



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2001

No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 25, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

WE MUST ELIMINATE WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, one of my goals since first being elected to serve in Congress has been to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government and many of its programs. While we have been successful in iden-

tifying and reducing wasteful spending, there is still too much unnecessary spending that needs to be eliminated.

This came out in a report by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs entitled *Government at the Brink* that outlines the urgent Federal Government management problems facing the Bush administration. They cited four core problems that exist: One, work force management; two, financial management information; three, technology management; and, four, overlap and duplication.

Senator FRED THOMPSON of Tennessee was the chairman of this committee when this report was compiled. I want to share with my colleagues what his committee found.

A chief source of the information was based on reports issued by the General Accounting Office, the GAO, and agency inspectors general, or the IGs. Now, my colleagues might ask, just how much money are we talking about. Well, according to GAO, we are talking about at least \$35 billion a year, and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

The GAO reported that the Medicare program wastes \$12 billion every year on improper payments. According to the GAO, 10 percent of total health care costs are lost to wasteful spending. What came to light about the misappropriation of our tax dollars is downright alarming. In order to cut out waste in Medicare claims, the Health Care Financing Administration decided that new computer software should be developed to create one mammoth computerized method to review bills. Ultimately, what the American taxpayers got after 4 years was a bill for \$80 million. An official at this agency had this explanation: He said that the money was used in effect as a painful learning experience. We learned about this in 1997.

The Medicare program is not the only offender. Let us take a look at the Department of Education. This govern-

ment agency failed its last three financial audits. The government auditors identified accounting discrepancies totaling up to \$6 billion in Federal education aid that was embezzled, lost, used for real estate purchases, luxury car items, rent, and so forth. If we intend to increase the funding to the Department of Education, then we need to put in strong accounting practices.

Unfortunately, it is not difficult to find all sorts of examples of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government. The Medicare program and the Department of Education have a long history of wasteful spending. However, the Department of Interior does not know what has happened to over \$3 billion it holds in trust for the American Indians. Or what about what is referred to as the "big dig" up in Boston, Massachusetts? Boston's central artery has cost tremendous amounts of dollars. It has increased about 525 percent, from \$2.6 billion to the current estimate of \$14 billion.

We have serious problems that are cited in the Thompson report that need to be addressed if we are to solve mismanagement of valuable resources. The most compelling of these is work force management. Many agencies lack the right employees with the right skills to do the job. The report also stated that the Clinton administration's downsizing of government hardly made a dent in the true size of government. What it did do was create a brain drain that cost the government many of its most experienced and valuable employees. The end result is that the Federal Government wound up doing the same old thing in the same old way, but with less experienced workers.

Financial management. How can the government operate efficiently when agencies do not know how much money they have, how much they spend, or how much their programs cost.

Information technology management. This is a critical item because

□ 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.

H3469

we want our government computer systems not to be vulnerable to terrorist attacks, either domestically or internationally. The GAO has designed computer security, a governmentwide program, but it has problems.

The last area of concern is overlap and duplication. For instance, the Federal Government has seven different agencies administering four different programs aimed at job training. Eight different agencies operate 50 different programs to assist the homeless. Nine agencies operate 27 teen pregnancy programs. Seventy different agencies gather and analyze statistical data. Seventeen departments and agencies operate 515 research and development laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the areas where duplication and overlap waste our tax dollars. We must restrain government spending, but I realize that, just as President Reagan said, government programs once launched never disappear. Actually, a government agency is the nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see here on this Earth.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used on July 26, 2001, for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Colonel Edward T. Brogan, Senior Chaplain, United States Air Force, Arlington National Cemetery, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, through Your grace You have established these United States. It is our blessing that Your strength can only be made perfect in our weakness. Enable us to kneel before You this day to receive Your good gift of strength. Perfect each of us, Lord, in our dependence upon You, that we might accomplish all that You would have us to do. Keep us from selfish ambition and brash self-reliance.

Today marks the fifth anniversary of the bombing of Khobar Towers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. That bombing reminded us of the cost of being a world power and of combatting evil. This day, Lord, we pray for Your protection upon our military men and women who serve all around the globe. Give them wisdom and energy in their service to our Nation. Watch over their families, ease the pain of the survivors and family members left behind after the terrorist attack at Khobar Towers and at too many other places.

Guide each Member of this House in humility before You and the people of the United States. Please also attend to the needs of the many staffers who accomplish so much of the work of this House. Give clarity and civility in debate, that the decisions reached might well serve our Nation. Bless our land with Your peace and dedication to serving You.

This we pray in Your holy and blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILCHREST 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she 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.

RHINOCEROS AND TIGER CONSERVATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 645) to reauthorize the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 645

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF RHINOCEROS AND TIGER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1994.

Section 9 of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5306) is amended by striking "1996 through 2002" and inserting "2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007".

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 9 of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5306) is further amended—

(1) by striking "There are authorized" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of amounts available each fiscal year to carry out this Act, the Secretary may expend not more than 3 percent or \$80,000, whichever is greater, to pay the administrative expenses necessary to carry out this Act."

SEC. 4. COOPERATION.

The Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 is further amended by redesignating section 9 (16 U.S.C. 5306) as section 10, and by inserting after section 8 the following:

"SEC. 9. ADVISORY GROUP.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—To assist in carrying out this Act, the Secretary may convene an advisory group consisting of individuals representing public and private organizations actively involved in the conservation of rhinoceros and tiger species.

"(b) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

"(1) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Group shall—

"(A) ensure that each meeting of the advisory group is open to the public; and

"(B) provide, at each meeting, an opportunity for interested persons to present oral or written statements concerning items on the agenda.

"(2) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide to the public timely notice of each meeting of the advisory group.

"(3) MINUTES.—Minutes of each meeting of the advisory group shall be kept by the Secretary and shall be made available to the public.

"(c) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory group."

SEC. 5. PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY.

Section 5(e) of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5304) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY.—To the maximum extent practical, in determining whether to approve project proposals under this section, the Secretary shall give consideration to projects which will enhance sustainable conservation programs to ensure effective long-term conservation of rhinoceros and tigers."

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4(3) (16 U.S.C. 5303(3)) is amended by striking "Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Fund established under section 6(a)" and inserting "the account established by division A, section 101(e), title I of Public Law 105-277 under the heading 'MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND'".

(2) Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 5305) is amended by striking the section heading and all that follows through "(d) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DONATIONS.—" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 6. ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DONATIONS."

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Title I of section 101(e) of division A of Public Law 105-277 (112 Stat. 2681-237) is amended under the heading "MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND" by striking "Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation

Act, subchapter I" and inserting "Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, part I".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

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

Madam Speaker, the fundamental goal of this legislation is to extend the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994. Since 1977, all species of rhinos and tigers have been listed under our Endangered Species Act and on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, which prohibits all commercial international trade in these species.

Despite these protections, the population of these species continues to decline; and sadly, rhino and tiger body parts are still an active ingredient in Chinese traditional medicines sold throughout the world.

One of the few positive developments for these species was the enactment of the Rhino and Tiger Conservation Act. Since its establishment 7 years ago, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has spent about \$7 million on 111 conservation projects in 16 countries in Africa and Asia. These projects have monitored populations, equipped game scouts, and educated local communities as to the value of these keystone species.

Without this act, these species would continue their steady slide toward extinction. In fact, during our subcommittee hearing on H.R. 645, the World Wildlife Fund testified that there is little question that the U.S. programs for tigers and rhinos and elephants have helped to avert disaster for these species, even possible extinction in some areas.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 645 is a simple 5-year extension of this vital wildlife conservation law at existing authorization levels. I urge Members to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 645. I first want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife, and Oceans, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), for their leadership in international wildlife conservation and for introducing this legislation to authorize the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2001.

Madam Speaker, rhinos and tigers remain some of the most charismatic and endangered species of wildlife anywhere on the planet. All subspecies are listed as endangered on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, or CITES. They have also become emblematic of the great global conservation challenge of our time, and that challenge is how do we best rectify the demands of a growing human population with the needs of keystone wildlife species and the protection of their habitats.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recently released a summary report concerning the Rhino Conservation Act, which succinctly captured this challenge in the report's introduction. Slightly paraphrasing the report, it reads as follows:

"Rhinos and tigers are included in the heritage of many cultures. They have made their way into storybooks, religions, medicines and ad campaigns. However, our attraction to these species and their habitats also threatens their existence. It has led to their killing for trophies and medicines and to the fragmentation and outright destruction of their habitat by people seeking timber and land resources. They are now among the world's most endangered species."

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), the ranking member on the subcommittee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I want to express my thanks and my gratitude to the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman GILCREST) for this particular piece of legislation and to reiterate my strongest support for this legislation, which basically is noncontroversial.

In 1994, Congress passed the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act in recognition of the crisis that rhinos and tigers were faced with imminent extinction in the wild. With the passage of the act and the subsequent creation of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Fund, conservation activities have been initiated in cooperation with range states and non-governmental organizations across Africa, Southern and Southeast Asia, and the Russian Far East.

Since 1996, the Fish and Wildlife Service has funded 105 grants totaling roughly a little over \$2 million. Most importantly, these appropriated funds have leveraged almost \$4 million in matching funds from cooperating partners. As a result, new conservation and research initiatives have been launched in Africa and Asia, including antipoaching and ranger-training activities, habitat surveys, enhanced surveillance and monitoring of illegal wildlife trade, establishment of wildlife compensation programs, and initiation

of education and outreach activities on the village level.

All of these efforts are making some very, very positive contributions in stemming the threat to rhinos and tigers; but much, much more needs to still be done. That is why we must support H.R. 645.

This legislation would reauthorize funding through fiscal year 2007 to support conservation projects administered through the Multinational Species Conservation Fund. H.R. 645 would also make two helpful modifications to the act to enhance sustainable long-term conservation efforts and to ensure more robust public participation by organizations actively involved in the conservation of rhinos and tigers.

This legislation is noncontroversial. Every witness who testified before the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans on March 15 spoke in strong support for reauthorization, including the witness testifying for the administration. It was not surprising then that on May 16 the full Committee on Resources reported the bill by unanimous consent.

Two weeks ago the House passed similar noncontroversial legislation to reauthorize programs for African and Asian elephants. This bill is no less important, and I urge all Members to support H.R. 645 so we can continue U.S. leadership in the global conservation of wildlife.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I would just like to close by saying that the world is growing a great deal smaller. As the population increases and our natural resources decrease, the frontier is gone. No longer can we move to another far-flung region of the Earth and find vast stretches of open space. So what we have left as far as our next challenge and our next frontier is an intellectual frontier to understand how we as humans can manage the diminishing resources with an ever-increasing population and preserve what my grandfather used to say was the majesty and the abundance of nature.

Madam Speaker, this is a picture of one of the species we are trying to save, the magnificent creature known as the tiger. This is an article in "Time Magazine" dating back just a few years to 1994. There is a quote in here from Ullas Kranthi of the New York Wildlife Conservation Society, who on a recent visit to India saw a tigress come and then quickly go. Then he smiled and he said, "When you see a tiger, it is always like a dream." All too soon, dreams may be the only place where tigers roam free.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is designed to make sure that tigers not only roam in our dreams, but actually roam in reality on the few stretches of

open space and habitat that they have left.

Another quote from this article, "What will it say about the human race if we let the tiger go extinct? What can we save? Can we save ourselves?"

On behalf of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), and the staff on both sides of the aisle on the Committee on Resources, I thank all of them for their help; and I urge my colleagues to vote for this most important very tiny amount of money that can go a long way.

□ 1415

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 645, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 645, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ADAMS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT JOHN ADAMS

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1668) to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his family, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1668

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

SECTION 1. COMMEMORATIVE WORK TO HONOR JOHN ADAMS AND HIS LEGACY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Few families have contributed as profoundly to the United States as the family that gave the Nation its second president, John Adams; its sixth president, John Quincy Adams; first ladies Abigail Smith Adams and Louisa Catherine Johnson Adams; and succeeding generations of statesmen, diplomats, advocates, and authors.

(2) John Adams (1735–1826), a lawyer, a statesman, and a patriot, was the author of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (the oldest written constitution still in force), the leader of the Second Continental Congress, a driving force for independence, a negotiator of the Treaty of Paris (which brought the Revolutionary War to an end), the first Vice President, the second President, and an unwavering exponent of freedom of conscience and the rule of law.

(3) Abigail Smith Adams (1744–1818) was one of the most remarkable women of her time. Wife of former President John Adams and mother of former President John Quincy Adams, she was an early advocate for the rights of women and served the cause of liberty as a prolific writer, fierce patriot, and staunch abolitionist.

(4) John Quincy Adams (1767–1848), the son of John and Abigail Adams, was a distinguished lawyer, legislator, and diplomat and a master of 7 languages, who served as Senator, Minister to the Netherlands under President George Washington, Minister to Prussia under the first President Adams, Minister to Great Britain under President James Madison, chief negotiator of the Treaty of Ghent (which ended the War of 1812), Secretary of State under President James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine (which declared the Western Hemisphere off limits to European imperial expansion), sixth President, and the only former President to be elected to the House of Representatives, where he was known as "Old Man Eloquent" and served with great distinction as a leader in the fight against slavery and a champion of unpopular causes.

(5) Louisa Catherine Johnson Adams (1775–1852), the wife of former President John Quincy Adams, was an educated, accomplished woman and the only first lady born outside the United States. Like Abigail Adams, she wrote eloquently on behalf of the rights of women and in opposition to slavery.

