowledgment of the atrocity and the admission of wrongdoing by those who perpetrated the persecution. It is only through acknowledgment and forgiveness that it is possible to move beyond the past.

Unfortunately, those responsible for ordering the systematic removal of the Armenians were never brought to justice, and the Armenian Genocide has become a dark moment in history, even an unacknowledged moment.

It is important that we remember this tragic event and show strong leadership by denouncing the persecution of people due to their differences in political and religious ideology. Who can visit the Holocaust Museum and not be personally touched? By establishing and continuing a discourse, we are acknowledging the tragedies of the past and remembering those awful moments in history so they will not be repeated.

As my friend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) says, history may not repeat itself but often it rhymes. Acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey will help to remove this decades-old barrier and allow greater cooperation and understanding between these two people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all those Members who have come down here tonight to recognize and make sure that regardless of what Turkey does and regardless of what this Congress does, that the American people still hear a voice on behalf of the Armenians in this country and remember the Armenian Genocide of 1915 to 1923, as well as our thanking all the Armenian organizations who have worked so hard to keep this issue at the forefront of our minds to serve as an example of the brutality of man against man.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

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

There was no objection.

REMEMBER THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, each year I am deeply humbled when we gather in the United States House of Representatives to honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished and the 500,000 survivors who were forcibly exiled from their ancestral homes in Ottoman Turkey during the years 1915 to 1923. Some of those survivors, Mr. Speaker, are part of my own community in Worcester, Massachusetts. I had the opportunity to meet with several of them on Sunday during a special program in the historic Armenian Church of Our Savior.

It is difficult to fathom a greater evil than the massacre and willful destruction of a people. Those who deny that a holocaust took place when there are recorded accounts of the barbarity are complicit and often perpetuate a cycle of violence. This is the injustice much of the world has committed against the Armenian people.

Elie Wiesel, Nobel laureate and Holocaust survivor, has called denial of genocide a double killing: The denial of genocide seeks to reshape history in order to demonize the victims and rehabilitate the perpetrators and is, in effect, the final stage of genocide. Nobel laureate and South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu in the Preface to the Encyclopedia of Genocide, which was published in 1999 by the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem, writes, "It is possible that if the world had been conscious of the genocide that was committed by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenians, the first genocide of the 20th century, then perhaps humanity might have been more alert to the warning signs that were being given before Hit-

ler's madness was unleashed on an unbelieving world."

And last year, Mr. Speaker, Israeli Minister of Education Yossi Sarid said publicly, "I will do everything in order that Israeli children learn and know more about the Armenian Genocide. Something happened that cannot be defined except as genocide; 1.5 million people disappeared. It was not negligence. It was deliberate."

And so scholars and eyewitnesses, Nobel laureates and Armenian survivors have spoken for 86 long years. And now we have entered the 21st century. After a long silence, governments are beginning to respond. They are beginning to acknowledge formally the Armenian Genocide. The European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the United Nations now recognize and reaffirm the Armenian Genocide as historical fact. In the last 5 years alone the parliaments of Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Lebanon, Russia and Sweden have passed resolutions officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide.

Last November, Pope John Paul II issued a communique condemning the Armenian Genocide as a "prologue to horrors" that would follow in the 20th century. Earlier this year, French President Jacques Chirac signed into law a bill stating that France publicly recognizes the Armenian Genocide of 1915. And authorities in Paris have voted to erect a memorial to the genocide of the Armenian people.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, France has achieved the moral leadership that the United States Congress and the White House have failed to fulfill. Last year, for the first time, the Congress moved forward on a resolution officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide, a resolution I proudly cosponsored. Unfortunately, the politics of denial and political expediency combined to thwart that effort. Bowing to pressure from the current Turkish Government, the measure was kept from coming to the House floor.

So, we begin again this year. In the House, I am an original cosponsor of a new resolution to have the United States officially recognize the Armenian Genocide. Thirty of our States, including Massachusetts, have passed resolutions officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide. We have a new President, who pledged during his campaign that he would officially recognize the Armenian Genocide. I have joined with over 100 of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, in sending a letter to President Bush asking that he honor his pledge. I believe in my heart that we can build on the progress made last year and perhaps this year, 2001, will be seen as the year when Congress finally debated and approved this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed to represent a district that includes a vibrant Armenian American community. They have educated the broader

Worcester community and indeed all of Massachusetts about the history and heritage of Armenian Americans, for out of one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century came this community, made up of survivors of the genocide and the families and children of survivors. They have created houses of worship, community centers, neighborhood activists and dedicated workers in every profession. They are the living legacy. The Armenian nation survives in Europe, and the heritage of Armenia thrives in America.

I will work with my colleagues to make sure that the United States will officially recognize the Armenian Genocide and that all of our children will learn this history and understand why it is part of America's history and culture.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, as have many of my colleagues, to commemorate and affirm the Armenian Genocide, one of the darkest chapters of the 20th century.

□ 2000

We have heard this repeated, and I think it is worth repeating because it is important that it is indelibly implanted in our minds. April 24, 1915, is remembered and solemnly commemorated each year by the Armenian community and people of conscience throughout the world. On that day, a group of Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, taken to the interior of Turkey and murdered. In the 8 years that followed, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered and 500,000 were deported because of the Ottoman Empire's decision to attempt to eliminate the Armenian people living under their rule.

Through our bipartisan congressional efforts, we have and we must continue to acknowledge and to remember the killing and the suffering inflicted on the Armenian people during those 8 years at the beginning of the last century. Real people died and the results were and are still shocking.

The Armenian genocide is a historical fact. There is a nonpartisan academic consensus that between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians perished at the hands of the crumbling Ottoman Empire. I deeply regretted the decision made by this body last year not to consider House Resolution 596, legislation recognizing the Armenian genocide. If we in the Congress continue to react with silence regarding these events and are unwilling to stand up and publicly condemn these atrocities, we effectively give our approval to abuses of power such as the Armenian genocide.

We must let the truth about these events be known and continue to speak out against all instances of inhumanity against one another. To this day it is still denied by the Turkish Government, just as the Nazis 2 decades later denied the Holocaust. Both of these atrocities could have been prevented or at least mitigated if the public had been aware of them. Sadly, it was only after the world learned of the Holocaust and the depths to which human beings could sink in their treatment of each other that the massacre of the Armenian population of Turkey gained attention as genocide.

Responding to this horror, governmental bodies throughout the world have passed resolutions and declarations affirming the Armenian genocide, including Canada, Argentina, Belgium, Lebanon, Vatican City, Uruguay, the European Parliament, the Russian Duma, the Greek Parliament, the Swedish Parliament and the French National Senate.

Additionally, 27 States, more than half, have also passed resolutions condemning the Armenian genocide. I am very pleased that on April 9 of this year my own State of Maryland enacted the Maryland Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. I, as had some others, had written to members of the Maryland Assembly urging their support of the resolution. I believe this measure will help educate others about this crime against humanity and send an appropriate message to the thousands of Maryland residents of Armenian descent who have been profoundly and personally affected by the Armenian genocide and who have made tremendous contributions to our State in the areas of business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts.

We salute the proud people of Armenian who spent 70 years fighting Stalinist domination and who have finally, in the past decade, achieved freedom. However, these freedoms must never allow them or us to forget the hardships suffered by their ancestors. Our universal respect for human rights must instill in all of us the continued condemnation and acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide, one of history's darkest chapters of the 20th century.

THE PRESIDENT HAD IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME, THAT OUR COMMITMENT TO OPEN TRADE MUST BE MATCHED BY A STRONG COMMITMENT TO PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this morning constituents of our Ninth District of Ohio woke up to reports of more job cuts at our local Jeep plant. The Toledo Blade ran two headlines.

One reads, "Jeep reductions: Firm warns up to 2,035 Toledo jobs to be cut." The second headline read, "Expanded PT Cruiser Output Bypasses City of Toledo for Mexico."

Welcome to post-NAFTA America. Here we have a company shifting production from the United States at the expense of our workers. Make no mistake, these are excellent jobs we are talking about. These are not minimum-wage jobs with no benefits. These are not low-tech jobs. They are the type of jobs that any community in America would fight for. These are middle-class jobs. That is what Toledo and the State of Ohio did, in fact. They went out and fought for the Jeep jobs. The taxpayers invested hundreds of millions of dollars to keep those jobs in Ohio and in the United States, and now Chrysler is cutting 2,000 jobs in Toledo at the same time as it is adding production lines in Mexico to make the popular PT Cruiser.

Now President Bush wants to expand NAFTA, he tells us. Is this the promise of NAFTA, 2,000 more families out of work and good jobs in our country? Is this what the future looks like under a hemispheric NAFTA known as Free Trade of the Americas, FTAA? Is this what you get with Fast Track?

President Bush went to Quebec City last week to push for NAFTA's expansion to the free trade of the Americas. He made some interesting claims about what his version of free trade envisions. There was some talk about labor rights and environmental standards and democracy. That sounds well and good, but we need to see concrete action to back up the rhetoric.

In Quebec City, President Bush said it is clear to me that ours is a hemisphere united by freedom. How about the freedom of workers to earn a living wage and to know that they are protected against workplace injury and guaranteed the right to organize the worth of their labor? How about the freedom for families to know what is in their food? How about the freedom of a mother on the border in Mexico knowing that the water is safe to drink and the air fit to breathe? How about the freedom for Members of Congress to have access to all the working documents and drafts of these agreements, not only the multinational giants that helped to negotiate the agreement that we are likely to consider?

In Quebec City, President Bush said, "Our commitment to open trade must be matched by a strong commitment to protecting our environment and improving labor standards." But then he did a pirouette and he said, "We should not allow labor and environmental codicils to destroy the spirit of free trade."

He had it right the first time.

Those of us on the other side of the argument have been saying for years that these trade agreements should give individuals the same rights as multinational corporations. The President was wrong when he said labor and

environmental provisions would destroy free trade. If free trade cannot accommodate labor and environmental concerns, it does not deserve to be known as free.

If the extension of the right for labor to organize, the right to free speech and the right to a safe and livable environment are things that would destroy a trade regime, maybe we should reconsider our trade priorities. Adding labor and environmental rights as a side agreement or included with fig-leaf compromises is completely unacceptable. We learned our lesson with NAFTA, the hard way.

President Bush said, and I quote, "I am confident I will have trade promotion authority by the end of the year because I think most people in the United States Congress understand that trade is beneficial to our hemisphere."

"It is in our Nation's best interest to have the President have trade promotion authority," he said.

Congress does understand that trade can be beneficial to our hemisphere. We also know it can be unbeneficial. We do not need Fast Track to create a trading system that is fair to all nations and workers. We need a trading system that will lift up workers everywhere and help us maintain our standard of living in America. We need a trade agreement that will lift workers up, not leave behind 2,000 more families in Toledo while factories in Mexico gear up to meet a demand for a very popular vehicle on the backs of an exploited workforce that works for slave wages.

Madam Speaker, our rallying cry as we approach the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas debate must be free trade among free people and no less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE MUST CONTINUE TO STRUGGLE AGAINST FORGETTING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Special Order commemorating the Armenian genocide; and I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jer-

sey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for putting this Special Order together and for keeping the issue of the Armenian genocide at the forefront here in Congress.

The tragic occurrence perpetrated against the Armenian people between 1915 and 1925 by the Ottoman Turkish Empire is of great concern to me and members of my constituency. During this relatively brief time frame, over 1.5 million Armenians were massacred and more than 5,000 were exiled. Unfortunately, the Turkish Government has not recognized these brutal atrocities as acts of genocide. Nor is it willing to come to terms with these horrific events of the past that many of their ancestors participated in.

Prior to the Armenian genocide, these brave people with a history of over 2,500 years in the region were subject to numerous indignities and periodic massacres by the sultans of the Ottoman Empire. The worst of these massacres prior to 1915 occurred in 1895 when as many as 300,000 Armenian civilians were murdered, and those who survived were left completely destitute.

Despite these events, Armenians have survived as a people and a culture throughout Europe and now throughout the United States. The Turkish Government needs to come to terms with the past and work towards improving the future. Turkish groups have suggested that since Turks were also killed during that time frame it should not be considered a genocide.

Genocide is the systematic, planned annihilation of a racial, political, or cultural group. It happened to the Jews in Germany, and it did happen to the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

I am well aware of the importance of Turkey as an ally in an unstable region and a frontline NATO state. However, the Turkish Government must officially recognize the atrocities of its predecessors in the Ottoman Empire. I believe that by failing to recognize such barbaric acts one becomes complicit in them.

Milan Kundera, the once-exiled Czech novelist, has written, "The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting."

I believe that we, too, must continue to struggle against forgetting. This Special Order begins that process. This genocide and its lessons must never be forgotten.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ESHOO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

APRIL 24, 1915, ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today to remember a horrific atrocity in history, the Armenian genocide. April 24 is recognized as the anniversary date of this genocide, when Armenian intellectuals and professionals in Constantinople were rounded up and deported or killed.

From 1915 to 1923, a million and a half Armenians were killed and countless others suffered as a result of the systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide by the rulers of the Ottoman Empire.

Half a million Armenians who escaped death were deported to the Middle East. Some were fortunate enough to escape to the United States.

Madam Speaker, I am thankful that more than a million Armenians managed to escape the genocide and establish a new life here in the United States. In my Seventh District in New Jersey, I am proud to represent a number of Armenian-Americans. They have enriched every aspect of New Jersey life, from science to commerce to the arts.

Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss and to honor those descendants who have overcome the atrocities that took their grandparents, their parents, their children, and their friends. We mark this anniversary each year to remind our Nation and to teach future generations about the horrors of genocide and oppression endured by the Armenian people.

We must commit ourselves to ensuring that America remains a beacon of tolerance and openness and diversity.

Madam Speaker, I commend the commitment of Armenian-Americans who continue to strive for world recognition of one of the greatest atrocities of the 20th century.

EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as one who came to Congress committed to having the Federal Government be a better partner in making our communities more livable, making our families safe, healthy and economically secure, this last weekend in the celebration of Earth Day was a special time.

Every April 22, around the world, there is recognition of the Earth Day celebrations. This was an undertaking that was founded in 1970 by then U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson, who proposed a nationwide environmental protest to, quote, shake up the political establishment and force this issue on to the national agenda.

Well, Senator Nelson succeeded, I think, even beyond his expectations, as he was able to encourage this recognition internationally. I think it was appropriate that he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role as the founder of Earth Day.

This year, as we reviewed the news accounts, there was a great deal of energy, excitement and indeed some good news for the environment around the world. Part of it was the environmental activism itself. There were over 800 rallies held across the United States, and internationally there were more than 100. In honor of Earth Day, the Wilderness Society named the White House as an object of their future concerns about national parks and monuments.

There was in Washington, D.C. a forum on solar energy held to celebrate the advances made in the technology, economics and prospects for the use of solar energy. There was a massive Trees Are My Friends campaign that helped to educate urban residents about the value of street trees in the urban forest canopy, helping residents connect with tree care and planning activities in their community.

This last weekend, I joined with people in my community in Portland, Oregon, to celebrate a successful tree-planting undertaking. They have successfully planted now 207,000 trees. During the month of April, citizens in a variety of cities in the West, including Portland, Seattle and Denver, were engaged in races and walks to raise the awareness of climate change, to help stop global climate warming.

□ 2015

There were rallies in India by cycling organizations to push for the creation

of no vehicle zones in major cities. Additionally, there were events to protest deforestation in Mexico, children rallying for the protection of endangered species in Estonia and Russia; and there were tree plantings in Burmese refugee camps in Thailand.

There was good news on the State level. One in particular that caught my attention was in the State of California where the Department of Fish and Game has issued draft regulations to protect sea otters and other marine mammals from deadly gill nets. These regulations are going to make a huge difference in the protection of marine mammals.

In Massachusetts, that State will become the first on a State level to limit carbon dioxide emissions from power plants under their own clean air rules. The new standard, which will go into effect in June, will also limit mercury emissions, acid rain causing sulfur dioxide, and smog-causing nitrogen oxide. It will apply to the State's dirtiest power plants that are contributing to global warming.

There were very significant developments in the Pacific Northwest, including in British Columbia where the government of that province, in coordination with environmental groups, logging companies and the first nations of Canada announced the plan to prohibit or defer logging on 3.5 million acres of the Great Bear Rain Forest, an area 4 times the size of Rhode Island.