(6) Charles Francis Adams (1807–1886), the son of John Quincy and Louisa Adams, served 6 years in the Massachusetts legislature, was a steadfast abolitionist who received the Free Soil Party's vice-presidential nomination in 1848, was elected to his father's seat in the House of Representatives in 1856, and served as ambassador to Great Britain during the Civil War, where his efforts were decisive in preventing the British Government from recognizing the independence of the Confederacy.

(7) Henry Adams (1838–1918), the son of Charles Francis Adams, was an eminent writer, scholar, historian, and public intellectual, and was the author of many celebrated works, including "Democracy", "The Education of Henry Adams", and his 9-volume "History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison".

(8) Both individually and collectively, the members of this illustrious family have enriched the Nation through their profound civic consciousness, abiding belief in the perfectibility of the Nation's democracy, and commitment to service and sacrifice for the common good.

(9) Although the Congress has authorized the establishment of commemorative works on Federal lands in the District of Columbia honoring such celebrated former Presidents as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, the National Capital has no comparable memorial to former President John Adams.

(10) In recognition of the 200th anniversary of the end of the presidency of John Adams, the time has come to correct this oversight so that future generations of Americans will know and understand the preeminent histor-

ical and lasting significance to the Nation of his contributions and those of his family.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—The Adams Memorial Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams, along with his wife Abigail Adams and former President John Quincy Adams, and the family's legacy of public service.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the commemorative work shall be in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001, et seq.).

(d) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work. The Adams Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work.

(e) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the commemorative work (including the maintenance and preservation amount provided for in section 8(b) of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001, et seq.)), or upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 10(b) of such Act, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Adams Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the account provided for in section 8(b)(1) of such Act.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act, the terms "commemorative work" and "the District of Columbia and its environs" have the meanings given to such terms in section 2 of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1002).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

H.R. 1668 introduced, by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), would authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his legacy. H.R. 1668 is supported by the administration and has strong bipartisan support.

Perhaps no American family has contributed as profoundly to public service as the family that gave the Nation its second President, John Adams; his wife, Abigail Adams; and their son, our sixth President, John Quincy Adams, who was also, by the way, a member of this body. The family's legacy was far-reaching, continuing with John Quincy Adams's son, John Francis Adams, who was also a member of this body and an ambassador to England during the Civil War; and his son, Henry Adams, an eminent writer and scholar, and it goes on and on.

The bill, as amended, focuses on the remarkable achievements of President

John Adams, his wife Abigail, and their son, John Quincy Adams. We have a monument here in our Nation's Capital honoring our first President, George Washington, as well as monuments honoring Lincoln, Roosevelt and Jefferson, but, incredibly, we have overlooked one person who arguably, second only perhaps to George Washington, did more than any other person to make it all happen. Historian David McCullough reminds us that while Jefferson was the author of the Declaration of Independence, he was the pen of the Revolution, John Adams was its important voice and the driving force. Clearly, we owe him a deep and lasting debt.

Madam Speaker, it was the voice of John Adams in the Continental Congress that was the most responsible for pushing, prodding and cajoling the other Founding Fathers to sever our ties with England. He did this at enormous personal sacrifice: separated from his wife and family for nearly 10 years, taking life-threatening voyages during winter storms across the Atlantic Ocean to secure help for our struggling Army from foreign nations, and risking imprisonment or even execution as a traitor if his efforts were to fail.

He was blunt and outspoken, but he was also warm and humorous and passionate, and he was passionate above all things about his brilliant and accomplished wife, his family and his country.

Many of his views were controversial and unpopular in his day. Even the notion of forming our new country was highly controversial and unpopular. But he put the good of a country as a whole above any desire to win a personal popularity contest.

His death was, fittingly, as interesting as his life. By an incredible coincidence he and Thomas Jefferson both died on the very same day, and, Madam Speaker, that same day was July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. That was a significant date in their lives, and it is the significant date in the history of our country, thanks to his courage and thankless work. For this reason, we worked very hard to bring this bill to the floor this week to honor this important American whose sacrifices created the very holiday all of us will be celebrating next week. Next week we will mark the 225th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. We will finally, at long last, be on our way to correcting a glaring oversight in our Nation's history.

It is ironic that more than 200 years have passed without properly honoring John Adams, but, upon reflection, perhaps we augment the value of our honor by doing so at this late date. After all, how many of us could possibly hope or expect to have such attention devoted to our memories and legacies two centuries after we draw our final breath? That we do so today

speaks volumes about the significance of President John Adams' contributions to our lives.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the truly enormous efforts of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and, by the way, his staff as well. They put enormous efforts into this legislation. The gentleman from Indiana has worked tirelessly as a true champion of John Adams, by pushing this legislation through our subcommittee, by bringing two nationally recognized scholars to come before us, and by educating so many of us here in this body and so many citizens of the public at large about the enormous debt we owe to this hero and champion of liberty, John Adams. When the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) retires from Congress next year, he can justifiably look back on his work on this legislation with a long-lasting sense of pride.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to observe that once, in a very low moment, during a period when her husband's work took him to Philadelphia, leaving her alone in Massachusetts, Abigail Adams wrote in a letter to John Adams, "I wonder whether future generations will ever know what we sacrificed for them?" The answer to that question, Madam Speaker, is a resounding "yes," we do know, we will know, because of what we do today, and we are grateful.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1668, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), my colleague, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1668. I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor today in support of this legislation which honors a great American.

The Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands held a hearing on June 12 on H.R. 1668 that was highly informative. We received testimony from noted historians David McCullough and Joseph Ellis, who provided the subcommittee with enlightening and detailed testimony on the accomplishments of former President Adams and his family, as well as the appropriateness of establishing a memorial here in Washington, D.C.

John Adams, our first Vice President and second President of the United States, was an early American statesman and patriot, and I am pleased to support this worthy legislative effort to honor former President Adams and his legacy. It is truly overdue.

The bill that is being brought to the floor today includes amendments to clarify the focus of the Adams Memorial. These changes are consistent with the testimony we received at our hearing.

I want to commend the bill's sponsor as well, the gentleman from Indiana

(Mr. ROEMER) for his insight and his perseverance in expanding our knowledge about and generating our interest in our second President and his family, and his perseverance in making this memorial a reality. My thanks also to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), our chairman, and the leadership for expediting the consideration of this measure before the July 4 recess.

It is fitting and proper that the House pass this legislation in conjunction with the 4th of July, which honors American independence, an event that John Adams was extremely instrumental in helping to achieve. Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 1668, as amended, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to rise to quote John Adams. He said, "I shall never shine until some animating occasion calls forth all of my powers." He shall never shine until some animating occasion shall call forth all of his powers.

Well, he certainly has not shined enough in our Nation's Capital, and we hope to do something about this today with this so-called animating occasion with the House of Representatives poised to pass this tribute to John and Abigail Adams, to John Quincy Adams, and to recognize the legacy of Charles Francis and Henry Adams.

I want to begin by thanking a number of people that have made this possible. As always in the House of Representatives, nothing is easy, and everything is complicated, and everything needs to be more bipartisan, and this is certainly a seminal event for bipartisanship and something coming forward with truly historic speed.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and his staff, the Committee on Resources staff, and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman; I want to thank on our side the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), our ranking member, and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for her help and devotion to this cause. This could not come to the floor in the expedited manner it did without all of their strong support and help, and the help in a bipartisan way from the Committee on Resources. So I am very grateful to all of you who honor this historic, dazzling, brilliant family with your recognition and your speed here today to bring this to the floor before July 4.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), my colleague who showed me all around

Quincy, and the Senate sponsor, Senator KENNEDY. I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my good friend and classmate, who is such an integral and instrumental force here in our Nation's Capital who has helped us bring this forward. I want to thank my own staff member, Matt Blaschke, who has worked tirelessly on this effort as well.

We do intend to bring this and pass it through the House and take it before the Senate as well, too. Steps from here in our Nation's Capital is a famous painting by John Trumbull, and it outlines the Declaration of Independence and sketches the magnificent and captures the magnificent history of that event. Front and center, at the exact point of center and foreground of that painting stands John Adams. John Trumbull recognized the integral force, the integrity, the valor, the character, the bravery that it took not only to get our Nation behind the Revolution, but then to seek the Declaration of Independence and get it passed through Congress. John Adams was that driving force.

As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) said, Thomas Jefferson wrote those eloquent words, but he did not have the voice to argue for those words in the Continental Congress. And taking a step back from even when John Adams was the fire and the passion to argue to the Members of the Continental Congress that, yes, we needed our independence, we were not going to take orders from Great Britain any longer; he also convinced the American people that that was the course that we should take as a people. In David McCullough's wonderful book, and he appeared at a dinner for us at the Library of Congress on John Adams, he carefully articulates in this book that at that time, one-third of the American people were undecided about the course of independence.

□ 1430

One third were Tory and for Great Britain, and one third were true blue and wanted in a patriotic sense our independence. John Adams convinced the American people that we needed to move forward in this revolution and seek for this independence and then pass it through the Continental Congress.

George Washington may have been our first President in the executive branch. John Adams was probably our first President from the extent that he guided these things through the Continental Congress.

Thomas Jefferson talked about his important role, Jefferson said, and I quote "his power of thought and expression moved us from our seats as we listened to his eloquent words."

Revolution, independence, and then setting forth the institutions today of our great republic, nobody except George Washington is probably more particularly in our gratitude for those three events than John Adams.

He then made a decision that may have been one of the most important of his lifetime, here is John Adams, a picture in his prime, he married a woman by the name of Abigail Adams, probably his equal intellectually, writing some of the greatest letters in our Nation's history.

She was a good and decent person who argued against slavery, who argued for women's rights. She also helped establish the tradition of the Adams' as the only founding family, first family never to own slaves, never to own slaves.

They then raised the most dazzling and brilliant family in the history of public service in this country. John and Abigail were married for 54 years. As we salute not only independence and revolution in our republican institutions, we also salute family as we honor John and Abigail Adams.

Then they go on to have a son who becomes our sixth President, John Quincy Adams, who died right over off the Statuary Hall.

John Quincy Adams is distinguished not for only one career, but for three. He is a minister to five different European nations appointed by George Washington. He is the architect of our foreign policy and writes the Monroe Doctrine as the Secretary of State. After finishing up his foreign policy career, he runs for President and wins and serves in principle, not making short-term political decisions to get re-elected, but long-term decisions on principle and policy so that the country is better off. It cost him his reelection.

People like John Adams and John Quincy Adams are needed now as public servants. Then after being President, he goes on to serve in this distinguished body for almost 18 years. He was founder of our foreign policy, President of the United States, Congressman from Quincy, Massachusetts; three great careers.

He has a son, Charles Francis Adams, who helps negotiate, appointed by Abraham Lincoln, to keep us out of the Civil War and keep British out of the Civil War. Finally, he has a son, Henry Adams, who is one of the most distinguished authors and historians in our Nation's history.

This is, indeed, a family that deserves this recognition from this Congress and hopefully from the Senate.

John Quincy Adams said about July 4th, and I quote, "it was not only the birthday of a great Nation, it was the opening of a new era in the history of mankind"; that new opening in the history of mankind, with that declaration, that all people are created equal, is the legacy, in many ways, of this family.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we can pass this today; that the Senate will pass this this week before they go out; that the President will sign this into law; and that we can begin the hard work of passing this and building this in our Nation's Capitol.

Finally, let me end on a quote from John Adams about the truly historic nature of that revolution and that movement for independence.

John Adams said, and I quote, "objects of the most stupendous magnitude, measures in which the lives and liberties of millions born and unborn are most essentially interested are here now before us. We are in the very midst of revolution, the most complete unexpected and remarkable of any in the history of the world."

John Adams, Abigail Adams, John Quincy Adams, and their family, let us bring the remarkable honor to that family with passage of this resolution, of this bill today, and begin the architecture of rewarding valor and virtue of a family and of public service in this Nation, probably the best family in the Nation's history.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank again the staff, the Members, to the bipartisanship shown in this; and I look forward to seeing this through in the next several years.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank again the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 1668, which authorizes the construction of a memorial to John Adams and his family in Washington.

Our great capital, Washington, D.C., is a city of tributes. Beautiful, elaborate monuments and memorials stand permanently affixed throughout the city to honor our country's most cherished heroes. Millions of people from all over the world come to our great capital every year to learn about our nation and the great men and women whose intellect, ideals, bravery and foresight first established and later preserved our freedom.

But if our commemorative structures are to provide a living history lesson, it is one that is woefully incomplete, for it omits John Adams, our most skilled and consequential diplomat, first Vice President, second President, and his distinguished legacy.

As a public servant, my fascination with Adams extends through three generations of his descendants. As a family, the Adamses were the guardians of our republic, from its creation through adolescence. Their courage and prophetic wisdom kept us out of war, built the foundation of American foreign policy, transcended party politics, and displayed independence in critical times. It is time to embrace their contributions with a proper memorial in our capital city.

Thomas Jefferson called Adams a "colossus for independence." To be sure, he was the most outspoken and persuasive advocate for a break with Britain. Adams had the foresight to insist that Thomas Jefferson write the Declaration of Independence and that George Washington command the Continental Army. He would go on to negotiate the Treaty of Paris, which successfully concluded America's war for independence. He is also the author of the Constitution for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—the oldest constitution still in force—which specifies that is the "duty" of the government to educate its citizens.

As President, Adams was nonpartisan and ideological, never sacrificing his beliefs for political gain. He skillfully (and wisely) avoided

war with France despite the overwhelming warmongering from his own Federalist Party. Such independence preserved his integrity, but cost him a second term.