This is one of the largest rain forest conservation efforts in North American history and will protect the only home of the white Spirit Bear, a rare subspecies of the black bear.

Madam Speaker, on occasion I have taken to this floor because I have taken offense with some of the activities of this administration as it relates to the environment. Admittedly, I was more than a little concerned when some of our predictions were borne out with the release of President Bush's recommended budget. He has decided to recommend major cuts in the EPA enforcement budget and to slash by 87 percent a global tropical forest program which he had endorsed on the campaign trail, I believe pledging \$100 million.

The budget also shows that the President has a mixed reaction to what is proposed as an energy crisis by recommending that the Department of Energy research on renewables be slashed by nearly 50 percent and that energy efficiency funding be cut by 23 percent. It simply, from where I stand, is a little disappointing to say the least; but I must confess that there have been a number of announcements and activities from this administration in the course of Earth Day, Earth Week activities that do, I think, bear commendation; and I think we should come forward and express appreciation for steps that are, in fact, positive.

The President announced that he will sign the international agreement on persistent organic pollutants to halt

the worldwide spread of these dangerous chemicals, such as dioxins. I think that is a positive step.

On Saturday, April 21, the day before Earth Day, at a meeting on free trade in Quebec, the President promised to link trade with a strong commitment to protect our environment, a movement that reinforces the work done by his trade representative, Ambassador Zoellick, who is working hard to see if we can reach some bipartisan accord to protect environmental values in the area of trade, and I commend them.

The administration has at least agreed to attend the next round of international talks on global climate change, even though they continue their opposition to the Kyoto protocol and have not expressed a willingness to compromise and a willingness to move forward. I hope cooler heads hopefully will prevail because it is inappropriate for the United States to abrogate leadership in the international arena.

I appreciated the fact that the President has decided to allow a ban on snowmobiles in Yellowstone and Grand Tetons National Park to take effect. It was my pleasure recently to meet with Mike Finley, the outgoing superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, who has done an outstanding job for the Park Service. This ban was an important part of Mike's legacy and will phase out snowmobiles in these critical parks in the next 3 years.

The administration has also decided to uphold a Clinton administration rule to dramatically expand reporting requirements for the emissions of lead. This is a step in the right direction to deal with a serious toxic metal which is linked to learning and behavior problems.

In the area of wetlands, the administration announced last week that it will uphold a wetlands development regulation that requires developers to get an Army Corps of Engineer's permit for various activities that would modify the wetlands.

And in the area of home appliances, the White House will keep Clinton administration energy conservation rules on washing machines and water heaters, measures which will make clothes washers become 22 percent more efficient by 2004, 35 percent more efficient by 2007, and will make a big difference in terms of saving energy and conserving water.

While I was disappointed that the administration is weakening the air conditioning rule by some 50 percent, nonetheless it still represents a substantial improvement and a move in the right direction.

Madam Speaker, I notice that I have been joined by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), a gentleman known for his zeal and concern for protecting the environment and his environmentally sensitive State, and I would yield to the gentleman for some comments.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Oregon who has always played such a

leadership role on environmental issues for organizing this special order this evening. It is 2 days after Earth Day, but this is the first day that we have been back and can talk about Earth Day.

I want to express my disappointment with the Bush administration and what has been happening for the last 3 or 4 months since President Bush took office with regard to environmental issues. Sunday was the 31st anniversary of Earth Day, and I took part in those first Earth Day celebrations when I was in college at that time in Vermont.

I have watched pretty much over the 30 or 31 years since the first Earth Day, we have seen significant progress on environmental concerns. I know in my own district we have done a lot to clean up the ocean along the Jersey shore. We have seen the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, all of these major pieces of legislation which have made significant progress in cleaning up the environment.

So it is very disappointing to see President Bush in the actions that he has taken in the last few months basically, I think, try to reverse that trend in very negative ways. I am joining the gentleman from Oregon tonight in saying that not because I am looking to attack President Bush and just say the Republicans are bad and be partisan about it, that is not my goal.

Madam Speaker, what I want to do is see this administration change course and basically recognize that the environment is a major concern of the American people and that these problems are not going to go away and we need to take progressive steps to improve the quality of our environment.

But it is disappointing, and I want to outline if I could maybe in 5 minutes or so where I see major problems in what the President has done in the last few months, but at the same time kind of show a bit of optimism about what I think we can do to change it so that he does not continue on this course. And I want to talk about energy policy first and then talk about some other environmental issues.

With regard to energy policy, and you already mentioned it, this signal about not really caring about global climate change, scrapping the Kyoto treaty and maybe suggesting that we not talk about it much in the future, I think is a grave concern.

Also the President's switch on carbon dioxide, to say that is not one of the air emission controls that we are going to put in place. And although we have not really received the report, I guess, of Vice President CHENEY's energy task force, that is going to come around mid-May, we keep hearing that the energy goals of this administration are more production of fossil fuels rather than conservation, and they do not talk about increased technological efficiency or much about the use of renewables.

Much attention has been focused on ANWR, that we should start drilling in ANWR and possibly other offshore areas around the United States.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly unfortunate, because we keep seeing signals at the same time that President Bush is saying these things and doing these things, these negative things, we keep seeing signals that the consensus, not only the American people, but the Congress I think, is very much to the contrary of most of his public pronouncements.

I got a little whiff of that again, if you will, this weekend when my former governor, now the EPA Administrator, Christie Whitman, suggested that the Bush administration may be backing off from drilling in ANWR. But as has been the case so often with Mrs. Whitman, the White House came back after she made those statements and sort of scolded her for her comments and said that they are going to continue the effort to try to drill in ANWR and to get congressional authorization to do so.

I think that Whitman was really basically commenting on the political reality, that the votes are really not there for ANWR in the Senate and probably not in the House as well. Basically, I think she was indicating that there really is a consensus in the Congress, I believe in both Houses, not to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I see so many things like that, when we think about every one of Bush's major pronouncements that I have been critical of: the Kyoto Treaty, the CO2 emissions. We have to realize that over the last 6 months or over the last year, there has really been a bipartisan consensus of most Democrats and some pro-environment Republicans, who have expressed support for the global climate change talks. We have recognized that this is an issue that we have to deal with.

With regard to CO2 emissions, we have had a number of pieces of legislation introduced in this House on a bipartisan basis that would address the CO2 emissions through market trading legislation. I have introduced a bill like that. I think also, if we look around at some of the utilities in various parts of the country, including in my home State of New Jersey, we have seen them start to implement new technologies that would actually cut down on carbon dioxide emissions. So it is just very unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these positive forces, these pro-environmental forces here in the Congress, have not gone away, and maybe they are underground right now; but hopefully, over the next few months or certainly this session of Congress, we will see them come forward with the support of the American people and demand that we address global climate change, demand that we address CO2 emissions, and not allow drilling in the ANWR.

I just wanted to express to my colleague with regard to those energy issues that I really am a lot more optimistic about what is going to happen here, even though I keep hearing these negative pronouncements on the environment from the Bush administration.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk about a couple of other areas that are not energy-related, but fall within the rubric of my subcommittee. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Environment and Hazardous Materials, and we have jurisdiction over Superfund, over Brownfields, over safe drinking water, and if I could just comment briefly on some of those issues. It was very disappointing to me to see President Bush's efforts to tear down the environment and the good legislation and the good initiatives that we have had in the past also translated into his budget. I mean, if we look at the budget, it is a cutback in the Department of Energy, it is also a cutback in the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency. In my home State, we have more Superfund sites than any other State in the country, so we really care about Superfund and whether the funding is going to be there to actually do cleanup.

What President Bush proposed in his budget is that for the next fiscal year, we could clean up only 65 Superfund sites as opposed to the 85 sites on the average that we have cleaned up in the last 4 years under the last administration. But even more important, he did not include the Superfund corporate tax in the budget as a method of paying for cleanup.

Now, that may have been okay in the last few years when the Republicans cut it out of the budget that President Clinton submitted, because we still have money in the trust fund to pay for a significant portion of Superfund cleanups. But if we do not reauthorize the corporate tax this year or even next year, we are simply going to run out of money in 2003. There will not be any money from the Superfund Trust Fund to pay for cleanups. I do not see us going ahead and allocating money out of general revenue sources to pay for it. So that program is also seriously threatened.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Oregon mentioned our problem with safe drinking water. Again, I could talk about what this administration is doing not only with standards with regard to arsenic, but also with the infrastructure. We have heard about the way he just threw out the arsenic standard and basically was not willing to change the status quo down to the 10 parts per billion that was recommended by President Clinton and also by the National Academy of Sciences. Well, again, I guess in part because the President and this administration realize that this is a problem that the American people do not like to ingest arsenic, over the last week or so we have seen the EPA Administrator, Mrs. Whitman, come out again

and say, oh, no, we are going to set up a new rule, we are going to take a year and study this, but I promise that by the next year, we will impose a rule that cuts back at least 60 percent on the existing standard.

Well, I can figure out what 60 percent is of 50 parts per billion, but I know it does not get down to the 10 parts per billion that President Clinton proposed. So, again, they are playing games.

She came out and said that she has convened this new panel at the National Academy of Sciences and asked them to look at the arsenic standards, but again, I get the impression from what I read and from what people tell me that this panel is somewhat rigged and that it is not inclined to adopt a more strict standard.

In the same way, I saw Mrs. Whitman come before our subcommittee a couple of weeks ago and talk about the tremendous need for resources, Federal or otherwise, to address the backlog of infrastructure needs for clean water in various States and various communities around the country. There was a report that she mentioned actually that came out in February that identified \$102.5 billion in infrastructure needs for safe drinking water. But when we looked at the Bush budget and when it came out a couple of weeks ago while we were back in our districts, it actually level-funded the amount of money that would be available for these infrastructure needs. So we have \$102.5 billion in needs and authorization in Congress for \$1 billion, and Bush's budget comes in at \$823 million.

So needless to say, there is a real gap between what the Bush administration has said in the past or during the campaign about environmental issues and what the EPA Administrator continues to say about concerns that she has for environmental issues, and what this administration actually does and its actions to address those issues.

I am also concerned about the fact that we have reduced the amount of funding at the EPA. We are not going to see enforcement of a lot of the good environmental laws that are on the books. However, again, I do not think the public is going to stand for this.

I really believe that ultimately this Congress will heed the public's wishes and not go along with a lot of these pronouncements that are coming out of the White House. But I know that we have to continue to identify all of these different negative actions that are being taken by this administration against the environment, and we have to speak out and we have to tell people over and over again what they mean, because a lot of them are not easily explainable and they are happening so quickly over the last 3 or 4 months of this administration that it is even hard to keep track of them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon again for his part and what he is doing to try to bring attention to this. I think we have

an obligation not only today in remembering Earth Day, but throughout the next 2 years of this session, to constantly focus on what this administration is doing to gut environmental concerns.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations, the hard work that he has done in protecting the environment, and the admonition that we need to be vigilant not just on Earth Day, but this is an ongoing effort. I must confess that I share the gentleman's observation. My assessment is that our commitment is to protect the environment. I have deep concerns about some of the administration's policies, as the gentleman mentioned. I hope, however, that we can on this floor reach common cause across party lines, geographic and philosophical divides, because the American public desires that we are able to move forward and be productive in this fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I came from a very environmentally aware State. I think we both share that kinship and that consensus. In our State, in Oregon, much of the environmental leadership transcended party politics. It came from an era, particularly in the 1970s, where half the time there was a Republican governor who was working with Democrats in the legislature; and when the Democrats took control of the State house, the governorship, it continued on.

Most of the major pieces of legislation that we are working on actually have bipartisan support, and if we could ever get them to the floor of this chamber, I think we would find that there would be strong votes, including significant Republican support.

I think it is important for us to walk that line, to fight back when there are items that are at odds with what the American public wants. As the gentleman pointed out with the budget, we need to acknowledge some of the positive things that are not where that takes place, and Congress must be willing to step up and lead by example in terms of walking the walk.

I had a couple of other observations that were positive in nature that I wanted to share, because I thought they were very significant. Joe Albaugh, the new director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, maybe created some waves the last couple of days when there was high water around Davenport, Iowa, but I think he raised an important issue about the responsibility of the Federal Government to help, but not to continue to step in and subsidize areas where it appears as though people are not moving out of harm's way. There are in this country over 8,000 properties that have a history of repeated loss claims from floods. Over the last 8 years, we have lost over \$89 billion of damage as a result of flooding. We have lost over 800 lives. And there are still a number of people who live with Federal subsidy in places where God has repeat-

edly shown that he does not want them to live.

I appreciate that this administration is willing to raise the issue. In the budget there are some budget savings that have been claimed as a result of modifying and reforming the Federal flood insurance program. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have legislation that we have introduced, the "Two Floods and You're Out of the Taxpayer Pocket," which would help provide a mechanism to claim the savings that the administration is interested in; and I appreciate what the FEMA Director is doing, and I know there will be support in Congress to come forward to try and make that important reform.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure earlier this week to share a platform with General Robert Flowers, the head of the Corps of Engineers, who made, I thought, an extraordinary, extraordinary statement. I commend people to perhaps go to the Web site, to the Corps of Engineers, look at General Flowers' statement. It was one that I think any Member of the House of Representatives would have been proud to make. The General committed to environmental sustainability, that all Corps of Engineers work will be based on the need for people and nature to coexist in a healthy, supportive, diverse and sustainable condition; to recognize the interdependence of activities, that we will recognize interdependence with nature, we will consider the possibility of second- and third-order effects on his projects; that the Corps would be responsible for cumulative impacts.

The Corps would accept responsibility for the consequences of planning, design, and construction decisions upon the continued viability of natural systems and human life. The Corps would be committed to long-term public safety, creating engineered objects of long-term value; that it would support a systems approach in all aspects of design and construction.

The Corps will evaluate and optimize the life cycle of products and processes so that as much as possible, we approach the natural state of systems in which there is no waste; to understand and utilize the dynamic nature of the environment. Their products will continue to rely to the fullest extent possible on renewable energy sources and recyclable products, and to seek continuous improvements, seeking constant improvements by sharing, promoting, collaborating and integrating knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was an outstanding statement by General Flowers, and I, for one, am standing willing to help him achieve that with the Corps of Engineers in terms of policy and budget and to make sure that Congress is supporting, rather than interfering.

□ 2045

I wanted to acknowledge that as, I thought, one of the most important

statements that I had heard in the course of the week of Earth Day celebrations.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, he is bringing up, I think, a very important issue. In sort of a general sense, when we talk about the environment, there are a lot of new technologies and new ways of doing things that really can make a difference.

That is one of the reasons I find what I have been seeing from this administration so disappointing, because I really believe that the environment and industry or business can work together, and that there is no reason why a pro-environment position cannot be also a pro-jobs creation, or a pro-economic development position.

Certainly, when we talk about new technologies, that is so true. Last week during the congressional recess we did a bus tour, I guess it was last Wednesday, where myself and the gentlemen from New Jersey, Mr. HOLT and Mr. PASCRELL, went to various parts of the State to highlight some of the concerns we had with what the Bush administration was doing.

One of the stops was in Linden, New Jersey, which is a town that has a number of utilities and also refineries. We were there with Public Service Electric and Gas, which is one of our major utilities in the State. They were actually building a new plant that was going to be gas-fired, natural gas-fired, and that was replacing some older oil-burning plants to generate electricity. They estimated that the new plants would cut down on the amount of carbon dioxide by one-third.

I just could not help it, I am standing there and talking to these business leaders, people representing the utility, who by no means would be perceived as Democrats or liberals or anything like that, and they are just explaining why this can be done and how easy it is to do, how it saves money and cuts down on carbon dioxide.

For the life of me, I do not understand the theory of this administration. The gentleman talked about the energy efficiency of air conditioners, as the gentleman mentioned before. We can talk about so many ways. In fact, the United States really is taking the leadership in terms of new technologies that would cut down on air emissions, and make it so that not only us but other countries would not continue to contribute so much to the problem of global climate change.

These are new technologies that we can sell to other parts of the world that would create jobs here at home because they are high-tech. There is absolutely no reason to perceive that environmental initiatives are somehow going to be too expensive or lose jobs or hurt industry. I think it is just the opposite. It is just another reason why I am very concerned about what is happening with this administration.

We talked about the budget. I think the gentleman mentioned renewables. I

believe that with regard to research on renewable resources, solar power, wind power, that the budget the President came in with cuts the amount of research money in half.

This morning I was down with the group of American Indians that are concerned about the environment, I think it is called the National Tribal Environmental Council. I spoke with them. It is amazing to me, they were talking about how, with wind resources in the Great Plains area, we would actually be able to generate enough power through wind on the Great Plains to produce enough electricity for the whole continental United States, the 48 States outside of Alaska and Hawaii, if we were to take that initiative.

The ability and the will is there if only this administration would wake up. I do not want to keep harping on it, but the gentleman said it when he pointed out that historically these issues, these environmental concerns, have been bipartisan.

The great conservationist leader was Teddy Roosevelt. It was Richard Nixon who signed so many of the environmental laws that we are talked about tonight in the seventies.

I think what happened, and frankly I am going to be partisan, now, when we had the changeover in the Congress from Democrat to Republican and we had Newt Gingrich come in as the Speaker, all of a sudden there was this great interest on the part of the Republican leadership to do the bidding of big business, big oil, big mining companies.

That is what we are seeing with President Bush as well. Most of the decisions that he is making seem to be contrary to a lot of the Republicans in his own party, but he is catering to the big oil and the big mining and these other special interests that are very shortsighted about the future and what can be done.

So again, I know we have to keep up the effort here, but I think there is good reason to feel that we can change things, because what is being done by this administration is not only not in the best interests of the country, but it does not even make sense from an economic development point of view or a money point of view, ultimately, I do not think.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

I was particularly taken by a comment the gentleman made about the opportunities to build the environment, to create jobs, to build the economy; that these are things that can be done concurrently and actually add value, being able to help make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

I had an opportunity this last week to tour a location where actually what the gentleman is talking about could have a tremendous effect. In the metropolitan Portland area, across the river, it is not in my district or in my State

but it is a very short journey, there is a large formerly-used defense facility called Camp Bonneville, 3,800 acres that has been used for the better part of this last century for military purposes.

The community has a plan where they would like to take this area that has been off limits, that has not been subjected to development. It has a potential for wildlife, for recreation, that is almost unsurpassed, just a few minutes from the core of a major metropolitan area, but it is going to require that the Department of Defense step up and provide the resources to decontaminate the area.

We do not know what is on the 3,800 acres. There is not money budgeted, although we recently had a reversal of a decision by the Department of Defense to go in and help us with that survey. It is critical that we examine areas like this.

When they first went in, there were 105-millimeter shells on the ground that they could find. These are items of high explosives, 7½ pounds of blasting powder, that could do tremendous damage. Now we have an opportunity perhaps, if the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers, and this Congress steps forward, to be able to make a difference for the people in the metropolitan area of Portland-Vancouver-Washington. But it is an example of what we can do to balance the environment, provide jobs, and give back precious resources in terms of open space and redevelopment possibilities.

But while we were on recess this last week, there was finally the long-awaited report from the General Accounting Office that deals with the environmental liabilities of just training range cleanup costs. The report was rather startling. It indicated that while the Department of Defense thought that its liability for the cleanup of training ranges was about \$14 billion, they find that other estimates show that liability could well exceed \$100 billion just for training range cleanup. Without complete and accurate data, it is impossible to determine whether these amounts represent a reasonable estimate, or what the implications are.

We have not performed a complete inventory of the ranges, identifying the types and extent of the unexploded ordnance and the associated contamination. We have a long list of areas that are formerly-used defense sites, training sites, base closures. We do not have the top management focus and leadership necessary even to get reliable report estimates at this point, and sadly, there is no specific program for unexploded ordnance remediation policy, goals, or program.

Now, we have been writing as Members of Congress, bringing this to the attention of the appropriators, to our fellow Members of Congress. This is a situation that affects not just metropolitan Portland, but it is something that touches people all across the country.

Two weeks ago, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and I led a trip to the American University campus and Spring Valley residential development here in the District of Columbia, where they are still excavating the hillside, removing arsenic. There is a child care center on the campus of American University that was closed because of intolerably high arsenic levels.

In our Nation's Capitol, from coast-to-coast, border to border, we have over 1,000 of these sites that need to be addressed that represent a threat to the public safety and health, and if done properly, represent an opportunity to have a transformational effect on communities in terms of the economic activities associated with cleanup and then the reuse of these facilities.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in my State, of course, we have so many opportunities like that. The list is endless.

I mentioned that we have more Superfund sites than any other State. I think we have over 6,000 hazardous waste sites that have been identified by the State of New Jersey outside of Superfund, most of which would be eligible for a brownfields initiative. Obviously, the Federal government needs to do more in that respect, as well.

I would like to think of ways, as the gentleman is pointing out, to do progressive things on Superfund, on brownfields, on other hazardous waste and other types of environmental cleanup. That is really what I hope that the gentleman and I and others who are concerned about the environment would be concentrating on. We do not want to spend our time trying to prevent good laws from being gutted, which is essentially what we have been doing for the last couple of months.

My district, I think the gentleman knows, a significant part of it is along the Jersey shore, along the ocean. When I was first elected in 1988, I was really elected on an environmental platform, because that was the year when all of the beaches were closed. The tourism industry is number one in New Jersey. People think of New Jersey as the petrochemical State, but we actually earn more dollars in New Jersey from tourism than even from the petrochemical industry. I think we were losing \$5 billion that summer because the beaches were closed.

A number of initiatives have been taken since then in Congress on a bipartisan basis, as well as in the State legislature. When the current EPA administrator, Ms. Whitman, was the Governor of New Jersey, she presided over a lot of these initiatives to clean up the ocean. Yet now we see the opposite happening here on the Federal level.

One of the things that happened in New Jersey that was used as an example nationally, and now faces a budget cut, was the Beaches Act. New Jersey

was the first State in the country that passed a law that said that we had to do testing on a regular basis during the summer months when people can swim at the Jersey shore. We have to test the beaches, and if they do not meet a certain Federal standard, then the beach has to be closed. Rather, we have to test the water, and if it does not meet a certain standard, the beach has to be closed and it has to be posted that one cannot bathe. This was a result of the wash-up of all the debris in 1988.

We put this into effect, and I and some Republicans on the other side, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) was a sponsor with me, we actually moved a bill in the last session of Congress called the Beaches Act that implemented that nationally. It was signed by President Clinton I guess in October, before the end of the last session.

That said that now every State would be mandated to do the same type of testing for water quality, and close beaches and post signs and publicly announce if the water quality was not up to snuff.

We authorized \$30 million under that legislation that was signed last fall to implement that program. Again, our EPA administrator, Ms. Whitman, was touting that program early in this administration, about how it was a great program and it was modeled after New Jersey. Then when I saw the budget a couple of weeks ago, I saw that the President's budget, instead of appropriating \$30 million, it appropriated something like \$2 million or \$3 million, which would not even allow more than a handful of States to implement the program.

So again, it just seems so unfortunate. I do not want to keep harping and being so partisan about it, but it just seems so unfortunate that at a time when there are a lot of progressive things that could be done, proactive things that could be done around here, like what the gentleman just described, we still have to talk about just trying to make sure that things do not get worse.

I do not want to be pessimistic because I am still optimistic, but it is unfortunate to see what we have had to contend with in the last few months.

□ 2100

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's somber reflections because we need to look at this in a balanced and objective fashion. I would just conclude my remarks this evening on a note of optimism and hoping that we will be able to work in a bipartisan fashion to do something about having the Federal Government step up and lead by example.

The United States Government is the largest Superfund polluter in the United States, the government itself. The military waste, the toxics and explosives that we have littering the landscape constitute a battle right

here on American soil 26 years after the Vietnam war, 56 years after the conclusion of World War II, 83 years after World War I. It involves mines and nerve gases and toxics and explosive shells. It has claimed at least 65 lives that we know of, most of them since World War II.

There is a strong likelihood, I am told, that there are more people who have lost their lives that we just as yet do not know about, and there are many more who have been maimed and injured.

What, I guess, shocked me the most were two young boys who were killed as a result of an explosive shell that they found in a field in a subdivision in their hometown of San Diego that was a formerly used military defense site. Three boys found the shell. They were playing with it. They detonated it, and two of them were killed. This danger continues every day. If we are not careful, at the rate we are going, it could last for another 500 or 1,000 years.

Now, this toxic waste of military activities in the United States could potentially contaminate 20 to 25 million acres, and some estimates are as high as 50 million acres. As I pointed out, we do not have a good inventory. We do not know. But what we do know is, at the current rate of spending in a budget that is not yet adequate, it will take centuries, potentially 1,000 years or more to return the land to safe and productive use and to protect children who may be playing, wildlife.

Fire fighters in the forests who were a couple of summers ago in a forest fire in New York State, all of a sudden they were out in the forest, and there were huge explosions because buried shells from artillery practice that did not explode were suddenly being detonated by the forest fire.

Congress needs to report for duty. It needs to provide the administrative and financial tools that are necessary. What I am talking about here is not going to affect active ranges and readiness. My concern is for closed, transferred, and transferring ranges where the public is already exposed or soon will be.

I hope that we can make every Member of Congress, every aspect of the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers understand what is going on in each and every one of our States, because every State is at risk.

We can make sure that somebody is in charge, that there is enough funding, and that we get the job done so that no child will be at risk of death, dismemberment or serious illness as a result of the United States Government not cleaning up after itself.

In the course of our conversation this evening, we have talked about some positive elements and some that were perhaps a little disconcerting, but I

think this is an area that we can commit ourselves to working in a bipartisan way. I can think of no more positive aspect for claiming the true purpose and spirit of Earth Day than acting to make sure that the Federal Government is doing all it can in this important area.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield a little time, I would say this. The gentleman from Oregon talked about optimism. I am going to be optimistic in the last thing that I say here this evening. When I mentioned over the weekend to my children who are fairly young, I have a daughter who is 7 and a son who just turned 6 and another daughter who is 3, and when I mentioned to them that it was Earth Day on Sunday, of course they got all excited about it.

But it really dawned on me that they are all in school in some way, either school or preschool at this point. I have watched over the last few years that they just have an incredible sort of environmental consciousness, more so than I do. I do not think it comes from me. I think it mostly comes from what they learn in school and what they see on TV. They remind me that one has to recycle this or that. They talk about the ocean and how it has got to be kept clean. They participated in a couple of cleanups that we have at this time of year, either along the beach or in some of the wooded areas.

So I mean there are many things that came out of Earth Day since 1970, the last 31 years, but I think maybe the most important thing is the education aspect that people, particularly the younger generation, younger than me, are very environmentally conscious. We talk about how younger people maybe are not as conscious or politically conscious, but I definitely believe that they are environmentally conscious.

So I just think that any effort to try to turn back the clock on the environmental movement is ultimately doomed to failure. So that is my optimism, and I know that we are here to make sure it is not doomed to failure, and we are going to keep it up.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Indeed.

ECONOMY, ENERGY, AND THE DEATH TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, good evening. Welcome back to Washington. As my colleagues know, we have all had about a 2-week recess. I spent my recess back in the district going around, as many of my colleagues have done, to town meetings, talking with people on the street and talking with the different interest groups out in our district and taking kind of a general overview of several things.

One of them of course is our economy. I had plenty of opportunity to discuss with people our economy.

I also discussed with many of my constituents our situation with the energy crisis that we are coming upon. As many of my colleagues know from their own constituents, we have seen gasoline prices just explode in the last couple of weeks.

Then of course I heard from a number of people in regards to the death tax. I went out firsthand and again witnessed the punitive action that the estate tax, the death tax, has worked upon people of this country, that has worked upon people of my district, the devastating results of people who have already paid their tax, who have the unfortunate situation of a death in their family, and here comes Uncle Sam to finish the devastation as if the family had not had enough.

So I want to visit about these three issues tonight, about the economy, about energy, and about the death tax.

Let me start off, first of all, talking on the economy. We have seen a lot of criticism lately about President Bush. I was listening to public radio. I listen to public radio quite a bit. I was driving in my district. Now, mind you, my district is larger geographically than the State of Florida so I do a lot of drive time in my district. I was listening to public radio. It is interesting. One of the commentators on public radio or one of the guests on public radio was talking very critically of President Bush and how he has soured the economy. President Bush has been in office, what, 12, 13 weeks. President Bush was handed this bad economy.

Now, this economy could get a lot worse if we do not do something pretty quickly. Frankly, I think the responsibility to do something about this economy falls to some extent on our shoulders in these Chambers. It falls to also an extent on the shoulders of the President of the United States. I do not think this President has shunned that responsibility. In fact I think President Bush has stood up to the challenge. He started off by proposing a tax cut.

Let me tell my colleagues this tax cut that the President has proposed, let us put it in its proper proportions. The President has proposed over a 10-year period, not a 1-year period, over a 10-year period, a \$1.6 trillion tax reduction. Now in addition to that, what he said is that this tax reduction should benefit the people who pay taxes. It is not a welfare program intended to go to people who do not pay taxes. It is a tax reduction program intended to be more equitable and fair to the taxpayer of this country.

As all of my colleagues and I know in these Chambers, we do not earn that money. We do not go out and create capital. We do not come up and figure out a better idea or a better mousetrap. All we do is go out to those people who toil, who come up with a better mousetrap, who come up with a better idea, all we do is go out, reach into

their pockets, and tax them. That is where the revenue in here comes.

When we have reached too deep into their pocket, which we have done over the last few years, do not my colleagues think they ought to be considered? That is what this tax cut does. It considers that. It says, if one is a taxpayer, we think there ought to be a little something in it for one. Now, one does not get the whole piece of pie. That would be much too imaginative for someone to think that, when the government taxes one, one is going to get a big chunk of the pie as a taxpayer. But the President has said one deserves a part of the pie.

Now, what part of the pie is that. Over the next 10 years, to put this in proportion, over the next 10 years, and the estimates vary a little bit, but approximately there is going to be \$33 trillion coming to the government from these people out there, the taxpayers, the citizens of this country who go to work every day, who come up with a better idea, who put in their shifts, who pay their taxes fairly and pay their taxes on a timely basis. \$33 trillion will be gathered from those people in the next 10 years.

Of that, if we take a look at the spending that we now have, we take a look at the spending that is forecast, our guess is we are going to spend about \$28 trillion of that.

So if we have about \$33 trillion, and we are going to spend about \$28 trillion, that leaves us about \$5 trillion in surplus. Of that, the President has asked for 1.6, \$1.6 trillion. About a third of that goes back to the taxpayer. Now is that too much to ask?

When I was out there visiting with my constituents over this last recess, I do not think my constituents thought that was too much to ask. In fact, I found my constituents saying, how do you justify the level of taxation that you have placed upon us, especially when we talk about things like the marriage penalty, especially when we talk about things like the death tax. Are we getting a bang for our dollar back there in Washington, D.C., Mr. Congressman? That is what those people wanted to know.

Now as we know, the President's tax policy is a long-term policy. This plan was designed when he was running for President. It has been fine-tuned since he has been elected to President. But as we know, we also need, on top of that, we may need an additional stimulant to put into the economy.

In order for us to avoid a downward or a spiral so to speak that gets out of control and takes this economy into a recession, we need to come up with a strategy. That strategy really is multi-leveled.

The first level of that strategy is the President's tax reduction, and everybody in these Chambers ought to be giving serious consideration to it. I would tell my colleagues, especially the liberal side of the Democratic Party that opposed any kind of tax reduction, then came out with their

Presidential candidate, and I think the gentleman proposed a \$400 billion tax reduction. Then the next level was \$600 billion. My guess is that before this is over, especially in light of the current economic situation, that even the liberal Democrats are going to have to step forward; they are going to have to step forward and help us institute a tax credit or a tax reduction back into this economy. We have got to get some stimulation.

On top of that, if this economy continues to sour on us, I think there is a very justifiable basis for a capital gains reduction; and many, many millions and millions of people in this country will benefit almost immediately from a reduction in capital gains taxation, say, from 20 percent down to about 15 percent.

So the first strategy that we need to invoke to take on this souring economy is some type of tax reduction.

Now, some of my constituents actually were swayed by this; they have been swayed by the argument that leaves the money in Washington, D.C., that all of us sitting in these Chambers will leave our hands off it. As I said in countless meetings, it is like leaving a jar of Girl Scout cookies in the room with me, and I am hungry, and telling me not to touch them while you go out for a couple of days. Of course they are going to get eaten. Any money left in Washington, D.C., I guarantee you, do not let them try to persuade you that it will go to additional expenditures like education.