One of the few people truly comparable to John Adams both in passion and intellect was his wife, Abigail. Those who knew them personally called their union perfect. Abigail's letters to her husband reveal not only her wit and intelligence, but also a profound belief in the equality of women that was more than 100 years before its time.

As a member of Congress, I am particularly intrigued by John Quincy Adams, the quintessential public servant, and son of John Adams. John Quincy Adams began his career as a diplomat, skillfully serving America's national interests in Russia, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, and Great Britain. Under President Madison he negotiated the Treaty of Ghent, and as Secretary of State during the Monroe Administration, he helped create the most important and decisive foreign policy statement of its time, the Monroe Doctrine.

John Quincy Adams' Presidency was ambitious. Like his father, he believed that the government should invest in education and science for the betterment of its citizens. He proposed a national university and observatory. He pursued his agenda with tenacity and initiative, and like his father, enjoyed negligible political support. Like his father, he served only one term as President.

A true public servant, John Quincy Adams returned to public life after a brief hiatus to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives from his hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts. In his nine terms, he spoke of no issue more often—or with more vigor—than slavery. Like his parents, John Quincy Adams was a stolid abolitionist, known to his colleagues as "old man eloquent." He also helped to establish the Smithsonian Institution, the museum in the heart of the mall. He died at the "post of duty" as a dedicated public servant, suffering a stroke on the floor of the House. He passed away two days later in the U.S. Capitol.

John Quincy Adams' son, Charles Francis Adams, spent his formative years in Washington, learning through the examples of his distinguished predecessors. As he entered into politics, Charles Francis Adams became increasingly disenchanted with the insincerity and outright corruption of his generation of leaders in Washington. He soon bolted the Whigs in favor of the Free Soil Party, which organized around the principles of a profound opposition to slavery. He received the Party's Vice Presidential nomination in 1848, and eventually held his father's old seat in the U.S. Congress. In 1860, President Lincoln tapped Charles Francis Adams—now a member of the new Republican Party, and widely known for his sharp intellect and persuasive powers—to act as Ambassador to England in order to prevent British military support for the Confederacy. His logic, reserve and directness achieved functional neutrality from Britain, which helped to preserve the integrity of our Union.

Charles Francis Adams' son, Henry Adams, shared his father's frustration with politics and corruption in Washington. His observations steered him towards journalism, where he described the shortcomings of modern politics without falling prey to them. A "liberal Republican," Henry Adams wrote pointed, brilliant essays exposing political fraud and dishon-

esty. He shared the idealism and independence of his heritage, never putting politics above his convictions. Henry Adams was also an accomplished academic, teaching Medieval History at Harvard, and the first American to employ the "seminar" method of instruction. Henry Adams is best known for his acclaimed autobiography, "The Education of Henry Adams." Some have called it the greatest autobiography in American history.

The Adamses occupy a position in American history unequaled by any other family. They helped create our nation as champions of freedom; they helped defend and guide it during its vulnerable, early days; and they helped preserve it through the most divisive battle in American history. They devoted their lives to our Republic, and it is time to recognize and celebrate their genius, sacrifices, and significance, here is our nation's capital.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, we have two speakers remaining; and I wonder if we could after that have a minute or two.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. That is fine.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, why build a memorial to John Adams along with Abigail and John Quincy? That immediately leads to the question why one, has not one been built before?

John Adams was not a dramatic leader like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, FDR, or even Ronald Reagan, but John Adams was a man who rose from humble roots in Braintree, Massachusetts to the challenges of his time.

He was elected our first Vice President and the second President because he was the leader of the new New England branch of the government. The Virginians loomed large and were brilliant, but they did not stand alone.

From the beginning, John Adams prodded the Virginians as well as the others to independence. He had watched the British in Boston. He saw the inevitable before others in the Continental Congress did.

The anchor reason for this memorial is John Adams' leadership in creating our Nation, which has been ignored for far too long.

But it is also about his wife, Abigail, an extraordinary writer and political advisor. Without Abigail, it is not clear that John Adams would have been, ever been as successful as he was. The Adams, up until the Bush family, were our Nation's only father and son Presidents.

John Quincy Adams, like his father, was independent. He was not establishment enough for his Federalist base nor populist enough for the Jeffersonians. Charles Francis Adams, Henry Adams and their wives complete possibly the most extraordinary family in our history.

The best argument for this memorial is the extraordinary character of the Adams family, but perhaps not to the

New Republic magazine, which, in a recent thoughtful cover story, criticizes John Adams and author David McCullough, partly by arguing that personality, history, and character are overrated.

Were John and John Quincy Adams morally superior to the Virginians because they did not own slaves and fought against slavery? Let us see, the answer is yes.

Excuses like geography and family background explain some differences, but it does not explain why some people rise above such circumstances, nor does it mean that one position is not morally superior.

It took moral courage for John Quincy Adams, to make his stands, featured in the movie *Armistead*, courage anchored in his belief in Jesus Christ. The recent New Republic cover story can mock character, but a primary part of memorialization is to encourage future generations to emulate the virtuous character traits exemplified by our past leaders.

Should we build memorials to individuals? History is not just a deterministic march like historian Richard Hofstadter and others suggest. The importance of regular people should not be underestimated. I am reading the *Great Platte River Road* wrote by Merrill Mattes right now which is based upon the fascinating journals of average people heading West, but, in fact, there are different makers in history.

People living next door to each other, with similar opportunities and backgrounds, do respond differently to challenges. Some people rise to challenges, others shrink.

If one views memorials in Washington as tributes to a sort of Greek or Roman gods, you will be deeply disappointed upon further investigation. They are merely men with all sorts of flaws. Each of the Adams would certainly acknowledge their moral shortcomings, but that does not mean that they were not extraordinary Americans worth honoring. Even Jefferson with his serious moral failings, was a brilliant writer, Western visionary, and architect, among his other attributes.

Another New Republic criticism in their review of McCullough's book was that writers like McCullough promote books that millions of people like to read. This sort of elitism is often prevalent in publications read only by a small group of people who desire to seem more important than the unwashed masses.

The ultimate irony is that the review concludes by saying that Adams was an elitist. Well, I guess it takes one to know one.

Ultimately, the reviewer maintains that Adams' writings were out of step with his time and certainly out of step with the ideas held today. The reviewer makes some interesting points about ideological framework, some of his views were outdated, but Jefferson was a slave owner and certainly showed none of the gender equity traits of both John Adams and John Quincy Adams.

So is Jefferson to be ignored as well? John Adams was an eclectic visionary and a prolific writer. He is important like Jefferson and Franklin because of his actions and leadership on the ideas which have stood the test of time, not because of a few ideas that did not.

Furthermore, I would argue that John Adams' framework grounded in English law, like the writings of John Dickinson in letters of a Pennsylvania Farmer kept Jefferson and others from drifting into the disasters of the French revolution. Most forget how wrongheaded Jefferson was about the French and how close our radicals came to sending us down that path.

David McCullough with his tremendous book on John Adams, number one on the New York Times best-seller list, has reached multitudes of Americans with the story of John Adams. Hurrah to him for being a popularizer to help pave the way for this memorial.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), along with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who holds the Adams seat in Congress, for their leadership in bringing this memorial forward.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands, for moving this bill forward expeditiously, so that we can honor John Adams and his family over this 4th of July and that the future generations can learn from the character, valor and wisdom of John, Abigail, and John Quincy from a memorial, hopefully, near the Jefferson Memorial.

In one of the most extraordinary events in American history, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, died on the same day.

And that day was July 4, on the 50th anniversary of our nation's founding. In 1959 Lester Cappon edited a two-volume edition of correspondence between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. Like many others in our country, reading the exchanges of intellectual leaders of the founding of our Republic, helped spark my lifelong interest in history.

McCullough's book is a great place to start any study of John Adams. He makes his life vibrant—you feel like you know him well when you are done.

But there is a substantial body of literature on the Adams, if you desire further reading. I own a large office of collection of Adams' books.

The Book of Abigail and John edited by L.H. Butterfield features selected letters between husband and wife, probably unmatched in American history.

Adams: An American Dynasty by Francis Russell and Descent from Glory by Paul Nagel are studies of the Adams generations.

Passionate Sage by Joseph Ellis was just re-issued in paperback, and is an outstanding read whatever problems Professor Ellis is currently having.

I purchased the Character of John Adams by Peter Shaw in 1976, 25 years ago. It had a profound impact upon me, and made me an Adams admirer ever since.

Paul Nagel's biography of John Quincy Adams is probably the best book for further study of his amazing life.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands.

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like to right off the bat thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for bringing recognition to John and Abigail Adams and their family, a century and three quarters after his death.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) for his generous gift of time to show me the old house in Quincy and introduce me to the Adams' family.

Having grown up on a family farm in Braintree, now Quincy, Massachusetts, Adams was fully expected to become a farmer and a clergyman, but he soon abandoned any hope of a quiet private life in exchange for a life that called on his vision and valor in the birth of a republic.

I underscore valor, because he and his compatriots at that time for all they knew were marching straight to the gallows. While many of his contemporaries were calling for compromise with Britain, Adams was one of the first to realize that independence was the only reasonable resolution of the relationship between the oppressive parent and its upstart colony.

Adams realized that America's future did not lie in negotiating concessions, but in promoting liberty by whatever means necessary. The fact that he was willing to fight for our independence is an indication of how fervently he believed in liberty, yet much of his public service was focused on avoiding war.

During the first months of his Presidential administration, Adams was confronted with the very real prospect of war with France. Many in his own party, including his own cabinet, supported the idea of waging war. Adams insisted on peaceful negotiations and diplomacy, and he was wise to have done so.

It is also only fitting in this legislation that we recognize his wife, Abigail. Through their 54-year marriage, Abigail was a sounding board and John Adams' closest advisor. No doubt, John Adams was one of the most visionary, valiant and courageous patriots to shape the American system.

There are good reasons why our Constitutional government survives and thrives, and the Massachusetts constitution that preceded it; John Adams' genius is a large part of that reason.

Now, some say we might not want to devote precious space here in the District of Columbia to yet another monument.

□ 1445

By the same token, I suppose we could steer the millions of tourists

here to go to Charlottesville, Virginia, or to Springfield, Illinois, to the hometowns of these great patriots, and see the sites there and send millions of tourists to the narrow streets of Quincy. No. We should have a monument to this great man, these great people, here near the seat of government in Washington, D.C.

I thank my colleague for promoting this legislation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise humbly today in support of H.R. 1668 to establish an Adams Memorial Foundation. I speak with profound gratitude to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a family man and my colleague, for his sincere promotion and presentation of this ideal, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for their promotion of this important work.

So many have spoken so eloquently, Madam Speaker, today about the reasons for a memorial to the second President of the United States of America. I would rather reflect on the significance of the day 1 week from today that John Adams, the second President, made possible, July 2, 1776. That is when the Colossus of Independence stepped into the breach and stepped onto the floor of the then Congress of the United States and drew upon his profound Christian faith and drew upon his courage and education, defended liberty and the notion of independence.

Thomas Jefferson would later write that, on that day, "His power of thought and expression moved us from our seats." He went on to say of John Adams' role in the creation of the Declaration of Independence that "no man better merited than Mr. John Adams to hold a most conspicuous place in its design, he was the pillar of its support on the floor of Congress. It is a blessed advocate and defender against the multifarious assaults it encountered. With the British floating in innumerable ships off the coast of Boston, it was the courage and faith and conviction of John Adams more than any other man on July 2, 1776, who began the process that wrought our independence, that wrought the freedom to have the debate on this floor every day."

As we stand 1 week from the celebration on that particular day of days, July 2, 1776, I commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and all those to support this amendment. It is time that we remember the Colossus of Independence, John Adams.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), which will be the home of the new memorial.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for yielding me this time

and for her very hard work, along with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the Chair, in bringing this bill forward at such a timely moment.

I bring, I must say, particular congratulations, however, to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for what he has done and the way he has done it. If I may say so, I will be very sorry to see the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) leave at the end of the 107th Congress so that we might not have more enlightened ideas of this kind from him.

What he has done is define a great American family, one of the most distinguished in our history, who has simply been overlooked among all the memorials that stand out there all over Washington, D.C., our first and sixth President, and one of the most important First Ladies, Abigail Adams, an extraordinary writer in her own right and a strong abolitionist.

There is no need for us, really, to lay out the reasons for a memorial for this family in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reasons have already been laid out in the texts of American history and in the vindication of history itself.

Let me say a word about how the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) went about doing what he is doing because it is a case study, it seems to me, in how to approach a delicate area like the Mall.

He, from the beginning, in writing his bill, consulted with the relevant agencies, especially the National Capital Planning Commission, the agencies which Congress has given the authority over matters dealing with the mall. He is proceeding in full compliance with the Commemorative Works Act. He does not name a site for where the memorial shall be found. That we have given to the NCPC. He specifically states what should already be taken for granted, that his bill must be done in keeping with the Commemorative Works Act.

It is important to come forward and say what this Member has done because recently there has been a lot of controversy surrounding memorials on the Mall. Our generation is in danger of using all the available space on this small piece of land meant to serve Americans in perpetuity.

I commend the three commissions who are submitting a plan to fairly apportion space on the Mall. They have found for us areas contiguous to the Mall, areas near the Mall, areas centrally located where tourists may go.

One thing we know is that the Adams family belongs here on the Mall. The only question is how and where to put it. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) wants to make sure that this is done right and done through the commissions who are expert at doing this.