□ 2115

This money will be utilized to provide more pork. This money is being heavily lobbied for right now, as we speak, by special interests in this city. Throughout the rest of America where you are providing these tax dollars for the city of Washington, D.C., where your Federal Government is located, I can assure you that a lot of those tax dollars are funding, in fact, lobbyists of special interest organizations who want to spend those dollars.

Do you think there are a lot of people in Washington, D.C. that want to see the taxpayer get some of those dollars back? Of course they do not. They want to take those dollars and enhance their special interests. And they know that in order to convince the American public that those dollars ought to stay in Washington, D.C., instead of a small fraction of those dollars going back to the people that paid them and sent them here to Washington, D.C., in order to do that, they put up very persuasive marketing efforts. Do not kid yourself; they are not going to come out to the taxpayers in Colorado or Wyoming or Utah or California or Washington; they are not going to come out to those taxpayers and say, "Hey, we've got a bad program in Washington, D.C. we want you to fund. We want to buy drunks a new car or we want to tear down the forest with a bunch of money." That is not what these programs are like.

These programs sound good, education, this, that, motherhood and apple pie. Frankly one of the problems we face back here is a lot of these programs are in fact good. But the reality of the situation is, we do not usually have a lot of choices between good and bad programs back here in Washington. Our choices are generally between good programs and good programs, and it is a tough decision. But we, in fact, have to say no. We cannot fund everything that comes into our office.

As many of my colleagues know on a daily basis, we have requests for lots and lots of money. We have got to take a serious look. We have got to tighten our belts just like everybody else, just like the working families of America have to tighten their belts with this economy beginning to slow down as it has.

So the first strategy, the first layer of that multilayered strategy that we must put into place is some type of tax cut that means something. While we are on that point, do not send out a \$300 billion tax cut to the American taxpayers. That does not do any good for the economy. You have got to have a tax reduction that means something. You have got to have something like a capital gains reduction that means something, getting rid of the marriage tax, which means something out there, eliminating the death tax which means something out there. A tax cut that reduces the liability of the taxpayer, not the person that does not pay taxes but of the taxpayer; make it mean something. That is how your first layer of a tax cut will help impact this economy in a positive fashion.

The second thing we have got to see happen, and it is happening as we speak, is reduction of the interest rate. Now, Alan Greenspan and the Fed surprised everyone last week with a half a percent reduction in the prime lending rate, in the prime rate that the Feds put out. Why is that a surprise? Why do you think it was handled over a telephone call? Why do you think it was unexpected? Because the Feds, they sense we have got problems ahead and we need to address it now and we need to put stimulation into the economy now. So those interest rates are going to have to come down again.

But how much more room do we have on the interest rates? You can continue to lower the rates, but at some point the lending institutions in this country have to have a margin. They cannot loan at zero. Who is going to put their money out there to loan it at 2 percent where it has got risk? So at some point the banks, instead of loaning at prime, will have to loan at prime plus 1 or prime plus 1½, et cetera. So the advantage of the reduction in rates can only go so much further. But so far I think Greenspan is doing a good job.

Now, some will say he should have done it 6 months ago. But I can tell you 6 months ago, a lot of people were thinking that everything Greenspan was doing was perfect. So in the world

of finance, hindsight is always perfect. The fact is, Alan Greenspan is participating, he is addressing this thing I think in a fashion that will help us slow down this slowdown or level off this slowdown and put us back into a recovery stage.

The third step that we have to take on this multilayered strategy is that we have got to control spending. We cannot allow the government to continue to spend as we spent last year. The 11 percent, 12 percent spending rate, which by the way is a much higher spending rate than almost every tax-paying family in America got to enjoy last year, cannot continue forward with this government. This is not a government that should continue to spend and spend and spend.

Many of the critics of President Bush's budget and many of the critics of President Bush's tax reduction are special interest groups in Washington, D.C. Do not kid yourself. Everybody has got special interests. I have special interests. Water, I worry about water in the West. I worry about land issues in the West. I worry about education for my three children. I have a special interest in those areas.

But every special interest is going to have to help participate in our government attempt to try and level off this slowdown in our economy. I do not think it is too much to go out, and President Bush has not gone out and asked a lot from the government. President Bush has gone out to the government and said, Look, you get to keep all the money you had last year, Government. But as your leader, as the President of the United States, I am telling you we cannot continue on this spending spiral. We cannot go on like that.

I am not asking you to go down. I am asking you at the government level, let's just knock it down a little. You can go ahead and have everything you have this year, governmental agencies, but next year we are going to keep it to a 4 percent increase, 4 cents on the dollar.

I asked when I was in my district how many of my constituents were going to have a 4 percent increase in their budget next year from their employer. I did not have very many of them that said they would. I did not have very many of them that expected they would. So I think it is entirely reasonable that the President ask that the government agencies, they too tighten their belts and they too live within a reasonable spending increase.

Let me tell you one of the favorite ploys that is utilized by special interests in Washington, D.C. I will use the board here as an example. This is an old-time trick used in budgeting and used by special interest groups. Let us say, for example, agency X received \$10 in last year's budget and let us say that agency X this year asked for \$20. They got \$10 last year. This year they are asking for \$20. Let us say that the President comes out with his budget

and says that agency X should get \$15. They got \$10 last year, agency X, they are going to get \$15 this year under the proposed budget, but they wanted \$20.

Now, the average American out there calls that a \$5 increase. Last year they got \$10; this year they are going to get \$15. Do you know what they do, the lobbyists and the special interests for agency X? They go out and say, wait a minute, they go out to our constituents, they go out to the general public and they say, We are getting our budget cut. You have got to write your Congressman. You have got to call your Congressman. They are cutting education or they are cutting water or they are cutting highways or they are cutting the school lunch program. You name it. You have got to call them. They are cutting us.

Ask them what they really mean by cutting. Has the President in his budget and have we in Congress really cut their budget or have we reduced what they have asked for? I think you will find in most cases the reductions they are talking about are reductions in what they have asked for, not reductions in what they actually received last year. In fact, in many of those cases, you will find they actually got an increase over last year.

Again, there are really three strategies that we have to deploy now. Again, one of them is to reduce those Federal interest rates. That is happening.

The second one is to put into place the President's tax cut proposal. It is going to be modified, but we have got to have it close enough to his proposal that it is going to make a difference in our economy. And I think that is going to happen.

And the third thing that we have to do is control government spending. That is going to be our challenge on this House floor. That is the one burden that is on the shoulders of each and every one of us. We have got to have enough leadership on both sides. Both sides of the aisle have to come together.

Now, I realize that the Democrats, especially the liberal leadership of the Democratic Party, the liberal side of that party, feels that they are an opposition government and may not join with us; but I can assure you that there are a number of conservative Democrats, as well as the Republicans, that will come together to try and control that government spending. We have got to do it, because if we do not, everyone in this Nation suffers as a result of this economy slowing down worse.

The last thing you want this economy to do is to slow down to the extent that we begin to lose consumer confidence. Last month consumer confidence was up, but the news released today tells us that consumer confidence is back down. The consumers have confidence when they have trust in their government, that government is going to control spending, when they know they are going to have more dol-

lars in their pocket as a result of a tax cut and when they know that the interest rate that they finance their home, that they pay their credit cards, that they pay for their new car, that that interest rate is going down. That is what restores or holds consumer confidence. That is the key ingredient out there for this economy.

Now, let me tell you about a missile we have got in the air. We really have two missiles right now in the air dealing with the economy. One is the hoof and mouth disease. Many of you have heard about the hoof and mouth disease. Let me tell my colleagues, let me distinguish at the very beginning of these remarks about the hoof and mouth disease. That is not the mad cow disease. There is a distinct difference between the mad cow disease and the hoof and mouth disease. The mad cow disease is a terrible disease. But the hoof and mouth disease, which is the one we are expecting sooner than later to appear somewhere in this country, humans do not contact it.

Now, humans can spread it. Humans can spread it simply through touch. It can be on the bottom of their shoes. This disease can actually spread through the air for, I think, 10 or 15 miles. But the hoof and mouth disease is not the deadly mad cow disease.

So when—I am not saying “if” because I think it is going to happen, but when there is an outbreak in this country of the hoof and mouth disease, the citizens of this country and our constituents should not panic. We have our Federal agencies coordinating. We have Joe over at the FEMA, we have the Department of Agriculture, we have the CIA, we have the Department of Interior. We are putting a lot of resources into trying to figure out when it hits, how to attack it, how to eliminate it, how to localize it and how to keep the public relations on it in such a way that people do not think it is the mad cow disease that has come into our country.

Now, if in fact we have that hoof and mouth disease and if in fact we let a phobia come out of that that creates some kind of lack of consumer confidence or some kind of panic amongst our consumers in regards to the beef industry, it could have a very negative, dramatic impact on our economy. I think it is incumbent upon all of us out there, and our constituents, not to panic if that hoof and mouth disease ends up in this country, to address it.

It is kind of like responding to a fire. I used to be a volunteer fireman and I used to be a police officer. The worst thing you can do as a police officer or a volunteer fireman, or any fireman, is to panic when you go to the scene of an accident or you go to the scene of a fire. We have got to remain calm.

Do not panic if this hoof and mouth disease shows up. One, you should rest assured that at least the government is going to do what we can do. What we are learning from what is happening over in the United Kingdom, fortu-

nately we were not the first ones out of the chute this time. We are learning from their trials and tribulations dealing with this hoof and mouth. So I think we are going to be able to address it. But we need help from you, we need help from your constituents and we need help from the consumers of America. Do not panic. Understand what it is.

Now, this leads me into the second so-called missile we have in the air. That is our energy crisis. During my meetings, and even the preceding speakers before I arrived here this evening, I heard criticizing the President about the energy policy. What kind of energy policy did Clinton have? He did not have an energy policy. There has not been an energy policy in this country for years. President Bush has only been in office for, what, 12 or 13 weeks and one of the first mandates this President placed on the American people was the fact we have to have an energy policy.

□ 2130

There are some things we should take a look at. We should have a big table, and we should place everything on the table. It does not mean it is going to happen, but it means we ought to talk about it. It means energy ought to be in most discussions we have in this country when we talk about the economy, when we talk about the health of the country.

What are our energy needs today? What are our energy shortages today? How are we going to mesh the two of these into the future? What are we going to do about California?

President Bush on a number of occasions has talked about California. Now I will say, I do not have a lot of sympathy for California. They have not allowed a power plant out there for 15 years. They have not allowed a natural gas transmission line for 8 years, 10 years. Some of the hardest-hitting radical environmental organizations in the country come out of California.

We have not had an inland refinery, which these organizations have opposed, built in this country for 25 years. I do not know how many years ago a nuclear facility was built.

My point is this: while you may not feel much sympathy for California, and I do not because they have kind of adopted the not-in-my-back-yard theory, the fact is that we have to put those emotional angers or lack of sympathy for a State like California aside. California is a State in the United States, and a lot of times what hurts California is going to hurt the rest of us. A lot of times what is bad for California is bad for the United States. We have to stand side by side with California. We have to stand side by side with every State in this Union and, as a team, determine what our energy policy will be.

That is exactly what the President of the United States has said. This is the United States. This is a country which

as a country must come up with some type of energy policy. One does not come up with a credible energy policy by pretending to address things, and not addressing them, that are somewhat painful. The fact is we are going to have to explore for more resources.

Conservation is an important issue and conservation can provide some of that gap that we have today, some of it, but not all of it. When we sit down and we talk frankly with each other, we know that we have to find some additional supplies of energy.

Now I heard a quote, I even wrote it down, from one of the previous speakers. Apparently he has visited some farm where they have enough wind generation; and he said if we could put this wind generation in place, it would supply the energy for all of the United States.

Come on. Give me a break. Show me where that is going to happen. If we had that capability, you do not think we would not have wind generation in this country right now in vast quantities?

I read an interesting thing, I think in the Wall Street Journal, today about wind generation. Some of our environmental organizations, and I think justifiably, are saying about wind generation, you are killing birds. Unfortunately, you are in a migration path and a lot of birds are going into your propellers on the wind mills and you can have acres and acres and acres and acres of wind mills and we are not producing much energy. Now that is not to say that we should not consider wind mill-generated power. We should. We should consider solar-generated power.

The fact is, we have a gap that we have to fill fairly quickly. The first way to begin to close that gap is conserve. We all are conserving right now.

The second way is to put an energy policy in place. Now let me mention to you why I am saying we are all conserving right now. I do not know about you, but a year and a half ago at my house, and I live high in the Rocky Mountains so in the winter it is cold, we need that heat, I can say that a year and a half ago, I admit it, I probably had my temperature on 68 degrees, 70 degrees in most of my house; and if I was chilled, I went into my house, and I did not think anything about moving the gas thermometer up to 80 or 85 to warm up for 30 minutes or so.

Well, that is not happening today. In fact, my wife just called me. She just called me about 2 hours ago and she said, Guess what our public service utility bill was for last month? 130 bucks.

A month ago it was 500-and-some dollars. We have changed our policies at our house, at my own home. Now when you go in a room in our house, we have thermometers that are set at 50 degrees, and maybe one is at 68 degrees. So I think across America all of us are beginning to conserve. It is an important part of it.

As the President has said, we need to figure out a new source of energy. Now

the President says put it on the table. Let us talk about ANWR. Let us talk about drilling off the Florida coast. Let us talk about where we can go and what can the Federal Government do to help with this energy crisis. Let us talk about lifting sanctions off Iraq and sanctions off some of the other countries we have that are oil-producing countries, that might put more oil on to the market as a result of those sanctions being lifted.

The President did not say let us adopt it. The President did not issue an executive order which were the favorites of the last administration we have, I might remind my liberal colleagues. The President did not say put it in place. He did not issue an executive order that said do it. He said let us consider it, put it on the table, put it up for debate.

What happens? How interesting. He puts it on the table, the President puts it on the table for debate; and the first thing we do is hear criticism after criticism. Worst environmental President we have ever had; it is a damage to the environment.

How interesting. These people that are screaming the loudest probably have their thermometers at 70 degrees at their house. They probably drive a car. They are probably wearing clothes that were produced by machinery. I mean, there is lots of energy consumption in this country by the very people that are being the most critical of this President who is saying, look, I am not saying we necessarily have to go with ANWR. I am not saying we necessarily should go off the coast of Florida. I am saying put it on the table and let us discuss it, because reasonable people can come to reasonable conclusions and reasonable conclusions lead to reasonable solutions. That is what we have to do.

This energy thing is nothing to laugh about. The situation in California, sure a lot of us may have chuckled about, well, California they got what they deserved; but the fact is it hurts California and it hurts the United States. We need to help California because, in turn, it helps us.

Take a look at the amount of agriculture that comes out of the State of California. I read a statistic the other day, and I think my recall of it is that if California were a country it would be like the third economic power in the world if it was a country of its own. We cannot simply disregard California. We cannot discount the problems that California is having. Nor can we discount the problems of the smallest State in the Union.

The fact is, we are a Union and we have to come together with an energy policy; and we expect our President to put forward some kind of structure so we can have that energy policy, and that is exactly what this President is doing.

Do you think the liberal Democrats are giving him credit for that? No, of course they are not. Do you think some

of these environmental organizations, Earth First and some of those type of characters, are giving him credit? No. They are out there fund-raising by screaming wolf, crying wolf.

Look, this is going to be a disaster. Where the disaster is going to come is if we sit and we do not put anything on the table for discussion and as a result we do not end up with an energy policy. This country needs it, and I think the President is exercising sound leadership in going forward.

I noticed a couple of my colleagues criticized, for example, the Kyoto Treaty. A lot of us now have heard about the Kyoto Treaty. This is not something that is new, by the way. What should be pointed out, President Bush did not kill the Kyoto Treaty. The Kyoto Treaty went down on a 99 to 0 vote. There was not one Democrat Senator, there was not one Republican Senator, who voted on Kyoto last year or the year before when it came up for a vote. Ninety-five to 0 is my understanding, or maybe it was 95 to 0; but I think it was zero in support of Kyoto.

Why? Because it was not balanced. Why? Because it was not fair to the United States. Why? Because it put such a burden on the United States that the United States would be at a distinct disadvantage in this world. That is why.