Madam Speaker, one generation does not have the right to fill the Mall as if there will be no great men or women who come after us, none among our children or grandchildren or great

grandchildren, but the Roemer bill says it even better. There must be space for those who, in our lack of wisdom, we have overlooked on the Mall.

The Roemer bill has found a great American family, which had no contemporaries to speak for them, no interest groups to speak for them. Instead, the Roemer bill let their contributions speak for themselves as a family worthy of recognition prominently in the Nation's Capital.

I thank the gentleman for the work he has done and for the work that will surely enhance the Mall area.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), my last speaker, who represents Quincy, the home, the place that was the town that was home to President Adams and his family.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise to mark an exciting occasion that, as David McCullough stated in his testimony, is some 200 years overdue, but better late than never.

I would take this occasion, also, to thank David McCullough for his contribution to the American people. Clearly, if there was a historian laureate as there is a poet laureate, I think we could all agree, the overwhelming consensus, it would be David McCullough. He has made history come alive in such a way that he has captured the attention of the American people.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). I think it was several Members who indicated their disappointment that he will not be returning in the next term. Let me add my voice to that. But let me reassure them that he will be very much involved and engaged in this effort as it proceeds over the course of the next several years. We have had many conversations regarding this, and I know he will continue to play a huge role.

Well, this legislation would at long last honor John, Abigail and John Quincy Adams, towering figures, as has been pointed out, to whom this Nation owes its very foundation. A family without peer in our Nation's history.

As my colleagues may understand, this is a special moment for me personally as a native son of Quincy, Massachusetts, where both John Adams and John Quincy Adams were born and raised. I sense, I feel deeply a certain political kinship, if you will, with this family as the first resident of Quincy to serve in this body since Charles Francis Adams, the son of John Quincy Adams, and obviously the grandson of John Adams, served in this body from 1859 to 1861.

Furthermore, Abigail Adams, wife and mother of the two Presidents, was from neighboring Weymouth, also part of our congressional district and where my own grandparents farmed and raised their children in the early 1900s.

Personally, this association is deeply humbling and yet the source of great

inspiration. As it is in Weymouth and Quincy and throughout the region, the birthplace of this Nation, from the pilgrims' first landfall in Provincetown on Cape Cod and settlement in Plymouth, Massachusetts, to John Hancock, also of Quincy, who presided over the Continental Congress that declared our independence, no family in American history has contributed so uniquely to the creation, the birth of this country, and to our democracy and to its survival as have John Quincy and Abigail.

The citizens of Quincy, Weymouth and Braintree and across the south shore of Boston have long recognized the magnitude of this legacy with great pride. It is enormously gratifying that we may now share in this pride with fellow Americans by authorizing a fitting memorial in the Capital.

It is and has been no easy task to enhance public appreciation of the Adams family when the objects of your admiration do so little to cooperate. This was a fiercely ambitious and industrious family, but they also displayed a frankness and selflessness that is rare in public life. That may account, I would submit, for the lack of appropriate public recognition until now.

The tendency towards self-effacement is reflected in a 1776 letter from John to Abigail in which he said, and I am quoting, "Let me have my farm, family, and goose quill; and all the honors and offices this world can bestow may go to those who deserve them better and desire them more. I covet them not."

On another occasion, he wrote, "Mausoleums, statues, monuments will never be erected to me."

This modesty was becoming, but certainly unwarranted. Few families in American history have given so much to their country over so many generations as statesmen, diplomats, advocates and authors. For any student of the first two centuries of American history, it seems incredible that there is no such tribute. It should be a highlight of every school pilgrimage to Washington. Well, today we are addressing this omission.

One of the most remarkable experiences of my 5 years in Congress occurred just 2 weeks ago during a subcommittee hearing on this bill chaired by the Congressman from Colorado, and to whom we all owe a debt of gratitude for his handling in such an expeditious fashion by bringing this legislation to the floor. I am sure he agrees that it was a riveting history seminar by two of the most eminent scholars of our time, David McCullough and Joseph Ellis.

They painted a portrait of John Adams as the Colossus of Independence, we have heard that from others, who chose Jefferson to draft the Declaration and nominated Washington to command the Continental Army. As others have referenced and David McCullough suggested, while Jefferson was the pen of the Declaration, it was Adams that gave it voice.

□ 1500

And later, with a nascent America drawing its very first breaths, he was our most effective diplomat in the 1780s, winning recognition of our national sovereignty from European powers and securing loans from the Dutch to finance the revolution, thus keeping an infant Nation alive during its most precarious years. A man of extraordinary courage, he instinctively embraced the public interest, even when it conflicted with his own self-interest, as when, as our second President, he steered America clear of the public outcry for war with France at the expense of his own reelection.

At his side throughout was a one-woman cabinet, Abigail Adams, whose influence would be impossible to overstate. She possessed a keen intellect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). All time has expired.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes on both sides.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, she was also an unwavering moral compass for her husband and for her son. She expressed with incredulity that patriots striving for independence could conceive of a new nation embracing the concept of slavery. She was their conscience. And their son, John Quincy Adams, diplomat, Secretary of State, author of the Monroe Doctrine, tireless abolitionist, and sixth President of the United States, died in this Chamber, in Congress, while the war with Mexico was being debated.

With so many lawyers and legislators nearby, I just want to say a brief word about the lasting contributions of John and John Quincy Adams to the development of the rule of law, not just here in America but around the world. It is truly a living legacy that continues to have powerful influence in the 21st century as we observe emerging democracies everywhere following, embracing the Adams model.

As early as 1776, Adams wrote, "The surest way to secure an impartial and exact execution of the laws was by guaranteeing an independent Judiciary." "Judges," he said, "should be subservient to none nor more complacent to one than another." In 1780, he had the opportunity to put these ideas, these concepts, into action as the framer of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the oldest written constitution still in force and the first to enshrine the concept of a coequal and independent Judiciary, "peopled by judges," as he said, "as free, impartial, and independent as the lot of humanity will admit."

He was keenly aware that it is an independent Judiciary that can best

protect fundamental personal liberties against the tyranny of despots and the tyranny of majorities. And when, 9 years later in the Constitutional Convention, our constitution was being considered, the framers adopted the system conceived by Adams, including his system for ensuring the independence of judges through life tenure, fixed compensation, and removal only by impeachment.

When, in 1801 his Presidency was drawing to a close, John Adams appointed John Marshall as the fourth chief justice of the United States, an appointment that would do more than any other in the history of our Nation to confirm the power and the independence of the judicial branch of government.

The Adams vision of the rule of law that a truly independent Judiciary is absolutely essential to a healthy and vibrant democracy has been proven by history, and it is high time that we celebrate that.

Not so long ago we celebrated the 200th anniversary of the arrival of John and Abigail Adams as the first occupants of the White House. With remarkable parallels to the 41st and 43rd Presidents, what an appropriate time to honor the Adams legacy, and I am confident that we shall.

As Mr. Ellis his observed in his testimony before the subcommittee, Washington and Jefferson required Adams' company during their lifetimes. They need him now in their repose. So do we.

So on behalf of the residents of Quincy and Weymouth, Braintree, and the south shore, I suggest we need to honor the Adams legacy now to achieve a more profound appreciation of this masterpiece of human genius and divine blessing called America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to once again commend and thank our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the sponsor of this bill, and thank our chairman for the generosity with time this afternoon.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to again thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN). Without the gentlewoman's help, this would not have been possible to move this quickly. She has been a delight to work with on this, and indeed to work with on all the things we have worked with so far in Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands. And I want to thank the rest of the subcommittee members as well.

I got a real education during this process. I have to admit that I too have not, and I perceive of myself as being some kind of an amateur historian, I love history; and yet I too did not understand the significance of John Adams, and not only John Adams but the Adams family. I am thankful for this being brought to my attention because it enriches my life as well.

There are principles to be taken, I think, from Adams' life. They are almost without number; but the ones I jotted down were his intelligence, his courage, his tenacity, his love of country, his religious faith, and something we, as politicians, talk about all the time and will be talking about on the stump during the 4th of July, I am sure, his belief in family values. If it were not for that strong belief in family values, he would not have had the kind of illustrious family that he has. So I am thankful for the education I received from this and for the education that future generations of Americans will get from the memorial that is created as a result of this.

Madam Speaker, this is a bill whose time has come. Let us pass it here today. Let us encourage our friends in the Senate to pass it. My dream, and I am sure the dream of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), would be that they too, even this week before recess, before the 4th of July, would pass this out of the Senate, and we would send it down to the President for his signature.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to Representative TIM ROEMER for introducing H.R. 1668. This legislation would authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a monument in our nation's capital to one of the most remarkable public servants this city and our country have ever known: our first vice-president and our second president, John Adams.

John Adams was the primary architect of the government in which all of us play an active role today, more than 200 years after he commenced his brave and tireless work to liberate his fellow citizens from the English Crown. Virtually millions of people have been the beneficiaries of his brilliant courage, but ironically, few of us fully understand and appreciate the depth or nature of the debt we owe him.

Madam Speaker, it was John Adams who authored a pamphlet that laid out the design adopted by our government in structuring three distinct and independent branches: our bicameral legislature, our executive branch and our independent judiciary. It is useful and appropriate to observe that it was John Adams who arguably fought more fiercely than any other person to ensure that our judiciary was independent. It was John Adams who observed that "we must be a nation of laws and not of men."

Madam Speaker, John Adams was also a great student of the world. He once wrote that "I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture in order to give their children

a right to study paintings, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain."

Benjamin Rush, himself a signer of the Declaration of Independence, wrote a letter in 1812 to his close friend John Adams in which he acknowledged that, "I consider you and [Jefferson] as the North and South Poles of the American revolution. Some talked, some wrote, and some fought to promote and establish it but you and Mr. Jefferson thought for all of us."

Jefferson himself called Adams the "colossus of independence," and in later recalling the driving force that Adams was in the Continental Congress, Jefferson observed that Adams's "sense and thought moved us from our seats."

Madam Speaker, let us honor, this great leader, patriot, and talented author of liberty to whom we owe our very freedom and independence as we approach the coming Fourth of July holiday; he who did more than any other person in the Continental Congress to bring it all about: John Adams.

It is gratifying that author David McCullough has appropriately been recognized by his alma mater and in 1998 received an honorary degree from Yale University.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, with the 225th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence being celebrated next week, it is with particular patriotic pride that the House should consider today H.R. 1668, a bill to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work to honor former President John Adams, his family and his legacy.

We can thank many people for bringing the House to this point, but I want to pay tribute to the work of one Member of this body who's inspiration and yeoman's work truly has given life and legs to the idea for an Adam's Memorial.

This member's work is based not in the politics of the moment or the whims of a majority, not upon the interest of a monied few or is it masked in media mania.

Representative TIM ROEMER's fount for this memorial was refreshingly found deep within the well spring of democracy itself, intellectual curiosity.

Though Adams himself sought no memorial, even he would appreciate the sentient scene of ROEMER cloistered in the Library of Congress greedily soaking up the lyrical lessons of Adams to the Continental Congress working tirelessly toward independence, drafting our Nation's now oldest constitution, that of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and continuing his service as Vice-President and President of the United States.

Representative ROEMER himself stands sentinel to all that Adams worked for his entire life, enlightened leadership. We thank him for his work on this legislation. Which will help illuminate our Nation's founding and the contributions Adams can still bring to Americans today.

Madam Speaker, as this bill's language points out, somewhere along the way, we lost sight of the extraordinary national contributions of John Adams and those of his wife Abigail and their offspring. Among the gleaming marble facades of our presidential constellation along our national mall, among the many sites where we pay homage to individual's throughout America's history here in our Nation's Capital, there is a void, an Adams void, that should be filled.

Daniel Webster, on the occasion of the deaths of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson on July 4th, 1826, noted: "A truly great man . . . is no temporary flame." Rather he concluded it is "a spark of fervent heat, as well as radiant light, with power to rekindle the common mass of human kind; so that when it glimmers in its own decay, and finally goes out in death, no night follows, but it leaves the world all light, all on fire from the potent contact of its own spirit."

It is time we reignited the flame of Adams genius and work. Our flint and steel will be an interpretive memorial for generations to visit, perpetually sparking their curiosities of this great American, John Adams, his legacy and his family.

Former Librarian of Congress, Daniel Boorstin, has highlighted for me a passage in a letter Thomas Jefferson sent Adams recalling the joint efforts of the two old revolutionaries, "We were fellow-laborers in the same cause . . . Laboring always at the same oar, with some wave ever ahead, threatening to overwhelm us, and yet passing harmless under our bark, we knew not how we rode through the storm with heart and hand, and made a happy port . . . and so we have gone on, and shall go on puzzled and prospering beyond example in the history of man."

With heart and hand let us give sail to that same voyage in the tradition of our founders. Let us hold the lamp of liberty bright to find passage through storms beyond our horizons and batten down all doubts of democracy by hoisting high the life and legacy of John Adams.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I hope that we pass this bill unanimously here today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1668, 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. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1668, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FUNDING FOR NATIONAL 4-H PROGRAM CENTENNIAL INITIATIVE

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 657) to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 657

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

SECTION 1. NATIONAL 4-H PROGRAM CENTENNIAL INITIATIVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the 4-H Program is 1 of the largest youth development organizations operating in each of the 50 States and over 3,000 counties;

(2) the 4-H Program is promoted by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and land-grant colleges and universities;

(3) the 4-H Program is supported by public and private resources, including the National 4-H Council; and

(4) in celebration of the centennial of the 4-H Program in 2002, the National 4-H Council has proposed a public-private partnership to develop new strategies for youth development for the next century in light of an increasingly global and technology-oriented economy and ever-changing demands and challenges facing youth in widely diverse communities.