So the President, in talking about this, all of a sudden they see an opportunity to hang something on the President as being anti-environment. The people out there that are crying against the President on this environment, they better be prepared to come forward and have something to put on the table for our energy policy. I invite them to do that, by the way. I think all of us need to come to that table, but have something that is going to work.

I noticed that some people criticized the President's reduction in research in some alternative energy methods. Do you know why? They are not producing. Research is a nice, magical word; but after all of these years, after all of the billions of dollars they have put into particular research, if it is not giving production, if results are not received out of it, something different has to be done. That is what the President is proposing.

The easiest thing to do is say, well, I am for more research. It is easy for every one of us to go back to our districts and say, I am for more research. I am going to vote for more research for alternative energy. Count on me. I am going to solve the problem.

That is nothing but a stall. Every one of your constituents ought to say to you, hey, if you are going to support this research, what research are you supporting? What kind of results have you gotten? What kind of date in the future are we going to have this product? What is it going to mean to the energy gap that we have today? What is it going to mean for the energy gap that we are going to have tomorrow? You ought to be able to justify, you

ought to be required to justify, the research dollars that you are spending out there. If you cannot justify it, stand up.

That is how we got to the car, that is how we got to the airplane, that is how we got a person to the Moon, that is how we developed medicine, through research. But many people in the history of this country have had enough guts to say, look, the money we are spending on research today is not giving us what we need. Let us try a different path. Let us use a different approach. Do not keep throwing good money after bad money.

I think this President has stood up and taken leadership in that regard.

Now the easiest thing to do would be for the President to say, well, let us just do like the previous administration, no energy policy. Let us just pretend that California can work out of this on their own and it is not going to be a crisis. Let us just pretend that the research is going to give us the answers, because certainly I can stall it through the next 8 years of the Presidency. But this President is not that way. This President is a doer, and he wants something done about the energy crisis, and many of my colleagues on this House floor want something done about this energy crisis. But we better take it serious because it is serious out there. The disease, the energy disease, or whatever you want to call it, the energy shortage or the energy crisis that is in California today could be on your doorsteps tomorrow.

We need to conserve and we need to explore. We need to find other sources of energy. We need to look for alternative energy. There has got to be a combination, and you begin that with a map. It is just like a road map. We need to take a trip, and we have some pretty tough terrain to get over. The easiest way for us to take that trip is to have a road map; and if we do not have a road map, and in this case we do not have a road map, we do not have an energy policy, we need to make a road map. That is exactly what this President is proposing. It does not mean we are going to go over this mountain or that mountain, but every mountain ought to be laid out on our map. Every mountain ought to be laid out. Every trail ought to be looked at, to see whether that is the trail that we should take. That is exactly what the President is saying we should do. I support the President in regards to those efforts.

THE DEATH TAX SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I have talked about the economy. I have talked about the hoof and mouth disease, and we visited a little about energy. Let me visit a little about another issue that has come up consistently throughout my district, consistently in my travels throughout this Nation, and I think most of my colleagues have experienced it as well. I intend to follow up on my remarks tomorrow evening from the House floor here, but that is this death tax.

Now some may think that I am being repetitive about this, but there are some people out there that just do not get it. There are some people out there that are being swayed by the advertising of the billionaires who, by the way, not all billionaires but a select group of billionaires who have taken out ads in the Wall Street Journal and said we do not need this. To the person, every one of those people that signed on that Wall Street Journal article or advertisement that there should be a tax on death, every one of those families has already done their trust planning, their legal planning. They have had their attorneys figure out how they pay the least amount, how to protect them from those taxes upon their death.

□ 2145

In my opinion, they are acting very hypocritically. After they have provided protection for themselves and the death tax, they turn around to us representing the government, they say you should continue this tax against the rest of America. That is pretty inequitable.

Madam Speaker, I think when you talk about the death or estate tax, the first step you need to take is ask what is its history. What is its justification? Should death be a taxable event? Because somebody dies, should that be a reason for the government to jump in and tax on property, by the way, which has already been taxed. This property that we are talking about in my discussions on the death tax, this is not property which has escaped taxation, this is property which has been taxed already once but in some cases, two or three times; in some cases, for multigenerations.

So the first question you ask, should death be a taxable event. I venture to say that it should not be, no more than we should have a marriage penalty tax because you get married. This should be a country that encourages marriage. This should be a country that encourages one family farm, one generation to move it to the next generation, that one family business go to the next generation. That is what this country is about. This country, after all, is built on capitalism. This country is built on private property rights. This country is built on the concept that the government works for the people, the people do not work for the government.

So I do not think that you can justify death as a tax. Do you know where the history of this came about? It was in the days when people wanted to move this government towards a socialist-type of domineerance, to punish the people that were successful, to go after the Carnegies and the Rockefellers that amassed all of this wealth, and take that money back for redistribution of wealth. The old theory that you do not allow a person to be paid based on what they are worth, they are paid on what they need.

It brings to mind the Ayn Rand book, Atlas Shrugged. Read that book, col-

leagues, or listen to Books on Tape. Is that the direction that we want to go with this death tax. It has certainly been the direction we have gone since the death tax has been put into place.

Let me say I was at a meeting the other day, and a gentleman asked, Why do you worry so much about the death tax. Those kids are taken care of anyway. They do not need all of that money.

That is exactly the point. I am not talking about the billionaires that signed the ad in the New York Times, I am talking about the family, the small contractor who owns a pickup, a backhoe, maybe a shed to do his maintenance in and if he is killed on the job, what about the family's opportunity the next day to continue that small business. That is who I care about. That is who I am talking about. And the very point is those people do need it. Those people do need that business to continue on to the next generation, and in many cases the families are dependent upon that business.

I have an entire group of letters here, some of which I am going to read this evening who are impacted, not billionaires, how this has affected a lot of your neighbors, especially in an area like my district. In the Colorado mountains, our real estate values have continued to spiral at an increasing rate. So we have seen a challenge the likes we have never seen in the past on our family farms and our family ranches.

This death tax is not right. I was at another meeting and I had a lady who was very justified in her thoughts and very professional in her approach. She said what right do the children have to inherit this property. I said they have every right, but now I have had second thoughts about it. Under our concept of government, it is not the children's right to inherit, it is the parents' right to determine where their property, which they have accumulated by following the laws, by working hard, they have accumulated property, it is their right of private property which is a basic, fundamental part of our Constitution, a fundamental part of the government that we enjoy is the right of private property. It is without question, in my opinion, the right of the person who owns the property to determine where property will go after their death.

I do not think the government, who did not put out the risk, and the government had something to do with somebody obtaining property, I admit that, we have a government of laws, you do not have to worry about somebody stealing, but that is why you pay taxes. So the government has already gotten its share of taxes off the private property. I think it is the right of the owner of that property to determine to whom and in what amounts that property should pass after that person's death.

Let me tell you that the hardships, and I have experienced some of those hardships, I have seen them in the

communities, the hardships that are put on communities cannot be overlooked in this argument of whether or not a death tax is justified.

These people will argue, this New York Times ad and some of these multibillionaires that signed this ad, who have already protected or minimized the impact on their wealth, one of the points they make is that it only impacts the upper 2 percent of our society.

Let us put aside my arguments, do you have a right to tax death. Let us put that aside. Let us put aside the inequity of that, and let us say that 2 percent actually pay it. Take a look at what it does to the communities that those 2 percent live in. That money leaves those communities. If you have a small community in Iowa, and you have a family who has had a family farm for a couple of generations and they have seen a small escalation in property values, and the husband and the wife team that have made that farm a going operation pass away, and the government comes in and taxes that property and forces the sale of the farm, what do you think happens to that money of those 2 percent. Do you think that it stays in that small town in Iowa? Of course it does not. It is sucked out of that town in Iowa to Washington, D.C. A small percentage of it may stay with the State of Iowa. But by far the largest chunk, 75 percent or greater, goes to Washington, D.C.

Do you think the people in these Chambers or these Federal agencies put those dollars back into that farming community in Iowa? Of course they do not. That money is taken out of these communities. For all practical purposes, it is taken from the community forever. Those are local dollars that go to local charities that provide savings in our local banks, that allow for productivity, for creation of capital.

Why should the government come in after they have taxed these people during their entire lifetime, come back and once again upon their death seize this money. I do not think that you can justify it.

Let me read you a couple of letters that I think kind of hit home.

"Dear sir, My name is Chris Anderson. I am 24 years old, and I currently run a small mail-order business. I am not a constituent of yours. I currently reside in New Jersey." That is interesting because the previous speaker was from New Jersey.

"However, I have listened with great interest as you spoke this evening on the topic of the death tax, as you called it. I in all likelihood will not face, will not be impacted by the problems you were outlining, at least not in the near future. I am not in line to inherit a business. However, I am soon to be married, and I look forward to having a family and perhaps one day my children will want to follow in my footsteps with my business. I hope and pray that they will not face the additional grief caused by the death tax.

"A 55 percent tax is, at best, a huge burden on a family business and the loved ones of the deceased. At worst, it can be a death blow that ruins what could otherwise have been the future of yet another generation. This letter is not a plea for help. I just want to let you know that although I am not a victim of this tax, I appreciate and applaud your efforts against it. I firmly believe that Congress and the government at large needs to recognize that America's future is and will always be firmly rooted in the success of small business. Many of these businesses are family owned and need the next generation to continue them into the future. I spent a few years working for a small family-owned business, and not just myself but several workers depended on the income that they derived from working for this small business. I fear for those workers when the tax man comes knocking.

"This tax has claws that rip at many people, and many more people than the immediate family of the deceased. It is also a huge impact on the employees of small businesses. I hope you do the best you can to eliminate or to do something about this death tax."

Now, let me read another one. Tomorrow evening, by the way, I want to go into much more detail about the death tax and other impacts that it has on a community.

This evening as I read these letters, I begin to feel the hardships that these families have out there. And every one of you here, you know of an example where the death tax has devastated a community or devastated a family. You know how unjustified it can be.

Let me read another letter. "Roberta and I just finished watching your death tax speech. We were both very proud to watch you as you stated some real concerns and problems that we face with this unfair taxation."

I want to tell you, Mr. and Mrs. Schaffer, it is an unfair taxation. It is not only an unfair taxation, it is the most unjustified taxation in our entire system.

"As you so well know, farming and ranching out here is no slam-dunk. If our farm is ultimately faced with this death tax, there is absolutely no way that we could ever afford and justify holding on to our family farm. This in turn will prevent us from allowing this farm to go on to future generations. It will keep our farm from becoming one more development out in the country. In other words, keep it as open space, and most of us have deep appreciation for open space. It will not keep it available to the wildlife, the deer and the elk. In fact, for your interest, we saw over 600 head of elk on the farm this morning. It will not keep it available for unencumbered natural gas productions.

"Scott, we are only able to meet the daily operating costs of our farm under the present economic conditions of agriculture. Unless there is a positive action taken by Congress on this death

tax problem, we will start having to make necessary plans to arrange our affairs so that our family can somehow struggle to make it to the next generation. By the way, there is no way we are going to let you," meaning Washington, "and the IRS come and take it from us. The government does not deserve it. Of course, in order to protect our land, it will make it necessary to begin destruction of the land: The development of one of the largest open space areas of our county. Our land is quite valuable if it were broken up into subdivisions, and the only way we can keep the government's hands off it, if you do not do something about this death tax, is to break up our farm and sell it as a subdivision; therefore, having the money to once again pay taxes to the government on property which has already been taxed."

Let me read you the next one. Mr. Allen says, "I am writing to encourage you to keep up the repeal of the death tax on the front burner."

Mr. Allen goes on to say, "As the owner of a family business, it is extremely important that upon our death, the business be able to be passed on to our son and daughter, both of whom work in this business, without the threat of having to liquidate our business, to sell our business off to pay inheritance taxes on assets which have already been taxed by the government. Of all of the taxes we pay, the death tax truly represents double or triple taxation.

"I am aware that several wealthy people, i.e. William Gates, Sr., George Soros, and other multibillionaires, have come out against a repeal of the death tax. This is one of the most self-serving demonstrations I have ever seen. They have theirs in trusts. They have theirs in foundations. They have theirs in offshore accounts. They have hired a fleet of attorneys to protect their interests; and of course they will pay little or no tax because they have protected their assets. Whatever their political motivations are, they certainly do not represent or speak for the vast majority of small farmers and business owners in this country. Again, I urge you to push for repeal of the death tax."

□ 2200

This is from Mr. Happy. "I am watching you as you are talking about the death tax and the marriage tax. I wish there was some way I could help you to get these taxes eliminated."

Mr. Happy goes on to say, "They are the most discriminatory taxes and socialistic taxes that our entire system could envision. I can't for the life of me understand how they got put into place to start with."

Well, as I mentioned, Mr. Happy, they got put into place because it was a way to go after the Carnegies and the Rockefellers. It was when this country was moving towards a socialistic government. They certainly did not go into place, Mr. Happy, as a result of the theory of capitalism.

"How could anyone advocate taxing somebody twice and three times. I don't care if it is a millionaire or a pauper. It is not the government's money." And in this letter, Mr. Happy has in this, "It is not the government's money" in capital letters.

Let me repeat what he said: "How could anyone advocate taxing someone two or three times. I don't care if it is a millionaire or a pauper. It is not the government's property. The taxes have been paid," and once again, in full capital letters, the word "paid." "The taxes have been paid. I have been considering divorcing my wife of 48 years and just living together, filing single tax returns because of the marriage penalty, or just filing separately. Why should a family who have been together for 45 years, who have paid taxes on time every year, be forced into the position of losing the property that they have spent their entire life accumulating, or be penalized because they have a marriage of 48 years? Can you answer that?"

Mr. Happy, I cannot answer it, other than the fact to tell you that there are some people here who believe in the redistribution of wealth, who believe somehow in justification of a death tax or tax upon somebody's death.

Let me just wrap this up with one other letter, and then I intend to continue this later this week, because I feel so strongly about the fact that the government should not be taxing death. Mr. Frazier writes me: "I was encouraged by the State of the Union and the President's \$1.6 trillion in tax relief. We have operated a family partnership since the 1930s," that is what Mr. Frazier says, since the 1930s they have operated a family ranch. "My parents died about 5 years apart in the 1980s and the estate tax on each of their one-fifth interest was three to four times more than what they paid for the ranch when they purchased it in 1946." In other words, his father and mother, who only owned one-fifth interest in this ranch, each paid more taxes on their one-fifth interest than they paid when they originally bought the ranch.

"Eliminating the death tax and the marriage penalty and reducing tax rates across the board will go a long ways in providing jobs. This, in turn, will enable hard-working families in our cattle country to pass their heritage on to the next generation and to continue to provide safe, wholesome beef to consumers around the world."

Remember, a lot of these people, they are not so interested in the business, it is the heritage of their farms, the heritages of their businesses that they want to pass to the next generation. That is something our country should encourage. Heritage has a lot of value. "I have three sons involved in our operation and a grandson starting college next fall, and it is important that we keep agriculture viable, to keep our beef industry from becoming integrated. We need to make it possible for

our youth to be able to stay on our ranches and farms."

These are not letters that I put together over at my office. These are letters that have been sent to my office by families in America, not the multi-billionaires that signed that New York Times ad who have already protected their wealth from government taxation. These are people whose lives will be devastated because the government continues on its path of considering death a taxable event.

Well, I have enjoyed my time this evening. We started out by discussing the economy and we have a multistage strategy that we must deploy in regards to our economy. We have to continue to have Mr. Greenspan lower the rates. He is going to do that to the extent that he can. We have to put a tax cut into place, and we have got to control government spending.

I moved from our economy to our energy policy this evening. I said that we need an energy policy. The previous administration did not have one; this administration in its first few days in office said, we need an energy policy, and they are willing to stand up and put everything on the table. Now, that does not mean it is going to be utilized, but it does mean we can discuss it and we, all of us as a team, Democrats and Republicans, must come together for an energy policy.

Finally, I have wrapped up with the discussion on the death tax. I intend later this week when I have an opportunity to speak again to go into more detail on the severe impact that this death tax has on American families. It is severe.

WAKE UP, AMERICA: ENGAGEMENT WITH CHINA HAS FAILED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight, approximately 58 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, one month ago, the Communist regime that controls the mainland of China attacked an American surveillance aircraft while it was in international waters. After being knocked out of the sky, 24 American military personnel, the crew of the surveillance craft, were held hostage for nearly 2 weeks. The Communist Chinese blamed us and would not return the crew until the United States was humiliated before the world.

Wake up, America. What is going on here? Large financial interests in our country whose only goal is exploiting the cheap, near-slave labor of China have been leading our country down the path to catastrophe. How much more proof do we need that the so-called engagement theory is a total failure? Our massive investment in China, pushed and promoted by American billionaires and multinational

corporations, has created not a more peaceful, democratic China, but an aggressive nuclear-armed bully that now threatens the world with its hostile acts and proliferation. Do the Communist Chinese have to murder American personnel or attack the United States or our allies with their missiles before those who blithely pontificate about the civilizing benefits of building the Chinese economy will admit that China for a decade has been going in the opposite direction than predicted by the so-called "free traders."

We have made a monstrous mistake, and if we do not face reality and change our fundamental policies, instead of peace, there will be conflict. Instead of democratic reform, we will see a further retrenchment of a regime that is run by gangsters and thugs, the world's worst human rights abusers.

Let us go back to basics. The mainland of China is controlled by a rigid, Stalinistic Communist party. The regime is committing genocide in Tibet. It is holding as a captive the designated successor of the Dalai Lama, who is the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. By the way, this person, the designated new leader, is a little boy. They are holding hostage a little boy in order to terrorize the Tibetan people. The regime is now, at this moment, arresting thousands of members of the Falun Gong, which is nothing more threatening than a meditation and yoga society. Christians of all denominations are being brutalized unless they register with the state and attend controlled churches. Just in the last few days, there has been a roundup of Catholics who were practicing their faith outside of state control. Now they are in a Chinese prison.

There are no opposition parties in China. There is no free press in China. China is not a free society under anyone's definition. More importantly, it is not a society that is evolving toward freedom.

President Richard Nixon first established our ties with the Communist Chinese in 1972 at the height of the Cold War. That was a brilliant move. At that particular moment, it was a brilliant move. It enabled us to play the power of one dictatorship off the power of another dictatorship. We played one against the other at a time when we had been weakened by the Vietnam War and at a time when Soviet Russia was on the offensive.

During the Reagan years, we dramatically expanded our ties to China, but do not miss the essential fact that justified that relationship and made it different than what has been going on these last 10 years. China was at that time, during the Reagan administration, evolving toward a freer, more open society, a growing democratic movement was evident, and the United States, our government and our people, fostered this movement. Under President Reagan, we brought tens of thousands of students here, and we sent

teams from our National Endowment for Democracy there. We were working with them to build a more democratic society, and it looked like that was what was going to happen. All of this ended, of course, in Tiananmen Square over 10 years ago.

Thousands of Chinese gathered there in Tiananmen Square in Beijing to demand a more open and democratic government. For a moment, it appeared like there had been a historic breakthrough. Then, from out of the darkness came battle-hardened troops and tanks to wipe out the opposition. The people who ordered that attack are still holding the reins of power in China today and, like all other criminals who get away with scurrilous deeds, they have become emboldened and arrogant.

My only lament is that had Ronald Reagan been President during that time of Tiananmen Square, things, I think, would have been different; but he was not. Since that turn of events about 12 years ago, things have been progressively worse. The repression is more evident than ever. The belligerence and hostility of Beijing is even more open. Underscoring the insanity of it all, the Communist Chinese have been using their huge trade surplus with the United States to upgrade their military and expand its warfighting capabilities.

Communist China's arsenal of jets, its ballistic missiles, its naval forces have all been modernized and reinforced. In the last 2 years, they have purchased destroyers from the former Soviet Union. These destroyers are armed with Sunburn missiles. These were systems that were designed during the Cold War by the Russians to destroy American aircraft carriers.

Yes, the Communist Chinese are arming themselves to sink American aircraft carriers, to kill thousands upon thousands of American sailors. Make no mistake about it, China's military might now threatens America and world peace. If there is a crisis in that part of the world again, which there will be, we can predict that some day, unlike the last crisis when American aircraft carriers were able to become a peaceful element to bring moderation of judgment among the players who were in conflict, instead, American aircraft carriers will find themselves vulnerable, and an American President will have to face the choice of risking the lives of all of those sailors on those aircraft carriers.

Mr. Speaker, how is it, then, that a relatively poor country can afford to enlarge its military in such a way, to the point that it can threaten a superpower such as the United States of America?

□ 2215

Even as China's slide into tyranny and militarism continued in these last 12 years, the United States government has permitted a totally indefensible economic rules of engagement to guide

our commercial ties with the mainland of China.

While China was going in the right direction, permitting that country to have a large trade advantage and thus providing a large reserve of hard currency may or may not have made sense, as long as China was going in the right direction and going towards democracy. Maybe we would like to build up a freer China that way.

But it made no sense, and it still makes no sense, for the United States to permit a country that is sinking even deeper into tyranny and into anti-Western hostility to have a huge trade surplus as a resource to call upon to meet their military needs.

In effect, the Communist Chinese have been using the tens of billions of dollars of trade surplus with the United States each year to build their military power and military might so some day the Communist Chinese might be able to kill millions of our people, or at least to threaten us to do that in order to back us down into defeat without ever coming to a fight.

We have essentially been arming and equipping our worst potential enemy and financing our own destruction. How could we let such a crime against the security of our country happen? Well, it was argued by some very sincere people that free trade would bring positive change to China, and that engagement would civilize the Communist regime.

Even as evidence stacked upon more evidence indicated that China was not liberalizing, that just the opposite was happening, the barkers for open markets kept singing their song: "Most-favored-nation status, just give us this and things will get better." It was nonsense then and it is nonsense today. But after all that has happened, one would think that the shame factor would silence these eternal optimists.

Perhaps I am a bit sensitive because, first and foremost, let me state unequivocally that I consider myself a free trader. Yes, I believe in free trade between free people. What we should strive for is to have more and more open trade with all free and democratic countries, or countries that are heading in the right direction.

I am thus positively inclined towards President Bush's efforts to establish a free trade zone among the democratic countries in this hemisphere. I will read the fine print, but my inclination is to facilitate trade between democracies.

When I say, "I will read the fine print," I will be especially concerned with a free trade agreement, and I will be looking to that free trade agreement to make sure that we have protection that our sensitive technologies, which can be used for military purposes, will not be transferred from the countries in our hemisphere, democratic countries in our hemisphere, to China or to any other countries that are potential enemies of the United States. This will have to be in that free trade agreement.

There will have to be protections against the transfer of our technology to our enemies. This is more of a concern following new science and technology agreements that were signed by China and countries like Brazil and Venezuela recently. Dictatorships are always going to try to gain in any agreement that they have with us, and they are always going to try to manipulate other agreements and the rules of the game so they can stay in power.

When one applies the rules of free trade to a controlled society, as we have been told over and over again, more trade, and let us have free trade with China, that is going to make them more dependent on us and they will be freer and more prosperous, more likely to be peaceful people, well, if we apply the rules of free trade to a dictatorship, ultimately what happens is that it is only free trade in one direction.

On one end we have free people, a democratic people who are not controlled by their government, and thus are basically unregulated and are moving forward for their own benefit. But on the other end, the trade will be controlled and manipulated to ensure that the current establishment of that country stays in power.

Never has that been more evident than in America's dealing with Communist China. In this case, it is so very blatant.

Those advocating most-favored-nation status, or as it is called now, normal trade relations, have always based their case on the boon to our country represented by the sale of American goods to "the world's largest market." That is their argument. Here on this floor over and over and over again we heard people say, "We have to have these normal trade relations because we have to sell our products, the products made by the American people, to the world's largest market."

That is a great pitch. The only problem is, it is not true. The sale of U.S.-produced vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, autos, you name the commercial item, are almost a non-factor in the trade relationship between our countries. They are a minuscule amount of what is considered the trade analysis of these two countries.

During these many years that we have given China most-favored-nation status or normal trade relations, the power elite there never lowered China's tariffs, and in fact increased the tariffs in some areas, and erected barriers to prevent the sale of all but a few U.S.-made products.

So while we had low tariffs, and intentionally brought our tariffs down by most-favored-nation, for over a decade, even as China was slipping more into tyranny, they were permitted to have high tariffs and block our goods from coming in.

Beijing would not permit its own people to buy American-made consumer items. They were not looking for a trade relationship with the United States for their people to be able to

buy American products. That is not what they were looking for. That is not what it was all about. They knew it, but yet our people were told over and over and over and over and over again, "Oh, we have to have most-favored-nation status and normal trade relations in order to sell American products to the world's largest market."

That is not what was going on. It is not what the reality was. Instead, the Communist Chinese were out to get American money, lots of it, and American money to build factories, and they wanted the Americans to build the factories with our technology and our money in their country.

By the way, many of the factories that were built there were not built in order to sell products to the Chinese people. Those factories were built to export products to the United States.

The system that developed with the acquiescence of our government, and this is no secret, what I am talking about tonight is no secret to anyone except to the American people, our government acquiesced to this for years, this policy put the American people, the American working people, on the losing end of the transformational action in the long run and sometimes even in the medium run.

The Chinese, because of our low tariffs, flooded our market with their products, and blocked our goods from entering China, and all the while we were hearing over and over again, "We must have most-favored-nation status in order to sell American products in the world's largest market."

They droned on year after year that most-favored-nation status was so important to selling our products in the world's largest market. I will just repeat that four or five times, because we must have heard it a thousand times on this floor, and every time said, I am sure, in complete sincerity by the people who were expressing it, but were totally wrong. A very quick look into the statistics could have indicated that.

By the way, just to let Members know, the people of Taiwan, numbering 22 million people, buy more from us annually than the 1.2 Chinese on the mainland. The Taiwanese, with 22 million people, buy more consumer products from us than do 1.2 billion Chinese in the mainland.

What has happened? What has happened as a result of these nonsensical counterproductive policies, anti-American policies to some degree, even though our own government has acquiesced in them? It has resulted in a decline in domestic manufacturing facilities in the United States. In other words, we have been closing down our factories and putting our people out of work.

By the way, that does not mean the company is put out of business. Those factories spring up someplace else. There is this flood of Chinese products, the factory closes down, and guess where it reopens? It reopens, yes, in Communist China, using our modern

technology and our capital, which is what the Chinese want to have invested in their country.

Adding insult to injury, our working people, some of them, whose jobs are being threatened by imports, our working people are being taxed in order to provide taxpayer-subsidized loans and loan guarantees for those corporate leaders wishing to close down their operations in the United States and set up on the mainland of China.

Even if China was a free country, that would not be a good idea. I do not believe we should be doing that even for democratic countries. But for us to do that to a Communist dictatorship or any kind of dictatorship, to have the American taxpayer subsidize these investments, taking the risks on the shoulders of the American taxpayer in order to build the economy of a vicious dictatorship, this is insane. This is an insane policy. This is not free trade between free people. It has nothing to do with free trade. It is subsidized trade with subjugated people.

Companies that were permitted to sell their product to the Chinese in these last 10 years, and there have been a few, companies like Boeing who have attempted to sell airplanes to China, have found themselves in a very bad predicament. As part of the deal enabling them to sell planes now to Communist China, they have had to set up manufacturing facilities in China to build the parts, or at least some of the parts for the airplane.

Thus, over a period of time, what the Chinese have managed to do is to have the United States just build factories and pay for them. Or, as part of an agreement to sell the airplane, we have set up an aerospace industry in China that will compete with our own aerospace industry.

I come from California. I come from a district in which aerospace is a mighty important part of our economy. I just want to thank all the people who have permitted this policy, this blackmail of American companies, to go on under the name, under the guise of free trade. It is going to sell out our own national interest 10 years down the road when these people will have a modern aerospace industry building weapons and being able to undercut our own people. Gee, thanks.

Making matters worse, many of the so-called companies in China that are partnering with American industrialists, and American industrialists, when they are going to build in China, are often required to have a Chinese company as their partner as a prerequisite to them investing in China, in short order these so-called partners end up taking over the company. So many of American companies have been there and have been burned.

Guess what, we look at these private Chinese companies that were partners with our American firms, we look at them, and what do we find out? They are not private companies at all. Many of them are subsidiaries of the People's

Liberation Army. That is right, the Communist Chinese army owns these companies. These are nothing more than military people in civilian clothing. Their profits end up paying for weapons targeting America, and we are paying them to build the companies that make those profits.

Perhaps the most alarming betrayal of American national security interests surfaced about 5 years ago when some of America's biggest aerospace firms went into China hoping to use Chinese rockets to launch American satellites.

□ 2230

They were trying to make a fast buck. It did not cost them a lot more to launch satellites here.

Yes, the Chinese were insisting that any satellites we put up for them be put up on their rockets. I personally thought that, as long as we made sure there was no technology transfer, that was an okay policy. As long as we just launched our American satellite which helped them set up a telephone system or something in China, that is fine if they never got ahold of it, and that would be okay.

I was guaranteed, along with the other Members of this body, there would be incredible safeguards. The last administration briefed us on the safeguards. Then as soon as we approved of letting these satellite deals go through and our satellites be launched on Chinese rockets, the administration trash canned all of the safeguards. I do not understand it. I do not understand why people did this.

But when all was said and done, the Communist Chinese rocket arsenal was filled with more reliable and more capable rockets, thanks to Loral, Hughes and other aerospace firms. Communist Chinese rockets, which were a joke 10 years ago, when Bill Clinton became President of the United States, they were a joke, one out of 10 failed, exploded before they could get into space. Today they are dramatically more likely to hit their targets, and they even carry multiple warheads. Where before they had one warhead and nine out of 10 would explode, now about 9 out of 10 get to their target, and some of them are carrying multiple warheads.

The Cox report detailed this travesty. We should not forget the Cox report. Unfortunately, there has been innuendo after innuendo as if the Cox report has in some way been proven wrong. There are no reports that indicate that what the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and his task force proved has in some way been discredited. In fact, there was a transfer of technology to the Communist Chinese that did great damage to our national security and put millions of American lives at risk that did not have to be put at risk.

Yet, even with all this staring Congress in the face, we have continued to give Most Favored Nations status to China and even now vote to make them

part of the World Trade Organization. Why? One explanation, well just bad theory. Expanding trade, of course, they believe will make things better. But expanding trade did not make things better. Expanding trade with a dictatorship, as I have mentioned, just expands the power base and solidifies the bad guys in power.

Of course the other explanation of why all this is going on, why we end up seeing our national security trashed is pure greed on some individuals' parts.

Our businessmen have been blinded, not by the dream of selling U.S.-made products to China as they would have you believe in the debates here on the floor of the House, but rather blinded by the vision of using virtually slave labor for quick profits on the mainland of China.

With little or no competition, no negotiators, no lawyers, no environmental restrictions, no unions, no public consent, it sounds like a businessman's dream to me. Yes, it is a businessman's dream if you just blot out the picture of a grinding tyranny and the human rights abuses that are going on and the horrible threat to the United States of America that is emerging because of the things that are going on and the things that are being done.

Because you are a businessman, because you are engaged in making a profit as we are free to do in the United States does not exempt you from being a patriot or being loyal to the security interests of the United States of America.

Today's American overseas businessman quite often is a far cry from the Yankee clipper captains of days gone by. In those days, our Yankee clipper ships sailed the ocean, cut through those seas, the Seven Seas. They were full going over, and they were full coming back. They waived our flag. Our flag was flying from those clipper ships, and our flag stood for freedom and justice. Those Yankee clipper captains and those business entrepreneurs were proud to be Americans.

Today, America's tycoons often see nationalism, read that loyalty to the United States, as an antiquated notion. They are players in the global economy now, they feel. Patriotism they believe is old think.

Well, we cannot rely on the decisions of people like this to determine what the interests of the United States of America is to be. Yet, the influence of these billionaires and these tycoons, these people who would be willing to invest in a dictatorship or a democracy, they could care less which one, they do not care if there is blood dripping off the hand that hands them the dollar bills, those individuals influence our government. Their influence on this elected body is monumental, if not insurmountable at times.

I believe in capitalism. I am a capitalist. I am someone who believes in the free enterprise system, make no mistake about it. But free is the ulti-

mate word. People must be free to be involved in enterprise. We must respect the basic tenets of liberty and justice that have provided us a country in which people are free to uplift themselves through hard work and through enterprise.

Today, more often than not, we are talking about how people are trying to find out ways of manipulating government on how to make a profit, not how to build a better product that will enrich everyone's life and make a profit by doing that, which is the essence of the free enterprise system.