(b) GRANT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture may provide a grant to the National 4-H Council to pay the Federal share of the cost of—

(A) conducting a program of discussions through meetings, seminars, and listening sessions on the National, State, and local levels regarding strategies for youth development; and

(B) preparing a report that—

(i) summarizes and analyzes the discussions;

(ii) makes specific recommendations of strategies for youth development; and

(iii) proposes a plan of action for carrying out those strategies.

(2) COST SHARING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of the program under paragraph (1) shall be 50 percent.

(B) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the program under paragraph (1) may be paid in the form of cash or the provision of services, material, or other in-kind contributions.

(3) AMOUNT.—The grant made under this subsection shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

(c) REPORT.—The National 4-H Council shall submit any report prepared under subsection (b) to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(d) FUNDING.—The Secretary may fund the grant authorized by this section from—

(1) funds made available under subsection (e); and

(2) notwithstanding subsections (c) and (d) of section 793 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 2204f), funds from the Account established under section 793(a) of that Act.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$5,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support S. 657, a bill that authorizes funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. 4-H has been a guiding force for America's youth for over the past century. It has taught countless numbers of youth responsibility and a sense of community.

This bill is identical to a House version, H.R. 1388, that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and I strongly support. S. 657 will provide the money for the 4-H programs in all 50 States to conduct meetings, seminars, and listening sessions on the national, State and local levels regarding strategies for youth development. Most importantly, it requires a report that Congress and the President can use to help determine what avenues and programs are best suited to helping the youth of this country.

S. 657 will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a \$5 million grant to the National 4-H Council. The bill sets up a cost-share structure so that the private sector will match the grant up to \$5 million.

For those of my colleagues that are wondering why my Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development and Research is so concerned, let me get right to the point. The rural development and research programs that my subcommittee is responsible for overseeing are stretched very thin, and the loss of young people in our rural areas is extremely disturbing. The best thing about the 4-H youth program is that it not only helps youth in rural communities but urban and suburban communities as well, because 4-H programs are present in over 3,000 counties in the United States.

The National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative is good for America's youth and for America's future. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also rise in support of this bill, S. 657, which provides funding to support the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. For 100 years, the 4-H program has served the youth of this Nation by providing leadership training and education in a wide array of life skills. Our Nation has changed. The 4-H program has changed as well. While many may think that the 4-H program is for rural youth only, the fact is that now over 35 percent of the programs for youth are really, indeed, in urban and suburban areas. Without abandoning their original core constituency, the 4-

H program and its thousands of volunteers have expanded their program throughout our Nation.

So as the 4-H program celebrates its 100 years of service to American youth, this bill will play an important part. S. 657 will authorize funding for a grant, as has been mentioned, which will be administered by the USDA to help the National 4-H Council plan a national convention to develop critical youth-development strategies for the next century. The \$5 million provided by this act will be paid out in a 50-50 Federal-private matching grant, so it will also be a tool to leverage additional private resources or resources from non-Federal sources.

Helping to shape the future of our Nation's youth is one of the most important investments this Congress can make. This is one good effort we can make in that regard. I thank the gentleman for bringing this bill to the floor, and I am delighted to encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

□ 1515

Mr. GANSKE. Madam Speaker, I am thankful that the House is taking up this legislation today which is the companion bill to the Ganske 4-H bill, H.R. 1388, which has wide bipartisan support.

In April, a group of 4-H'ers from Iowa asked me to introduce this legislation in the House of Representatives. Since 4-H has been working to serve both rural and urban kids for over 100 years, I was proud to help them.

Madam Speaker, this is the 4-H logo. It stands for head, heart, hands and health: Head for clearer thinking, heart for greater loyalty, hands for larger service, and health for better living. These are goals that are laudatory.

4-H is active in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. It has chapters in over 3,000 counties, and has almost 7 million members. There are over 600,000 4-H volunteer leaders around the country, and I want to thank them for their efforts and for the countless hours they have put in. I know that those volunteers also recognize that their own lives are enriched by the time they spend with kids in 4-H.

Madam Speaker, 4-H is often seen as a rural organization, and it has served rural areas very successfully through its history. But the organization is very active in serving youth in our urban areas and cities. Over a third of its members are from the suburbs and cities.

Madam Speaker, 4-H is undertaking an ambitious plan to use the celebration of its 100th anniversary to foster a new initiative in youth development, culminating in a plan of action for families, communities and youth leaders around America to implement

strategies for youth development to lead us into the next century. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support 4-H by voting for this legislation.

I am honored that I was able to play a role in bringing this legislation forward, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for their important contributions as well. Vote for this legislation.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I do not have any additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Madam Speaker, as a proud Hoosier representing proud 4-H'ers across Indiana, and as a former 4-H'er myself, I am proud to stand in favor of S. 657 to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) for their seminal work on this project, and for their efforts to raise the national profile of 4-H through this study.

Madam Speaker, think of it: 50 States, 3,000 counties, and just as many county fairs, 4-H is making a difference in the lives of America's youth. In the year 2002, 4-H will celebrate 100 years of having fun and making a difference for kids in both rural areas and, in increasing measure, in urban areas around the United States of America.

The grant authorized by this legislation for the Secretary of Agriculture will not only provide the opportunity to study strategies for youth development, but as the gentleman from Oklahoma stated, it will require a report to the President. It will require leadership in 4-H, both public and private, to think clearly about the next 100 years of youth development in 4-H.

Madam Speaker, \$5 million may not seem like a lot of money in this town, but all across America \$5 million is very serious money. It gives us a genuine opportunity to assist 4-H in developing new strategies to face the new horizons for America's youth increasingly beset by distractions of a destructive nature that lead them down a path of unproductive lives.

Madam Speaker, 4-H is fun. But as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) stated so eloquently, it is much more than just fun. It is head, heart, hands and health. It is teaching the habits of good living to young boys and girls across America.

Madam Speaker, 4-H makes a difference, and so I stand in strong support and urge all of my colleagues to support this bill to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is one of those occasions where as a Member of Congress, we have an opportunity to return something to one of the organizations that gave us the opportunities that we now enjoy.

I think back to my days at Crawford Public School as a member of the Crawford Junior 4-H Club when I had my first opportunity to participate in leadership experience, my first opportunity to be a president of anything. This is my opportunity to return to 4-H, this body's opportunity to return to 4-H, part of what it has provided all of us with.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam Speaker, I support this bill to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. From its beginnings as the Corn Club for Boys and Tomato Canning Club for Girls, the 4-H program has grown to one of the largest youth organizations in the United States with more than 6.8 million participants. Today 4-H'ers can be found building model rockets, organizing canned food drives for the needy, showing livestock, delivering a speech before local government officials on issues critical to youth, and much more.

In celebration of the centennial of the 4-H Program in 2002, the National 4-H Council has proposed a public-private partnership, to develop new strategies for youth development for the next century. As our world becomes increasingly global and technology-oriented, the demands and challenges facing youth continue to change. This bill will allow the program to change as well. The bill calls for the federal government to provide a \$5 million federal grant that may be matched by non-federal sources.

Today, as a former 4-H member I ask for your support of the youth of America by passing this bill and allowing this great youth organization to evolve into the next century.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, on behalf of over 94,101 Kansas youth involved in the 4-H program, I rise today in support of the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. 2002 marks the 100th anniversary of 4-H and it is only fitting that today we take action to recognize the important contributions that this organization has made in the development of our youth.

In my home state of Kansas, 4-H is the largest youth organization outside of school. Almost 100,000 youth between the ages of 7-19 are involved in 3,065 4-H clubs and groups. 4-H reaches 1 in 7 Kansas youth, helping them develop important life skills such as teamwork, cooperation, time management, and communication.

4-H is a diverse organization, in both its membership and programming. 4-H is traditionally thought of as being targeted to "farm kids." Yet 55% of 4-H'ers in Kansas, a very rural state, reside in suburban and urban areas. Of the 6.8 million youth in 4-H nationwide, 30% represent minority racial, cultural, and ethnic populations. In fact, minority youth are the fastest growing segment of 4-H membership.

While 4-H has expanded to meet the needs and interests of youth with diverse backgrounds in all types of communities, at the same time it continues to honor its historic connection with America's rural communities. In Kansas, 45% of 4-H participants live on

farms or in rural areas. As a member of the Agriculture Committee and the Congressional Rural caucus, I understand and appreciate the leadership and opportunity 4-H has provided to millions of our rural youth over the past century.

The purpose of 4-H is illustrated in the 4 H's—head, heart, hands and health—which make up the symbolic 4-H clover. As the pledge states, 4-H does indeed teach youth to think more clearly, to value loyalty, to engage in service, and to follow a healthy lifestyle so that they may become better citizens who will enrich the lives of others and improve our society.

The occasion of a centennial is a significant milestone for any organization, and I am proud of the century of service 4-H has given to our nation. I encourage my colleagues to recognize the contributions and value of 4-H youth development by supporting the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House bill 1388 to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. For 100 years 4-H programs across the United States have been producing exemplary citizens. I believe that programs such as 4-H that promote healthy lifestyles, good decision making skills, and loyalty to one's self, community, country and world are vital to the development of our nation's youth. The program has successfully reached our youth in over 3,000 counties in all 50 states. Through conferences, exchanges, and camps in North Carolina, 4-H is making a difference in the lives of young people.

Through federally-funded grants, this bill will make it possible to conduct meetings and seminars to determine what youth development programs are needed and/or currently working and allow this important program to succeed another one hundred years.

4-H participants in North Carolina and across the country benefit from the relationships formed and the timeless values taught through the program. The 4-H program teaches young people skills that will last a lifetime, and reaches students in both rural and urban areas, while not misplacing the values the organization was founded upon. Thank you and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to offer my full support of funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative. 4-H is the youth education branch of the Cooperative Extension Service, which is also a program of the United States Department of Agriculture. The 4-H program is one of the nation's largest youth development organizations operating in over 3,000 counties throughout each of the fifty states. Texas has one of the largest memberships which includes more than 1.1 million children and teenagers. In and around the district I am privileged to represent, the 28th District of Texas, more than 72,000 young people are enrolled in the 4-H program.

In anticipation of its centennial in 2002, the National 4-H Council has proposed the creation of a public-private partnership to develop new strategies for youth development that will reflect the fast-changing realities of life in the 21st Century. Among other things, 4-H hopes to examine the impact of expanding globalization and the role of emerging high technology businesses.

The National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative will promote program discussions on the

national, state, and local levels. These programs, whether meetings, seminars, or listening sessions, will promote new strategies for youth development and education. This legislation will provide grants up to \$5 million to the National 4-H Council to federal share of program costs. Funding for these planning strategies will help address the issues facing millions of youth all across America.

During these sessions, which will begin at the county level, interested young people will be able to raise issues or questions that face them and their future, such as how the 4-H program can best use emerging technologies to meet tomorrow's challenges. The results of these county sessions will form the foundation of a national strategic plan to implement changes and better prepare for the future. The diverse backgrounds and needs of Texas' counties will be reflected in these reports, helping 4-H members all across the nation understand and adapt to our changing world.

Funding for this program will greatly benefit America's future by helping today's youth. We always say that our children are our future. Let's give them the chance to speak out and address the concerns of our changing world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 657.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 657, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CALLING ON CHINA TO RELEASE LI SHAOMIN AND ALL OTHER AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF CHINESE ANCESTRY BEING HELD IN DETENTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 160) calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Li Shaomin and all other American scholars of Chinese ancestry being held in detention, calling on the President of the United States to continue working on behalf of Li Shaomin and the other detained scholars for their release, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 160

Whereas in recent months the Government of the People's Republic of China has arrested and detained several scholars and intellectuals of Chinese ancestry with ties to the United States, including at least 2 United States citizens and 3 permanent residents of the United States;

Whereas according to the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China, and international human rights organizations, the Government of the People's Republic of China "has continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms";

Whereas the harassment, arbitrary arrest, detention, and filing of criminal charges against scholars and intellectuals has created a chilling effect on the freedom of expression, in contravention of internationally accepted norms, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People's Republic of China signed in October 1998;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China frequently uses torture and other human rights violations to produce coerced "confessions" from detainees;

Whereas the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China has extensively documented that human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China "included instances of extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, forced confessions, arbitrary arrest and detention, the mistreatment of prisoners, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process", and also found that "[p]olice and prosecutorial officials often ignore the due process provisions of the law and of the Constitution . . . [f]or example, police and prosecutors can subject prisoners to severe psychological pressure to confess, and coerced confessions frequently are introduced as evidence";

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has reported that some of the scholar detainees have "confessed" to their "crimes" of "spying", but it has yet to produce any evidence of spying, and has refused to permit the detainees to confer with their families or lawyers;

Whereas the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China also found that "police continue to hold individuals without granting access to family or a lawyer, and trials continue to be conducted in secret";

Whereas Dr. Li Shaomin is a United States citizen and scholar who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China for more than 100 days, and was formally charged with spying for Taiwan on May 15, 2001;

Whereas Dr. Li Shaomin has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, and has not been allowed to contact his wife and child (both United States citizens), or his lawyer;

Whereas Dr. Gao Zhan is a permanent resident of the United States and scholar who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China for more than 114 days, and was formally charged with "accepting money from a foreign intelligence agency" on April 4, 2001;

Whereas Dr. Gao Zhan has been deprived of her basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, and has not been allowed to contact her husband and child (both United States citizens), her lawyer, or Department of State consular personnel in China;

Whereas Wu Jianmin is a United States citizen and author who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of

China, has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has been denied access to lawyers and family members, and has yet to be formally charged with any crimes;

Whereas Qin Guangguang is a permanent resident of the United States and researcher who has been detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China on suspicions of "leaking state secrets", has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention, has been denied access to lawyers and family members, and has yet to be formally charged with any crimes;

Whereas Teng Chunyan is a permanent resident of the United States, Falun Gong practitioner, and researcher who has been sentenced to three years in prison for spying by the Government of the People's Republic of China, apparently for conducting research which documented violations of the human rights of Falun Gong adherents in China, has been deprived of her basic human rights by being placed on trial in secret, and her appeal to the Beijing Higher People's Court was denied on May 11, 2001;

Whereas Liu Yaping is a permanent resident of the United States and a businessman who was arrested and detained in Inner Mongolia in March 2001 by the Government of the People's Republic of China, has been deprived of his basic human rights by being denied any access to family members, by being denied regular access to lawyers, is reported to be suffering from severe health problems, and has yet to be formally charged with any crimes;

Whereas because there is documented evidence that the Government of the People's Republic of China uses torture to coerce confessions from suspects, and because the Government has thus far presented no evidence to support its claims that the detained scholars and intellectuals are spies, and because spying is vaguely defined under Chinese law, there is reason to believe that the "confessions" of Dr. Li Shaomin and Dr. Gao Zhan may have been coerced; and

Whereas the arbitrary imprisonment of United States citizens and residents by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and the continuing violations of their fundamental human rights, demands an immediate and forceful response by Congress and the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) condemns and deplores the continued detention of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, Teng Chunyan, and other scholars detained on false charges by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and calls for their immediate and unconditional release;

(B) condemns and deplores the lack of due process afforded to these detainees, and the probable coercion of confessions from some of them;

(C) condemns and deplores the ongoing and systematic pattern of human rights violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China, of which the unjust detentions of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan, are only important examples;

(D) strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider carefully the implications to the broader United States-Chinese relationship of detaining and coercing confessions from United States citizens and permanent residents on unsubstantiated spying charges or suspicions;

(E) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider releasing Liu Yaping on medical parole, as provided for under Chinese law; and

(F) believes that human rights violations inflicted on United States citizens and residents by the Government of the People's Republic of China will reduce opportunities for United States-Chinese cooperation on a wide range of issues; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President—

(A) should make the immediate release of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan a top priority of United States foreign policy with the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(B) should continue to make every effort to assist Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, and Teng Chunyan, and their families, while discussions of their release are ongoing;

(C) should make it clear to the Government of the People's Republic of China, that the detention of United States citizens and residents, and the infliction of human rights violations upon United States citizens and residents, is not in the interests of the Government of the People's Republic of China because it will reduce opportunities for United States-Chinese cooperation on other matters; and

(D) should immediately send a special, high ranking representative to the Government of the People's Republic of China to reiterate the deep concern of the United States regarding the continued imprisonment of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Qin Guangguang, Teng Chunyan, and Liu Yaping, and to discuss their legal status and immediate humanitarian needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in an emotional appeal before the House Committee on International Relations last Tuesday, the wife of Dr. Li Shaomin and the husband of Dr. Gao Zhan, two highly respected scholars held hostage by the People's Republic of China, asked Congress and the President to leave no stone unturned in securing the release of their loved ones.

Also at that hearing, Mike Jendrzeczyk of Human Rights Watch made a number of incisive comments and said, "The detentions of respected China scholars have sent a shock wave through the international academic community. Many researchers are increasingly worried about the risks of working in China, and have taken extraordinary steps to speak out."

He noted on April 17, more than 400 leading scholars from 14 countries, as well as Taiwan and Hong Kong, all of them who work in the field of China studies, sent a petition to President Jiang Zemin. The authors of the letter noted that the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the latter, which was ratified last February, makes it very clear that holding academics and scholars are precluded by international law. Moreover, China's intolerance to free expression will likely

deter other academics from pursuing research in the People's Republic of China. The respected human rights leader bottom-lines it and says, "The detentions raise serious questions about the rule of law in China and whether it exists."

Indeed, Madam Speaker, at least six Chinese American scholars and intellectuals are today being unjustly detained. They are being held hostage by the PRC, an outrage that demands immediate relief. H. Res. 160, which I introduced on June 8 and now has approximately 40 cosponsors, calls for the immediate and unconditional release of these scholars and academics.

These include: Dr. Li Shaomin, who is a United States citizen and scholar who has been detained by the PRC for 120 days and counting. He has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest, detention and indictment, and has not been allowed to contact his wife and child, both of whom are American citizens as well, nor has he been in contact with his lawyer.

Dr. Gao Zhan is a permanent resident of the United States and is a member of the faculty of American University. She has been detained by the People's Republic of China for 134 days and counting.

Mr. Wu Jianmin is an American citizen and author who has been detained by China and deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention.

Qin Guangguang is a permanent resident of the United States and a researcher who has been detained by China on suspicions of leaking state secrets. His human rights have been violated by arbitrary arrest and detention.

Ms. Teng Chunyan is a permanent resident of the United States, a researcher and a Falun Gong practitioner. She has been sentenced to 3 years in prison for spying by the PRC. The apparent reason for her sentence is her research showing that the PRC is violating the human rights of Falun Gong adherents in China. If that is true, Madam Speaker, the U.S. State Department is guilty of that charge. This country's Report on Human Rights Practice, which catalogs the myriad of human rights abuses by China, also points out that at least 100 Falun Gong were tortured to death last year as part of their crackdown.

Then there is Mr. Liu Yaping. He is a permanent resident of the United States and a businessman. He was arrested in Inner Mongolia in March 2001. He has been diagnosed with severe health problems while in detention, including a brain aneurysm which may rupture. The reason for his arbitrary arrest and detention are unclear. He has had no contact with his family, and has not had regular access to his lawyers.

Madam Speaker, at a hearing of the Committee on International Relations, noting that both she and her husband, Li Shaomin, are American citizens, Liu

Yingli testified, "If China's Ministry of State Security can get away with imprisoning my husband now, it may well detain more academics in China in the future, regardless of their skin color, or country of origin."

Despite the fact that Dr. Li is not a political activist or dissident, but is a teacher who worked for AT&T in New Jersey for 8 years, Liu Yingli said, "This case is not just about the freedom of one man, but about academic freedom." Again, Dr. Li has been held hostage for 120 days.

Liu Yingli also testified, "It has been nearly 4 months since Li Shaomin's detention on February 25: 4 months of grief and pain, 4 months of worry and fear. But we are American citizens. We should not have to live with such fears."

She said, "This painful experience has not spared our daughter, who is only 9, and our parents, who are more than 70 years old. Our family has spent sleepless nights and restless days waiting for news of Shaomin. Our daughter, Diana, has asked repeatedly when Daddy will come home."

□ 1530

Madam Speaker, when this unjust detention was brought to my attention I expressed concern and dismay. But when I met with Liu and her daughter—I knew more—much more had to be done. Diana, the 9-year-old daughter of Dr. Li asked me to help her dad. She composed two letters and drawings in crayon that really hit home with me. One that was for me and one I was asked to give to President Bush. I would just like to quote the one that I gave to the President on April 25. I hand delivered it to him.

"Hi, Mr. President,

"My name is Diana Li. I am 9 years old. I have never written to a President before in my life. Now I am writing because China has captured my daddy, Shaomin Li. I need your help to rescue my daddy. Would you please help me? I miss my daddy very much. I can imagine if you were captured by China, your daughters would miss you very much, too. And so would their mom.

"Please help me rescue my daddy. Thank you, Diana Li."

Madam Speaker, let us hope that the crayon is mightier than the sword and that Beijing will understand the extreme folly of their hostage-taking and listen as well to the plea of a 9-year-old asking for her father.

And, Madam Speaker, the cases of the other hostages are equally compelling. At the hearing last Tuesday, we also heard from Donghua Xue, the husband of Dr. Gao Zhan, who has been held hostage for 134 days. Mr. Xue, a senior systems analyst at EDS Corporation, told us how on February 11 when he and his wife, a U.S. permanent resident and research fellow at American University and their 5-year-old son Andrew, an American citizen, were leaving China after a brief vacation, were arrested and detained. To quote Mr. Xue.

"The three of us were separated by force, blindfolded and held in three different places."

Donghua was held for 26 days. His 5-year-old son, an American citizen, was separately held for 26 days without any contact whatsoever with his parents or family members. Even our embassy in Beijing was in the dark about this littlest hostage who, I need to say again, is an American citizen.

Madam Speaker, it was and is abundantly clear that Mr. Xue is desperately worried about his wife's condition, and he told us at the hearing that her attorneys in Beijing have made several attempts to visit her and they have all been denied. The only reason we can think of, he went on to say, is that she perhaps has been physically tortured or at least has some obvious wounds that they do not want the outside world to see. In a word he went on, "My wife Gao Zhan is in a very dangerous situation. I am calling on the American government to try even harder to help."

In his testimony, Madam Speaker, Mr. Xue also underscored the Chinese government's rhetorical commitment to the rule of law. He said "the Chinese Ambassador to the U.S. emphasized several times in his letters to the congressional Members and to U.S. officials that, quote, "China is a country ruled by laws." The spokesman from the Chinese foreign minister has said that they, quote, "strictly follow the legal procedures to deal with the scholars' cases."

"I certainly wish that these statements were true," he went on, "but from my nightmare experience in China, the statements are far from reality. To make a family disappear from the earth for almost a month, to illegally detain my son Andrew," he testified, "a U.S. citizen for 26 days, without even notifying the U.S. embassy, to separate a 5-year-old American child by force from his legal guardians and his family, to emotionally and psychologically torture a 5-year-old child for several weeks just for interrogations hostage. These actions not only violate Chinese and international laws and U.S.-China treaties, these actions are inhuman and they are barbaric. We can only associate these actions with the terrorism organizations, not with a country that purports to be ruled by laws."

Mr. Xue also made an important comparison, Madam Speaker, with the way in which his wife's case has been portrayed and that of our 24 detained servicemen and women from the EP-3E reconnaissance aircraft. I quote him again:

"When our 24 crew members had been detained in China, they were allowed to meet with U.S. officials. They were allowed to send messages to their families. They lived in a hotel condition according to news reports. They were finally released after 11 days of diplomatic negotiations. We don't know where our scholars are. We don't know

anything about my wife's health condition. But one thing we are 100 percent sure of, they are not living in a hotel condition. Why do they treat crew members and the scholars so differently? It is the Chinese government who is discriminating against the Chinese people. I hope the American government pays the same effort as they did for the crew members to rescue these detained scholars."

Madam Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution. Hopefully, this is the first step in raising everyone's consciousness concerning this outrage of hostage-taking of these Chinese Americans.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 160. I commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for introducing this important resolution and for his quite eloquent advocacy of it. We have so often heard the pleas of children hurt by governments, hurt by violations of human rights; and I think that it will often be quoted, "Let the crayon be mightier than the sword." I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that is a line that I think we should remember.

Madam Speaker, this resolution calls on the government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release American scholars of Chinese ancestry, including both United States citizens and U.S. permanent residents, being held in detention. Unfortunately, the recent arrest of these scholars is only the latest example of the Chinese Government's willingness to invent false accusations against perfectly innocent people, especially those involved in the noble but dangerous effort to secure human rights for the people of China.

To illustrate the cost in human terms of China's brutality, let us look at one case, one of the several cases that our colleague from New Jersey brought up, and that is the case of Dr. Gao Zhan. Gao Zhan is an academic who specializes in researching women's issues. She and her husband are permanent residents of the United States and their 5-year-old son, Andrew, is an American by birth. Gao and her family traveled to China to visit relatives. As they stood in line at the Beijing airport waiting for their flight back to the United States, they were seized by Chinese officials. Each family member was forced into a separate car waiting outside the terminal and taken away.

Imagine the horror of a mother being suddenly separated from her child by nameless Chinese officials. Imagine the fear experienced by Gao's husband as he was blindfolded, driven for hours to an unknown location, and subsequently interrogated about his wife's research. Imagine being a 5-year-old boy torn away from your parents under such circumstances. Gao's son was taken to a

state-run institution. He was held alone for 26 days, completely separated from his family. Let me repeat, a 5-year-old boy held alone for 26 days without his mother, without his father, or without even access to his grandparents, who happen to live in China.

These actions violate international law and bilateral agreements between the United States and China, not to mention basic human decency in the way of treating people, particularly a 5-year-old child. Chinese authorities finally allowed Gao's husband to retrieve his son and return to the United States. Gao, however, has not fared so well. She is still imprisoned in China on false charges. The Chinese Government refuses to reveal the nature of the so-called evidence against Gao or to give her a chance to publicly defend herself with adequate defense counsel.

We know about the cases of Gao Zhan and the other five scholars that are specifically mentioned in the resolution because they have connections to the United States. They are residents or citizens of the United States. But let us also remember that there are tens of thousands of Chinese citizens who have no connection with America but are dissidents struggling to lay the groundwork for a future democratic China. These thousands are locked away for years in Chinese jails. There is no embassy to ask about them, no newspapers to write about them, and they are relegated to a most uncertain and most inhumane fate. We must remember them. We must honor them and the democratic cause for which they fight.