More and more people are not even looking again to this great country and considering this great country for the role that it is playing in this world and how important it is and how we should never sacrifice the security of this country. Because if this country falls, the hope for freedom and justice everywhere in the world falls. No, instead they have put their baskets, not in the United States of America, put their eggs in the basket of globalism. Well, globalism will not work without democratic reform.

China will corrupt the WTO, the World Trade Organization, just as it has corrupted the election processes in the United States of America. You can see it now 20 years from now, maybe 10 years from now, the panels of the WTO, you know, made up of countries from all over the world, Latin America, Africa, Middle East. There are members of those panels making these decisions, they will not have ever been elected by anybody, much less the people of the United States of America, yet we will be expected to follow their dictates. Communist China, they will pay those people off in a heartbeat. Why not? They did it to our people.

Remember the campaign contributions given to Vice President Gore at the Buddhist Temple? Remember the money delivered to the Clinton's by Johnny Chung? Where did that money come from? We are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars. Where did it come from? It originated with Chinese military officers. These military officers were wearing civilian clothes. They were top officers in that part of the People's Liberation Army that produces missiles. That is where the money came from, all this while our most deadly missile technology was being transferred to Communist China. One wonders why the Communist Chinese leaders are arrogant and think that American leaders are cowards and corrupt when we let this happen.

Our country has, in short, had a disastrously counterproductive policy. We have, over the last 10 years, built our worst potential enemy from a weak, introverted power into a powerful economic military force, a force that is looking to dominate all of Asia. When I say worst potential enemy, that is not just my assessment. That is what the Communist Chinese leaders themselves believe and are planning for.

Why do you think Communist Chinese Boss Jiang Zemin recently visited Cuba? He was in Cuba with Fidel Castro who hates our guts when he released the hostages, the American military personnel that he was holding hostage. What do you think that was all about? He was telling the whole world we are standing up to the United States of America, and they are our enemy. He was involved with an activity that was declaring to the world his hostility towards the United States.

Why, when you have a country like this who are professing hostility to the United States and doing such as this, why are we permitting them to buy up ports that will effectively give them control of the Panama Canal, which is what they did a year and a half ago.

The Panama Canal, the last administration let the Chinese, the Communist Chinese, through bribery, tremendously expand its power in Panama and, through bribery, let it get control of the port facilities at both ends of the Panama Canal. Why would we let such a thing happen?

In many ways, we are repeating history. In the 1920s, Japanese militarists wiped out Japan's fledgling democratic movement. That it did. In doing so, it set a course for Japan. Japan then was a racist power which believed it, too, had a right to dominate Asia. Japanese militarists also knew that only the United States of America stood in their way. This is *deja vu* all over again as Yogi Berra once said.

The Communist Chinese, too, are militarists who seek to dominate Asia. They think they are racially superior to everyone. They are unlike their Japanese predecessors, however, willing to go slow, and they have been going slow. But make no mistake about it, they intend to dominate Asia, all of it. And even know, their maps claim Siberia, Mongolia and huge chunks of the South China Sea.

The confrontation with our surveillance plane must be reviewed in this perspective if the damage to the United States and the imprudence and arrogance on the part of the communist Chinese are to be understood.

China's claim on the South China Sea includes the Spratley Islands. I have a map of the South China Sea with me tonight. Hainan Island. Our airplane was intercepted, knocked out of the sky somewhere in here. But what we are not told about and what the media is not focusing on and no one has been talking about is this plane was precisely in the waters between Hainan Island and the Spratley Islands.

For those who do not know what the Spratley Islands are, they are just a series of reefs that are under water at high tide and at low tide above water. They are just a short distance, as you can see, this is here, this is the Philippines; and right about 100 miles offshore, the Spratley Islands. Yet they are several hundred miles from China. Yet the Chinese are trying to claim these islands. That is what this was all

about. Not only are these islands, the Spratley Islands, the home of natural gas and oil deposits, but they are also in a strategic location.

□ 2245

The Spratly Islands, having them in China's power, having them being recognized as part of China, would, of course, be a disaster to the Philippines whose oil and gas that belongs to, but also it would give the Communist Chinese sovereignty rights which would permit them to bracket the South China Sea. China, Hainan Island, the Spratlys would bracket the South China Sea, from this land point to this land point. Thus, we have a situation where when China claims, which it does, a 200-mile zone, that would leave China with a stranglehold on the South China Sea which is one of the most important commercial areas on this planet. It would have a stranglehold on Japan and Korea.

What do you think our friends in the Persian Gulf, for example, would think about it if they understood that this was a power play, that what we had with the surveillance aircraft was a power play? The reason why the Communist Chinese were demanding an apology then, they were demanding an apology because supposedly we were in their airspace. If we apologized, that was a recognition of their sovereignty in bracketing with the Spratly Islands on one side and Hainan Island on the other side, bracketing the South China Sea. If we ended up apologizing to the Communist regime, it would have been taken as a legal recognition, a small one, of their sovereignty and their 200-mile limit. That is what this was all about. That is why they were playing hardball with us.

The American people and our allies are not being told that that is what the stakes were. This is a long-term effort on the part of the Communist Chinese to dominate the South China Sea and expand their power so they could call it maybe the Communist China Sea rather than the South China Sea. It behooves us to face these facts. That is what it was all about. That is why they wanted an apology and that is why they should not have gotten an apology.

I applaud this administration for wording its letter in a way that was not and could not in any way be interpreted as a recognition of the Chinese sovereignty over that airspace. An accommodationist policy toward Communist China, ignoring this type of aggression, ignoring human rights and democracy concerns while stressing expanded trade, and even through all this you have a bunch of people saying, "Oh, isn't it lucky we have trade relations or we would really be in trouble with the Communist Chinese." Give me a break. But ignoring those other elements and just stressing trade as part of a so-called engagement theory has not worked.

The regime in China is more powerful, more belligerent to the United

States and more repressive than ever before. President Bush's decision in the wake of this incident at Hainan Island to sell an arms package to Taiwan including destroyers, submarines and an antiaircraft upgrade was good. At least it shows more moxie than what the last administration did.

I would have preferred to see the Aegis system be provided to our Taiwanese friends. But at least we have gone forward with a respectable arms deal that will help Taiwan defend itself and thus deter military action in that area.

But after the Hainan Island incident, the very least we should be doing is canceling all U.S. military exchanges with Communist China. I mean, I do not know if they are still delivering us those berets or not, but that is just ridiculous to think that we are getting our military berets from Communist China. We should cancel all military exchanges.

The American people should be put on alert that they are in danger if they travel to the mainland of China. And we should quit using our tax dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the IMF and the World Bank to subsidize big business when they want to build a factory in China or in any other dictatorship.

Why are we helping Vietnam and China? Why are we helping those dictatorships when nearby people, the people of the Philippines, whom I just mentioned, who are on the front line against this Communist aggression, who China is trying to flood drugs into their country. The Chinese army itself is involved in the drug trade going into the Philippines.

The Philippines are struggling to have a democracy. They have just had to remove a president who is being bribed. Bribed by whom? Bribed by organized crime figures from the mainland of China. When those people in the Philippines are struggling, why are we not trying to help them? Let us not encourage American businesses to go to Vietnam or to Communist China, when you have got people right close by who are struggling to have a democratic government and love the United States of America. The people of the Philippines are strong and they love their freedom and their liberty, but they feel like they have been abandoned by the United States. And when we help factories to be set up in China rather than sending work to the Philippines, and they do not even have the money to buy the weapons to defend themselves in the Philippines. That is why it is important for us to stand tall, so they know they can count on us. But they can only count on us if we do what is right and have the courage to stand up.

The same with China and India. India is not my favorite country in the world, but I will tell you this much, the Indians are struggling to have a free and democratic society. They have democratic institutions, and it is a struggle because they have so many

varied people that live in India. But they are struggling to make their country better and to have a democratic system and to have rights and have a court system that functions, to have opposition newspapers. They do not have any of that in China. Yet instead of helping the Indian people, we are helping the Communist Chinese people? This is misplaced priorities at best.

Finally, in this atmosphere of turmoil and confrontation, let us never forget who are our greatest allies, and that is the Chinese people themselves. Let no mistake in the wording that I have used tonight indicate that I hold the Chinese people accountable or synonymous with the Chinese Government or with Beijing or with the Communist Party in China. The people of China are as freedom-loving and as pro-American as any people of the world.

The people of China are not separated from the rest of humanity. They too want freedom and honest government. They want to improve their lives. They do not want a corrupt dictatorship over them. And any struggle for peace and prosperity, any plan for our country to try to bring peace to the world and to bring a better life and to support the cause of freedom must include the people of China.

We do not want war. We want the people of China to be free. Then we could have free and open trade because it would be a free country and it would be free trade between free people instead of this travesty that we have today, which is a trade policy that strengthens the dictatorship.

When the young people of China rose up and gathered together at Tiananmen Square, they used our Statue of Liberty as a model for their own goddess of liberty. That was the statue that they held forth. That was their dream. They dreamed that her torch, the goddess of liberty, would enlighten all China and they dreamed of a China democratic, prosperous and free. Our shortsighted policy of subsidized one-way trade crushes that goddess of liberty every bit as much as those Red Army tanks did 12 years ago.

Let us reexamine our souls. Let us reexamine our policies. Let us reach out to the people of China and claim together that we are all people of this planet, as our forefathers said, we are the ones, we are the people who have been given by God the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That is not just for Americans. That is for all the people of the world. And when we recognize that and reach out with honesty and not for a quick buck, not just to make a quick buck and then get out, but instead to reach over to those people and help them build their country, then we will have a future of peace and prosperity.

It will not happen if we sell out our own national security interests. It will not happen if we are only siding with the ruling elite in China. We want to share a world with the people of China. We are on their side.

Let me say this. That includes those soldiers in the People's Liberation Army. The people in the People's Liberation Army come from the population of China. They and those other forces at work in China should rise up and join with all the other people in the world, especially the American people, who believe in justice and truth; and we will wipe away those people at the negotiating table today that represent both sides of this negotiation, and we will sit face-to-face with all the people in the world who love justice and freedom and democracy, just as our forefathers thought was America's rightful role, and we will build a better world that way.

We will not do it through a World Trade Organization. We will do it by respecting our own rights and respecting the rights of every other country and every other people on this planet.

I hope that tonight the American people have heard these words. The course is not unalterable. This is a new administration. And in this new administration, I would hope that we reverse these horrible mistakes that have compromised our national security and undermined the cause of liberty and justice.

I look forward to working with this administration to doing what is right for our country and right for the cause of peace and freedom.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and until 1:00 p.m. April 25 on account of official business.

Mr. HOLDEN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

- Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. VISCLOSKEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

- Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. ESHOO, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Members (at the request of Mr. RADANOVICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
- Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. RADANOVICH, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, April 26.
- Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, May 1.
- Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. FERGUSON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, on April 25.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to further national security, foreign policy, and economic competitiveness, promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations; in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the involvement of the Government of Libya in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 5, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

- H.R. 132. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the "Goro Hokama Post Office Building."
- H.R. 395. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida, as the "Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 2001, at 10 a.m.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On December 15, 2000:

H.R. 1653. To complete the orderly withdrawal of the NOAA from the civil administration of the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, and to assist in the conservation of coral reefs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2903. To reauthorize the Striped Bass Conservation Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4577. Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4656. To authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the lake Tahoe Basin to the Wahoe County School District for use as an elementary school site.

H.R. 4942. H.R. Making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5016. To redesignate the facility of the United States Postal service located at 514 Express Center Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the "J.T. Weeker Service Center".

H.R. 5210. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located 200 South George Street in York, Pennsylvania, as the "George Atlee Goodling Post Office Building".

H.R. 5461. To amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management eliminate the wasteful and unsortmanlike practice of shark finning.

H.R. 5528. To authorize the construction of a Wakpa Sica Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierce, South Dakota, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5630. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5640. To expand homeownership in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.J. RES. 133. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On December 20, 2001:

H.R. 207. To amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority under which comparability allowances may be paid to Government physician retirement purposes.

H.R. 1795. To amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering.

H.R. 2570. To require the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a study regarding methods to commemorate the national significance of the United States roadways that comprise the Lincoln Highway, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2816. To establish a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement in deterring, investigating, and prosecuting computer crimes.

H.R. 3594. To repeal the modification of the installment method.

H.R. 3756. To establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4020. To authorize the addition of land to Sequoia National Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4907. To establish the Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1527. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV01-916-1 IFR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1528. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenpyroximate; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301109; FRL-6773-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1529. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301114; FRL-6774-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1530. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Zoxamide 3, 5-dichloro-N-(3-chloro-1-ethyl-1-methyl-2-oxopropyl)-4-methylbenzamide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301110; FRL-6774-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1531. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Risk-Based Capital Requirements (RIN: 3052-AB56) received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1532. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmit-

ting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 107—58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1533. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request to make funds available for the Disaster Relief program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; (H. Doc. No. 107—59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1534. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting an Annual Report for FY 2000; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1535. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priorities—Recreational Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1536. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Software Quality Assurance—received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1537. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reporting Unofficial Foreign Travel—received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1538. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Stabilization, Packaging, and Storage of Plutonium-Bearing Materials [DOE-STD-3013-2000] received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1539. A letter from the Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Light Truck Average Fuel Economy Standard, Model Year 2003 [Docket No. NHTSA-2001-8977] (RIN: 2127-A135) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1540. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Solvent Extraction for Vegetable Oil Production [FRL-6965-5] (RIN: 2060-AH22) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1541. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for Electric Utility Steam Generating Units for Which Construction is Commenced After September 18, 1978; Standards of Performance for Industrial—Commercial—Institutional Steam Generating Units [FRL-6965-4] (RIN: 2060-AE56) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1542. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Transportation Conformity: Idaho [ID-00-001; FRL-6957-1] received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1543. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmit-

ting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Avalon, Fountain Valley, Adelanto, Ridgecrest and Riverside, California) [MM Docket No. 99-329; RM-9701] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1544. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Hastings, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 00-241; RM-9968] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1545. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Huachuca City, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00-208; RM-9977]; (Rio Rico, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00-209; RM-9978]; (Pine Level, Alabama) [MM Docket No. 00-211; RM-9993] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1546. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hinton, Whiting, and Underwood, Iowa; and Blair, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-94; RM-9532; RM-9834] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1547. A letter from the Chief, Market Disputes Resolution Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96-238] Amendment of Rules Governing Procedures to be Followed When Formal Complaints are Filed Against Common Carriers—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1548. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1 through March 31, 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1549. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with various resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 107—56); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1550. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 107—57); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1551. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01-06), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1552. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability (Transmittal No. 0A-01),

pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1553. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability (Transmittal No. 0B-01), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1554. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01-08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1555. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the Republic of Korea [Transmittal No. DTC 132-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1556. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the second report on the Status Of The Ratification Of World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and The World Intellectual Property Organization Performances and Phonograms Treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

1557. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Entity List: Revisions and Additions [Docket No. 9704-28099-0127-10] (RIN: 0694-AB60) received April 9, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

1558. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-580, "Storm Water Permit Compliance Amendment Act of 2000" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1559. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-26, "Motor Vehicle Excessive Idling Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1560. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-27, "Eastern Avenue Tour Bus Parking Prohibition Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1561. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-28, "Medicaid Provider Fraud Prevention Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1562. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-29, "Homestead and Senior Citizen Real Property Tax Temporary Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1563. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-35, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 873, S.O. 99-68 Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1564. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-36, "Uniform Per Student Funding Formula For Public Schools

and Public Charter Schools Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1565. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-37, "Attendance and School Safety Temporary Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1566. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-38, "Real Property Tax Clarity and Litter Control Administration Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1567. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the failure of the Department of Defense to provide access to certain records to the General Accounting Office, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 716(b)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1568. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the FY 2000 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1569. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2000 Annual Program Performance Report and FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1570. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1571. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2000 performance report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1572. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 032101H] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1573. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Steller Sea Lion Research Initiative (SSLRI) [Docket No. 00-1220361; I.D. 022801A] (RIN: 0648-ZB03) received April 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1574. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 107-60); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1575. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 107-61); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1576. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Nonimmigrant Classes; Legal Immigration Family Equity

Act Nonimmigrants, V and K Classification—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1577. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the construction of a flood damage reduction project for the Upper Des Plaines River, Illinois; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1578. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the recreation and commercial navigation project at Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1579. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Prohibited Area P-49 Crawford; TX [Docket No. FAA-2001-9059; Airspace Docket No. 01-AWA-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1580. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace: Harrisonburg, VA [Airspace Docket No. 00-AEA-13FR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1581. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace: Waynesboro, VA [Airspace Docket No. 01-AEA-14FR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1582. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cooperative Research and Development Agreements—received March 22, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1583. A letter from the Co-chair, National Assessment Synthesis Team and Co-director, The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, transmitting a report entitled, "Climate Change Impacts On The United States: The Potential Consequences Of Climate Variability And Change"; to the Committee on Science.

1584. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Emergency Medical Services and Evacuation—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1585. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Safety and Health (Short Form)—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1586. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Puerto Rican Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes Shipped From Puerto Rico to the United States [T.D. ATF-444] (RIN: 1512-AC24) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1587. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Announcement and Report Concerning Pre-Filing Agreements—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1588. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor, Nonconventional Source Fuel Credit, and Reference Price for Calendar Year 2000—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1589. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 2001-22] received April 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1590. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report assessing the voting practices of the governments of UN member states in the General Assembly and Security Council for 2000, and evaluating the actions and responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States, pursuant to Public Law 101—167, section 527(a) (103 Stat. 1222); Public Law 101—246, section 406(a) (104 Stat. 66); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on April 3, 2001 the following reports were filed on April 20, 2001]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 503. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-42 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.J. Res. 41. A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations; with an amendment (Rept. 107-43). Referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 392. A bill for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson (Rept. 107-44). Referred to the Private Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1209. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 863. A bill to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; with an amendment (Rept. 107-46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

[Submitted April 24, 2001]

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 146. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-47). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 309. A bill to provide for the determination of withholding tax rates under the Guam income tax (rept. 107-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 118. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. (Rept. 107-49). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 119. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend title 18, United States code, and the Uniform code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-50). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration of H.R. 503. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on April 20, 2001]

H.R. 503. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than April 24, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 1540. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination regarding exposure to hazardous substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. REYES, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs authority to furnish certain benefits for certain diseases occurring in children of Vietnam-era veterans upon a determination that such diseases have a positive association with parental exposure to a herbicide agent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr.

MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BASS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BACA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1542. A bill to deregulate the Internet and high speed data services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1543. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to exempt certain communications from the definition of consumer report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt State and local political committees from duplicative notification and reporting requirements made applicable to political organizations by Public Law 106-230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act for certain computer professionals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1546. A bill to allow States to spend certain funds to establish and maintain peer mediation programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1547. A bill to establish a grant program in the Department of Defense to assist States and local governments in improving their ability to prevent and respond to domestic terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1548. A bill to phase out the incineration of solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1549. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide comprehensive health assessments for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 1550. A bill to change the deadline for income tax returns for calendar year taxpayers from the 15th of April to the first Monday in November; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reduce losses caused by repetitive flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1552. A bill to extend the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act through 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1553. A bill to repeal export controls on high performance computers; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1554. A bill to provide for a one-year procurement moratorium for the Marine Corps V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft program in order to provide a needed time out and to allow for a safety and performance reliability evaluation of that aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. MCCREERY):

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for meal and entertainment expenses of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment for inpatient hospital services under the Medicare Program, and to freeze the reduction in payments to hospitals for indirect costs of medical education; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to permit local educational agencies to use funds made available under the innovative education program to support certain community service programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HILLIARD (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1558. A bill to prohibit States from denying any individual the right to register to vote for an election for Federal office, or the right to vote in an election for Federal office, on the grounds that the individual has been convicted of a Federal crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIARD (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1559. A bill to require that general Federal elections be held over the 48-hour pe-

riod that begins with the first Saturday in November, to prohibit States from preventing citizens who are registered to vote from voting in Federal elections and from carrying out certain law enforcement activities which have the effect of intimidating individuals from voting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1560. A bill to increase the numerical limitation on the number of asylees whose status may be adjusted to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1562. A bill to replace the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the Office of the Associate Attorney General for Immigration Affairs, the Bureau of Immigration Services, and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1563. A bill to assist aliens who were transplanted to the United States as children in continuing their education and otherwise integrating into American society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1564. A bill to fund capital projects of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 1565. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Brian Lamb; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1566. A bill to urge the President to initiate consultations with the Governments of Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand to determine the feasibility and desirability of negotiations to create a free trade area between the United States and those countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1567. A bill to encourage the provision of multilateral debt cancellation for countries eligible to be considered for assistance under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative or heavily affected by HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HIN-

CHEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STARK, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the restriction on coverage of periodic health examinations under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1569. A bill to establish a commission to study the establishment of a national education museum and archive for the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide up-to-date school library media resources and well-trained, professionally certified school library media specialists for elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1571. A bill to provide for permanent resident status for any alien orphan physically present in the United States who is less than 12 years of age and to provide for deferred enforced departure status for any alien physically present in the United States who is the natural and legal parent of a child born in the United States who is less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for legal permanent resident status for certain undocumented or nonimmigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide more revenue for the Social Security system by imposing a tax on certain unearned income and to provide tax relief for more than 80,000,000 individuals and families who pay more in Social Security taxes than income taxes by reducing the rate of the old age, survivors, and disability insurance Social Security payroll tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1574. A bill to provide for prices of pharmaceutical products that are fair to the producer and the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend all motor fuel taxes for six months, and to permanently repeal the 4.3-cent per gallon increases in motor fuel taxes enacted in 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1576. A bill to designate the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area in the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. MALONEY

of New York, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with non-inmate workers and the firms that employ them and increasing the likelihood that Federal agencies get the best value for taxpayers dollars, to require that Federal Prison Industries fully and timely perform its Government contracts by empowering Federal contracting officers with the contract administration tools generally available to assure full and timely performance of other Government contracts, to enhance the opportunities for effective public participation in decisions to expand the activities of Federal Prison Industries, to provide to Federal agencies temporary preferential contract award authority to ease the transition of Federal Prison Industries to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to provide additional work opportunities for Federal inmates by authorizing Federal Prison Industries to provide inmate workers to nonprofit entities with protections against commercial activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Congress should have the power to prohibit desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUCCI (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH):

H. Res. 120. Resolution urging cemeteries to maintain the flags placed on the grave sites of American veterans on Memorial Day through at least May 31; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. STARK):

H. Res. 121. Resolution expressing the sincerest condolences of the House of Representatives to the families of the 42 people, including 37 children, killed in the March 6, 2001, explosion of the Fanglin elementary school in the Jianxi province of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 122. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that India should be a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

24. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution 8 memorializing the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1041 that amends section 1917(b)(1)(c) of the Social Security Act by deleting the date of May 14, 1993, for states to have long term care partnership plans approved, affording states throughout the nation the ability to give their citizens the same rights to participate in these types of programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

25. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of North Dakota, relative to Resolution No. 4028 memorializing the United States Congress to call a convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to Resolution 22 memorializing the United States Congress to rename the Federal Building in New Albany, Indiana, in honor of former Congressman Lee Hamilton; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

27. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to Resolution 8 memorializing the United States Congress to take all actions that are necessary to stop the dumping of foreign steel in the United States, including the amendment of existing foreign trade laws or the enactment of new foreign trade law to address the crisis in the steel industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

28. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to Resolution 40 memorializing the United States Congress to repeal the federal excise tax on telephone and other communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

29. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to a Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to immediately secure the construction of critically needed new electric generation facilities, oil, and gas pipeline and transmission facilities using Wyoming Power River Basin super compliant coal, Wyoming gas and other available Wyoming natural resources; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Abecnego Monje Ortiz, Dolores Ortiz, and Eneyda Monje Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 1579. A bill for the relief of Juan Gonzalez and Mayra Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. PITTS, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 10: Mr. HOSTETTTLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs.

CLAYTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 13: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. SWENEY.
H.R. 17: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 25: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 28: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 31: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 37: Mr. CANNON and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 39: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 41: Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 46: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 65: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 68: Mr. GOODE, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 80: Mr. COX.
H.R. 82: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 115: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 117: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WU, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 144: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 162: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio,

Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 168: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 175: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 179: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 187: Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 214: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 218: Mr. KING, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTTLER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 250: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SABO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. JOHN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 259: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 261: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. COX.

H.R. 267: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 280: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 281: Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 293: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 294: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 296: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 298: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANK, Ms. HART, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 303: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 318: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. LOFGREN.

- H.R. 336: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
- H.R. 348: Mr. DEUTSCH.
- H.R. 429: Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 436: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 458: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 476: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. BLUNT.
- H.R. 478: Mr. BOYD.
- H.R. 500: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 503: Mr. WOLF, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. KINGSTON.
- H.R. 510: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. BERRY.
- H.R. 512: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
- H.R. 513: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LAFALCE.
- H.R. 516: Mr. MURTHA.
- H.R. 525: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 526: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 527: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. SIMPSON.
- H.R. 542: Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 548: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BACA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROSS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 549: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NEY, and Mr. GEKAS.
- H.R. 566: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H.R. 572: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 582: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 586: Mr. OSBORNE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
- H.R. 595: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 599: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 602: Ms. HART, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H.R. 604: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mrs. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 606: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BERRY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
- H.R. 608: Mr. STRICKLAND.
- H.R. 612: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 619: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 623: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
- H.R. 631: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 639: Mr. FOLEY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 661: Mr. GANSKE, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. PORTMAN.
- H.R. 663: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 665: Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. STUPAK.
- H.R. 682: Mr. SABO.
- H.R. 687: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 730: Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
- H.R. 737: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 746: Mr. KERNS and Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 747: Mr. COX.
- H.R. 752: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 755: Mr. SABO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 760: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. SHAYS.
- H.R. 762: Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 770: Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 778: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 782: Ms. HART, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 783: Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 786: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. PELOSI.
- H.R. 792: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 805: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. HILL.
- H.R. 817: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
- H.R. 822: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
- H.R. 826: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
- H.R. 827: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 831: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BACA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HART, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 840: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 844: Mr. KING, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. WEINER.
- H.R. 862: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 868: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PUTNAM.
- H.R. 869: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. HART.
- H.R. 876: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DICKS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. INSLEE.
- H.R. 877: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Mr. TIAHRT.
- H.R. 885: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 906: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 912: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 917: Mr. SABO.
- H.R. 921: Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 931: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 933: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PALLONE.
- H.R. 937: Mr. STUMP.
- H.R. 948: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. RIVERS.
- H.R. 951: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRANK.
- H.R. 952: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
- H.R. 954: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. WU, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 962: Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 967: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KING, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 968: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. SANDLIN.
- H.R. 969: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. BUYER.
- H.R. 1001: Mr. SANDLIN.
- H.R. 1004: Mr. CLYBURN.
- H.R. 1016: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
- H.R. 1018: Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BASS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HART, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HILL, Mr. HERGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GEKAS.
- H.R. 1029: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 1051: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1052: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1053: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1054: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1055: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1056: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1057: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1058: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1059: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1060: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1061: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 1072: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 1076: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 1082: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. LATHAN.
- H.R. 1083: Mr. WU.
- H.R. 1084: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1086: Mr. BONIOR.
- H.R. 1097: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LANTOS.
- H.R. 1112: Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH.

- H.R. 1116: Ms. LOFGREN.
- H.R. 1121: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 1136: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
- H.R. 1137: Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. HART, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 1138: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 1140: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPES, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1143: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BACA, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCNULTY.
- H.R. 1147: Mr. GREENWOOD and Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 1155: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.R. 1160: Mr. SABO.
- H.R. 1165: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1170: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAPPES, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 1177: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. MORELLA.
- H.R. 1182: Mr. TOOMEY.
- H.R. 1184: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BONIOR.
- H.R. 1187: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BORSKI.
- H.R. 1192: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 1194: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1227: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
- H.R. 1234: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
- H.R. 1238: Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
- H.R. 1242: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TERRY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 1252: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 1255: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 1271: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1275: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1276: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1280: Ms. HART, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BACA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. FRANK.
- H.R. 1291: Ms. HART, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BACA, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GOODE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1296: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
- H.R. 1305: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. VITTER.
- H.R. 1306: Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 1307: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 1313: Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 1324: Mr. ROSS, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. BONILLA.
- H.R. 1328: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. NEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. BACA.
- H.R. 1330: Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
- H.R. 1335: Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
- H.R. 1340: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1351: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1354: Mr. WYNN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ABER-CROMBIE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 1358: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. PALLONE.
- H.R. 1360: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BALDACCIO.
- H.R. 1366: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. OSE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 1367: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BOUCHER.
- H.R. 1371: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LANTOS.
- H.R. 1375: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 1377: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mrs. WILSON.
- H.R. 1388: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HILLIARD.
- H.R. 1400: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
- H.R. 1416: Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 1431: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 1436: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MCNULTY.
- H.R. 1438: Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 1450: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
- H.R. 1452: Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABER-CROMBIE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 1462: Mr. SCHAFFER.
- H.R. 1464: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
- H.R. 1467: Mr. OTTER, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. GOODE.
- H.R. 1468: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 1470: Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. LANTOS.
- H.R. 1471: Mrs. THURMAN.
- H.R. 1488: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 1490: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
- H.R. 1496: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1497: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SHOWS.
- H.R. 1498: Mr. JEFFERSON.
- H.R. 1501: Mr. BEREUTER.
- H.R. 1507: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. EVERETT.
- H.R. 1522: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FILNER.
- H.J. Res. 13: Ms. RIVERS.
- H.J. Res. 20: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
- H.J. Res. 36: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BALDACCIO.
- H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. WELLER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. BEREUTER.
- H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. PASTOR.
- H. Con. Res. 45: Mrs. WILSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. HOLT.
- H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
- H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. KING.
- H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FRANK.
- H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. RUSH.
- H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OTTER, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ISAKSON.
- H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Con. Res. 98: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H. Con. Res. 104: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. LEVIN.
- H. Res. 13: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN.
- H. Res. 14: Mr. LANGEVIN.
- H. Res. 75: Mr. MANZULLO.
- H. Res. 87: Mr. COYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H. Res. 97: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LANTOS.
- H. Res. 112: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H. Res. 117: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H. R. 641: Mr. OSBORNE.
- H. R. 1310: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 503

OFFERED BY: MS. LOFGREN

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT No. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Motherhood Protection Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. CRIMES AGAINST A WOMAN—TERMINATING HER PREGNANCY.

(a) Whoever engages in any violent or assaultive conduct against a pregnant woman resulting in the conviction of the person so engaging for a violation of any of the provisions of law set forth in subsection (c), and thereby causes an interruption to

the normal course of the pregnancy resulting in prenatal injury (including termination of the pregnancy), shall, in addition to any penalty imposed for the violation, be punished as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The punishment for a violation of subsection (a) is—

(1) if the relevant provision of law set forth in subsection (c) is set forth in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of that subsection, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, but if the interruption terminates the pregnancy, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or both; and

(2) if the relevant provision of law is set forth in subsection (c)(4), the punishment shall be such punishment (other than the death penalty) as the court martial may direct.

(c) The provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Sections 36, 37, 43, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 229, 242, 245, 247, 248, 351, 831, 844(d), (f), (h)(1), and (i), 924(j), 930, 1111, 1112, 1114, 1116, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1153(a), 1201(a), 1203(a), 1365(a), 1501, 1503, 1505, 1512, 1513, 1751, 1864, 1951, 1952(a)(1)(B), (a)(2)(B), and (a)(3)(B), 1958, 1959, 1992, 2113, 2114, 2116, 2118, 2119, 2191, 2231, 2241(a), 2245, 2261, 2261A, 2280, 2281, 2332, 2332a,

2332b, 2340A, and 2441 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 408(e) of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 848).

(3) Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2283).

(4) Sections 918, 919(a), 919(b)(2), 920(a), 922, 924, 926, and 928 of title 10, United States Code (articles 118, 119(a), 119(b)(2), 120(a), 122, 124, 126, and 128).

H.J. Res. 41

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 3, line 22, strike the close quotation mark and the period that follows.

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:

"SECTION 3. Any bill, resolution, or other legislative measure reducing benefits payable from the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Trust Fund, the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, the Medicare Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund, or any successor fund shall require for final adoption in each House the concurrence of two thirds of the Members of that House voting and present."

Page 2, lines 15 and 16, insert " , other than section 3," after "this article" each place it appears.