As a first step, it is absolutely imperative that the Bush administration make the release of these six Chinese Americans a top priority in our relationship with the People's Republic of China. We can win the release of these Chinese Americans if we bring this issue to the highest level. If President Bush personally asks President Jiang to release these and other imprisoned scholars, I am confident that Gao Zhan will see her husband and son again, and that Li Shaomin will soon come home to his wife and his daughter.

It is important that we pass this resolution. It is also important that we keep these human rights abuses in mind when we decide what position to take as a country and as a Congress on the issue of whether the Olympics should be held in Beijing in 2008. It is perhaps unfortunate that the administration has announced that it is neutral with regard to that bid for the Olympics. But the Olympics stands for something. It stands, in part, for the humane treatment of all people. I think this Congress ought to take up and bring up on this floor the resolution urging that the Olympics not be held in Beijing while human rights abuses continue.

In addition, it is important that we as Members of Congress keep these human rights issues in mind as we vote on annual, quote, "normal trade relations," also known as most-favored-na-

tion status when that issue comes to this floor. But for now, I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 160.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his outstanding leadership on House Resolution 160, calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Li Shaomin and other American scholars of Chinese ancestry currently being held in detention. I also would commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his eloquent words today in support of this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, the Good Book says that we are to stand with those in prison as though we ourselves were prisoners. In this well of liberty, this well where resides the dreams and hopes and ambitions of freedom-loving people all over the world, today's resolution authored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is an important statement. It is important that this Congress call on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Dr. Li Shaomin and other American scholars of Chinese ancestry held in detention and that we call today on the President of the United States to continue immediately and urgently working on behalf of their release.

The Government of the People's Republic of China, Madam Speaker, has targeted, arrested, and detained several scholars and intellectuals of Chinese ancestry with ties to the United States, including, as astonishingly as it may seem, two United States citizens and three permanent residents of the United States of America. According to the Department of State's 2000 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices in China and international human rights organizations, the Government of the PRC has, quote, "continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms. Targeting of intellectuals and scholars for harassment, arbitrary arrest, detention and criminal charges has created a chilling effect on the nascent freedom of expression which has begun to take hold within the People's Republic of China."

Dr. Li Shaomin is a United States citizen, Madam Speaker, and a scholar who has been detained by the Government of the PRC for more than 100 days. He was formally charged with spying for Taiwan on May 15, 2001. Dr. Li has been deprived of his basic human rights by arbitrary arrest and detention and has not, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) stated with passion, even been allowed to contact his wife and child or his attorney or been offered even the most

rudimentary due-process rights which, while not secured and vouchsafed for the citizens of China, certainly ought to be respected for the citizens of the United States of America within the geographic boundaries of China.

Accordingly, this resolution, Madam Speaker, does in fact condemn and deplore the continued detention of Dr. Li, of Dr. Gao Zhan and other scholars detained on false charges by the Government of China, calls for their immediate release, deplores the lack of due process and urges the Government of the PRC to consider carefully the implications to its broader relationship with the United States through this detention and coercion of American citizens and citizens of Chinese descent.

□ 1545

We need look no further, Madam Speaker, than the cover of *The Washington Post* today, which speaks about China's concern about U.S. actions affecting our long-term relationship.

Madam Speaker, I would say it is time for China to begin to worry how its actions against American citizens will affect the relationship of this body to that government.

I close again with that challenge, that quote, from two millennia ago that we ought to stand with those that are in prison, Madam Speaker, as though we ourselves were prisoners. We in this Congress should stand today strongly for House Resolution 160 and call on the government of the People's Republic of China to make this small step toward liberty.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, as representatives of the American people, with this resolution we will today urge the People's Republic of China, in the strongest possible terms, to release Li Shoamin, a naturalized American citizen, and I might add a constituent of mine from New Jersey, from my congressional district, from custody of the Beijing State Security Bureau, where he has been detained since February of this year.

Our actions today are also intended to call attention to the other scholars of Chinese ancestry who are being illegally detained in China. I have met personally on three occasions with Liu Yingli, Mr. Li Shaomin's wife and their charming young daughter, Diana.

When one meets with them and talks with them and sees the pain and uncertainty that they are experiencing over the detainment of their husband and father, it is impossible not to realize how important this legislation is.

I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), in presenting this legislation and urging its passage.

Li Shaomin received his Ph.D. in sociology from Princeton a decade and a half ago. He is a respected and pub-

lished scholar in demography, has contributed greatly to research focused on strategic management and marketing.

On February 25, Dr. Li, who over the years has traveled frequently to Beijing and other parts of China, was traveling across the border to visit a friend. Upon crossing, Dr. Li was detained by state security officials who claimed he had been, well, we do not know. They now say he was engaged in espionage.

The detention of Dr. Li is just another in a string of a half dozen arrests by Chinese authorities of academics who have connections with China. We have a responsibility to let the Chinese Government know that the United States and the world are aware of these actions, are watching closely, and find this sort of behavior unacceptable.

The charges brought against Dr. Li are vague and unsubstantiated. The fact that Dr. Li is the son of a prominent Chinese dissident, Li Honglin, who now resides in Hong Kong, I think is a significant point. It raises extremely serious questions of political motivation for the Chinese detainment of Dr. Li.

Since his detention, Dr. Li's detention, Chinese authorities have refused to release any information or describe any so-called evidence that has surfaced against Dr. Li. Disturbingly, the Chinese authorities also failed to inform Dr. Li's wife directly about the detention until May 17, when she was informed by the state security ministry via telephone that her husband was arrested and charged with espionage. U.S. consular officials have not been granted sufficient access to him, and in addition without explanation from the Chinese authority, Liu Yingli and Dr. Li's lawyer have been denied access to Dr. Li.

Of course, all of this raises questions about the rights of people in China who do not have the U.S. embassy watching out for their interests, how much worse it must be for them.

The People's Republic of China is a proud nation that is increasingly taking its place on the world stage. All of us are aware of their desire to have increased trading relationships with the West; to host the Olympic games; to be on the modern stage of nations. If China wants to be a member of the community of nations, actions like the detainment of Dr. Li are unacceptable and, I would argue, counterproductive. It is only appropriate that Congress make clear that Dr. Li and other U.S. citizens who are being illegally detained must be released.

Violation of human rights, violation of standards, international standards of law, are not behavior consistent with a modern nation that wants to be part of the modern world of trade, of academic inquiry and exchange, and international exchange.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to pass this legislation. We must do all we can to see that these Americans are released as quickly as possible.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H. Res. 160 and to keep these issues in mind as other issues involving the U.S.-China relationship come before this House.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HYDE and the distinguished East Asia and Pacific Subcommittee Chairman, The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman LEACH, for swiftly moving H. Res. 160, a resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release certain American citizens and residents from detention in China. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH for drafting this important, timely resolution.

I am very concerned that Chinese-American citizens and U.S. permanent residents of Chinese ancestry are being illegally held by the government of the People's Republic of China. There is no rule of law in that country. In China a person is not innocent until proven guilty. A person's guilt or innocence is predetermined by the government, and, as we all know, thousands of arrests and imprisonments are carried out for political reasons.

Let's be perfectly clear about this. Government sponsored kidnapping is terrorism. It is no less a crime than what is being committed by terrorists against Americans currently being held in the Philippines.

Madam Speaker, as you will recall, the People's Republic of China has done this before. One year it held activist Harry Wu. Another time it held Wang Dan and Wei Jingsheng. Harry Wu was released to ensure the First Lady Hillary Clinton would attend the UN 1995 Beijing Women's Conference. Wang Dan and Wei Jingsheng were temporarily released in 1993 as China was bidding to host the 2000 Olympics game. For years the Chinese dictatorship have been holding and releasing, and then holding and releasing Catholic clergy loyal to Pope John Paul II. Some of these hostages are beaten to death, some are eventually released, some permanently, some temporarily after they are leveraged on MFN, WTO, Taiwan or some other significant issue.

So let us be clear. Our State Department is on notice that we want our people back immediately and unconditionally. The President should put on hold any consideration about his meeting with Chinese leaders until this occurs.

The Chinese government and the bureaucrats in the State Department who are still in place from the previous Administration must understand that our people are not pawns for trade. First the Chinese government must return our people and then we can talk about other things, such as trade.

The cautions U.S. response that we have given to date, just will not do. The taking of our citizens is an outrage and they should be released now and unconditionally. Accordingly, I strongly support H. Res. 160.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to make a statement on behalf of H. Res. 160, a bill that I have cosponsored which calls on the Chinese government to immediately and unconditionally release from prison Dr. Li Shaomin and all other American scholars of Chinese ancestry.

As you know, in recent months we have seen the shocking arrest of United States citizens and permanent residents by the People's Republic of China (PRC). These prisoners represent some of the best and brightest of the U.S. academic and business communities, and they have been falsely and tragically charged with committing crimes of espionage and violation of "state secrets" laws while traveling in China. In most cases, these prisoners have been held for long periods of time without formal charges filed against them, without the ability to meet with their attorneys, and without communication with their families and loved ones.

Although the Chinese government has said that many of these individuals have confessed to their crimes, our own State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Abuses contains condemning data showing the PRC routinely denies prisoners basic due process rights, and regularly extracts confessions by coercion.

As we know, this behavior by the Chinese is nothing new. We remember the brutal way that their government suppressed a movement toward free speech in Tiananmen Square a decade ago, and we have seen no redeeming conduct since that time that would lead us to believe that they intend to change their ways. It was just several weeks ago that an American military aircraft was shot down while flying in international waters, and the service members aboard held hostage while the Chinese government attempted to force an apology by the United States. To this date, we still have been unable to retrieve our own aircraft from their country.

This unending succession of events is being watched on the world stage by nations that the PRC would do well to please in order to secure their place in the world economy. However, China neither feels contrite regarding their actions, nor do they exhibit acceptable efforts to improve their lot with democratic countries. Unfortunately, the United States consistently regards them for their provocative and brutal actions by extending to them a privileged trade status ideally afforded friendly and democratic nations.

Madam Speaker, this legislation's passage would send a strong signal to the Chinese government that their actions are barbaric and unacceptable. When confronted with situations that threaten American citizens abroad, it is absolutely necessary to speak in a united front. We should also refuse to award them with the riches gleaned from an unbalanced trading relationship that comes at the expense of American jobs and national security.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 160, which condemns and deplores the continued detention of Li Shaomin, Gao Zhan, Wu Jianmin, Tan Guangguang, Teng Chunyan, and other scholars detained on false charges by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and calls for their immediate and unconditional release. The resolution condemns and deplores the lack of due process afforded to these detainees, and the probable coercion of confessions from some of them.

Furthermore, it condemns and deplores the ongoing and systematic pattern of human rights violations by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Also, the resolution strongly urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider the im-

plications to the broader United States-Chinese relationship of detaining and coercing confessions from United States citizens and permanent residents on unsubstantiated spying charges or suspicions. In addition, the measure urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to consider releasing Liu Yaping on humanitarian grounds.

In addition, the measure expresses the sense of the House that human rights violations inflicted on United States citizens and residents by the Government of the People's Republic of China will reduce opportunities of United States-Chinese cooperation on a wide range of issues.

I congratulate Representative SMITH for his work in bringing this resolution to the floor. This is an important statement by the people's House today. It says to the Government of China, that the U.S. House of Representatives cares about the human rights abuses committed by the Government of China.

Just two months ago in March, I had the honor of leading a ceremony in which my constituent, Dong Hau Xue, husband of the imprisoned American University scholar named in this legislation, Dr. Gao Zhan, became a U.S. citizen.

This ceremony was bittersweet. When he and his wife first applied for permanent residency 1998, it had been their hope and prayer that they would experience the joyous day of citizenship together, having both completed the requirements of citizenship.

But this was not to be. Gao Zhan should have been standing alongside her husband and their 5-year-old son Andrew. Instead, Gao Zhan was languishing in a Chinese prison, thousands of miles away, separated from her family and loved ones.

Today marks Gao Zhan's 134th day in captivity. Gao Zhan is an academic researcher at the American University studying women's issues. What kind of government imprisons academics who focus on women's issues?

I know how grim conditions can be in Chinese prisons. I visited Beijing Prison #1 in 1991 where some 40 Tiananmen Square demonstrators were being held. When I was in Tibet, I talked with several individuals who had been in Drapche Prison who told me of the horrible conditions.

It is an outrage that a country pressing to host the athletes of the world during the 2008 Summer Olympic games continues to abuse the basic human rights of citizens and visitors to their nation.

If the Chinese government ever hopes to have any credibility in the world community, China must immediately release Gao Zhan, an innocent woman, wife and mother; U.S. citizens Dr. Li Shaomin and Mr. Wu Jianmin; permanent U.S. residents Mr. Qin Guangguang, Mrs. Teng Chunyan, and Mr. Liu Yaping.

I urge a unanimous vote in support of H. Res. 160 and I implore the government of the People's Republic of China to free Gao Zhan and the other scholars and reunite them with their families.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I am outraged. Outraged that the People's Republic of China is holding American scholars against their will. H. Res. 160, introduced by my colleague Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, takes an important step toward addressing the human and civil rights abuses committed by the Communist Chinese government. This Congress must not let human

rights abuses by China or any other nation go unchecked.

At the present time, Li Shaomin and other scholars are being held in Chinese prisons for "crimes against the State." These Americans may be enduring torture and coercion, and may be forced into "confessing" to crimes they did not commit. But these are perhaps the least of the indignities that these men and women must endure.

The imprisonment of Li Shaomin and other American scholars of Chinese ancestry are just symptoms of the larger disease that is China's blatant disregard for human life and human rights. It is clear from the State Department's 2000 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in China, that the Communist Chinese government commits, on a daily basis, violations of the most essential and basic human rights.

Let our support for this resolution send a clear and compelling signal that this Congress and our Nation will not stand silently by while natural and universal human rights are curtailed in China or anywhere else.

Mr. FALOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 160.

Madam Speaker, I am deeply disturbed by the Government of China's recent arrests and detentions of American citizens and U.S. permanent residents of Chinese ancestry.

Prosecutions of Americans by China's State Security Ministry and agencies have been rare since the Korean War. With the recent outbreak of detentions, however, it is troubling that China may now feel it acceptable to target American subjects—as long as they have Chinese blood.

In particular, I find it deplorable that those detained have been held virtually incommunicado for months—denied any contact with immediate family members and even their attorneys. Given the lack of due process and the hidden, clandestine proceedings, it is no wonder that China's charges of espionage and other serious violations against the detainees are viewed as false, and any confessions produced as resulting from torture.

In an effort to address these matters, Madam Speaker, I commend Mr. SMITH, Mr. LANTOS and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for introducing House Resolution 160. I am honored to be a co-sponsor of the measure.

In addition to calling upon the Chinese Government for the immediate and unconditional release Dr. Li, Dr. Geo and other American scholars of Chinese ancestry who have been detained, this important legislation urges President Bush to appoint a special envoy and make the detainees' release a top priority in U.S.-Sino relations.

I cannot agree more Madam Speaker, as American citizens and U.S. permanent residents, when they go overseas, must be protected and not be subject to arbitrary harassment and detention on unsubstantiated charges, whether by China or any other nation.

I strongly urge adoption of the legislation by our colleagues.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, we do have some additional speakers; but regrettably, they are either en route from their home districts or are in appropriations markups. So

at this point since they are not here, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 160, 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. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CALLING UPON HEZBOLLAH TO ALLOW RED CROSS TO VISIT FOUR ABDUCTED ISRAELIS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 99) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lebanon, Syria, and Iran should call upon Hezbollah to allow representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit four abducted Israelis, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, Omar Souad, and Elchanan Tannenbaum, presently held by Hezbollah forces in Lebanon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 99

Whereas on October 7, 2000, Hezbollah units, in clear violation of international law, crossed the Lebanese border into Israel and kidnapped three Israeli soldiers, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad;

Whereas on October 15, 2000, Hezbollah announced that it had abducted a fourth Israeli, Elchanan Tannenbaum;

Whereas these captives are being held by Hezbollah in Lebanon;

Whereas the 1999 Department of State report on foreign terrorist organizations stated that Hezbollah receives substantial amounts of financial assistance, training, weapons, explosives, and political, diplomatic, and organizational assistance from Iran and Syria;

Whereas Syria voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas Lebanon voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas Iran voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations General Assembly;

Whereas the International Committee of the Red Cross has made numerous attempts to gain access to assess the condition of these prisoners; and

Whereas the International Committee of the Red Cross has been denied access to these prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Lebanon, Syria, and Iran should call upon Hezbollah to allow representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit four abducted Israelis, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, Omar Souad, and Elchanan Tannenbaum,

presently held by Hezbollah forces in Lebanon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, even in the midst of war or violent conflict, the need for some limits must be underlined. Those limits are of crucial importance in that they remind us of our essential humanity. When humanitarian standards are ignored, we need to call them to the attention of those who seem to be violating them. In the case of the individuals mentioned in the resolution now before us, who are Israeli soldiers and civilians, the rules are, in fact, being ignored. This resolution relates to several Israeli soldiers and one civilian who have been kidnapped from Israel itself or in Europe. Their captors have admitted holding them and they have said that they are alive, but that is all that is known about them.

In defiance of international norms, their captors are not permitting the International Committee of the Red Cross to have access to them. Of course, the captives should be treated humanely. Of course, they should be released, but they should certainly, at the very least, be provided with protections of international humanitarian law. The International Committee of the Red Cross should be provided with access to them so that their welfare can be ascertained and other appropriate protections be afforded to them. It is cynical and cruel for Hezbollah to deny the ICRC access to them. The real harm is being done to their families who wait for word of their welfare.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that the governments of Lebanon, Syria, and Iran either fund Hezbollah or allow it to operate on their territory. This resolution asks those governments to use their influence to ask Hezbollah to do the right thing. It is not too much to ask. I request that my colleagues join me in supporting this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); and the ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for moving this bill through their committees.

I also want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for sponsoring it. It is a good resolution and it deserves the support of this body.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his words in support of this resolution; and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); our distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); my Republican colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for their work; and my other colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), for helping to get this resolution to the floor for quick consideration today.

In October 2000, Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad were abducted while on a routine patrol of Israel's northern border. A fourth man, Elchanan Tannenbaum, a reservist, was taken while on a business trip in Europe.

At the present time, these men are believed to be held by the Hezbollah on Lebanese soil. The United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan and the International Committee of the Red Cross have made numerous overtures to Hezbollah in an effort to gain access to assess the physical condition and well-being of these prisoners. The Hezbollah has rejected these requests each and every time.

The continued detention of these men by Hezbollah troops is unacceptable and must be addressed immediately.

The conditions of their capture and the subject of detention run completely counter to the international standards and laws. Given that the State Department Report on Terrorism has named Iran and Syria as the patron states of Hezbollah, we must hold the governments in Tehran and Damascus responsible for the well-being of these men.

As signatories to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, Iran and Syria have a responsibility to the international community to take concrete steps to encourage Hezbollah to permit this visit to take place. President Khatami and President Assad have made statements regarding the desire to join the community of nations. If these statements truly represent the desires of Iran and Syria, I ask them to take the first step toward achieving that objective by exerting their considerable influence over Hezbollah to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to do their job without further delay.

I first met the families of these men on a visit to Israel earlier this year in January with Members from New York, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER). It was my hope

that by the time we met again that their sons and fathers would be home.

Last month, I stood beside them once again here in Washington, but the void left by their sons and fathers still remains. I know that the families are grateful that they need not fight for their sons and fathers alone. They are joined by well over 70 Members of the House and the Senate who have cosponsored this resolution before us. We send a strong signal to the patron states of Hezbollah; but most of all, we must send hope to Adi, to Binyamin, to Omar, and Elchanan and their families. We can do just that by passing this resolution today.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 99, a resolution to urge Lebanon, Syria, and Iran to allow the International Red Cross to visit the four abducted Israelis. Many of my constituents have contacted me to voice their concerns for the Israeli citizen and the three Israeli soldiers that were taken hostage. I recently received a group of letters from the fifth grade class at the Jacobson Sinai Academy of North Dade, asking me to "imagine how their families are crying from sorrow because their child has been kidnapped." I believe Congress has a responsibility to push for International Red Cross intervention to check on the status of the captured Israelis.

We should continue diplomatic efforts to seek the help of Syria and Iran in opening a dialogue with the Hezbollah. H. Res. 99 sends an important message to the international community that these hostages have not been forgotten, even while the security situation in the Middle East has deteriorated since last fall. I urge the House to unanimously pass this resolution and continue to work towards a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker. I yield myself such time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

It is with regret that we have to bring this resolution before the House today, but it is necessary to do so, because of an ongoing human tragedy—the capture of several individuals by a terrorist band operating with the support, or perhaps the acquiescence, of three Middle Eastern states, and which is holding them without providing any access by international humanitarian organizations.

I want to express my appreciation for the efforts of the gentleman from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, who have worked so diligently on this resolution. Also, I want to thank the Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and my colleagues, the gentleman from New York, (Mr. ACKERMAN), our subcommittee Ranking Member, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the full Committee ranking member.

Last October, Hezbollah terrorists crossed the Israeli border near the so-called Shebaa Farms area and captured 3 soldiers. Later that month, they kidnapped an Israeli businessman in Europe.

This resolution is not just about the legality of the captivity of these individuals, although

of course they should be released. The narrow question we are focusing is on whether they should be allowed visits by the International Committee of the Red Cross—and who should be making that appeal to their captors.

There is no question about who is responsible for this act—Hezbollah. Those countries which allow Hezbollah to operate, or which fund it—namely Iran, Syria, and Lebanon—are in a position to influence this request.

We are asking that they would use their influence. It's just that simple. That is what this resolution is seeking.

Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to fully support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on the immediate release of three Israeli soldiers and one Israeli citizen who have been held hostage by Hezbollah in Lebanon for the last eight months. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for sponsoring this resolution and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for bringing it to the floor today.

On October 7, 2000, Hezbollah terrorists crossed the Lebanese border into Israel, ambushed an IDF patrol unit, and abducted Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, and Omar Souad. Only a week later, Elchanan Tannenbaum, an Israeli civilian, was abducted while on a business trip to Switzerland. Despite constant international pressure, Hezbollah has not yet shown any signs of releasing these four hostages. Hezbollah continues to deny any requests to meet with these four men.

The kidnapping of these three soldiers and one citizen is yet another intolerable element of the ongoing struggle in the Middle East. Iran and Hezbollah's blatant violation of established international norms must be confronted. Syria, Lebanon, and Iran all voted in favor of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations General Assembly, yet Hezbollah has continued to deny the International Committee of the Red Cross access to these prisoners.

Having worked against Hezbollah in Bosnia, I am aware of the danger they pose to Israelis and America abroad. We must take all necessary steps to ensure that, at the very least, Syria, Lebanon, and Iran call upon Hezbollah to allow representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit these Israeli hostages. For 261 days, these four men have been held captive. The families of these young men cannot continue to be tormented by the uncertainty of their loved ones' existence. Hezbollah has remained tight lipped on the condition of these men, and several Arabic language newspapers have reported that at least one of the soldiers had died in captivity.

The United States must take a strong position against Hezbollah and call for these terrorists to allow the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit Adi Avitan, Binyamin Avraham, Omar Souad, and Elchanan Tannenbaum. This resolution is a re-affirmation of our commitment to Israel and the values of democracy, justice, and human decency.

□ 1600

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 99.

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. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HONORING 19 U.S. SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN TERRORIST BOMBING OF KHOBAR TOWERS IN SAUDI ARABIA ON JUNE 25, 1996

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 161) honoring the 19 United States servicemen who died in the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia on June 25, 1996, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 161

Whereas June 25, 2001, marks the fifth anniversary of the tragic terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers military housing compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia;

Whereas 19 members of the United States Air Force were killed in the bombing and 250 other United States military personnel were wounded;

Whereas the 19 airmen killed while serving their country were Captain Christopher Adams, Sergeant Daniel Cafourek, Sergeant Millard Campbell, Senior Airman Earl Cartrette, Jr., Sergeant Patrick Fennig, Captain Leland Haun, Sergeant Michael Heiser, Sergeant Kevin Johnson, Sergeant Ronald King, Sergeant Kendall Kitson, Jr., Airman First Class Christopher Lester, Airman First Class Brent Marthaler, Airman First Class Brian McVeigh, Airman First Class Peter Morgera, Sergeant Thanh Nguyen, Airman First Class Joseph Rimkus, Senior Airman Jeremy Taylor, Airman First Class Justin Wood, and Airman First Class Joshua Woody;

Whereas the families of these brave airmen still mourn their loss;

Whereas on September 24, 1996, the House of Representatives agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 200 of the 104th Congress honoring the victims of that terrorist bombing;

Whereas those guilty of the attack have yet to be brought to justice; and

Whereas terrorism remains a constant and ever-present threat around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers military housing compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, the Congress—

(1) recognizes the sacrifice of the 19 members of the United States Air Force who died in that attack; and

(2) calls upon every American to pause and pay tribute to those brave airmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 161.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) honoring the commitment and sacrifice of the 19 servicemembers killed 5 years ago today on June 25, 1996, when a terrorist truck bomb demolished the Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia in which they were stationed.

This resolution should remind us that these brave Americans then, as well as those serving in uniform today, willingly risked their lives to defend United States' interests and the freedom and the values that we all enjoy as citizens. Such commitment imposes on the rest of us an obligation to ensure that we do not break faith with those who serve and that we respond to such commitment by resolving to provide the resources necessary for our military forces to successfully carry out the missions assigned to them.

For the families and loved ones of those who died on this day, this resolution signals our continued understanding of the pain and loss that they feel and that the sacrifices made by these 19 men and women, some of America's best and brightest, will not, cannot, be forgotten.

Finally, we as a Nation must understand that terrorism directed at Americans will continue for the foreseeable future. Five years ago, terrorists killed 19 Americans residing in Khobar Towers; 8 months ago, they killed 17 aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*. In the face of this terrorism, we must be vigilant to prevent or reduce the probability of it occurring, and relentless in the pursuit of those who perpetrate such horrendous actions.

While I am pleased that Federal indictments have been issued in connection with the Khobar Towers attack, I and many others join me in a mutual concern that not all of those responsible for the attack have yet been identified. America should not rest until all the perpetrators have been brought to justice.

Madam Speaker, I want to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) for his work in putting together and advancing this worthy resolution. His commitment, I know, is shared by many in this House,

certainly many on the Subcommittee on Military Personnel; the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), the ranking member; the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER); and so many others on both sides of the aisle who recognize that this sort of resolution knows no party. Rather, in joint celebration of lives that were cut off too short and in solemn resolution of a recognition of the loss of those lives, we join together.

Madam Speaker, I would certainly urge all of my colleagues in the House today to join me in supporting this very, very worthy piece of action.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to join my esteemed colleague from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, in commending my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), for his thoughtfulness today.

This is a terrible day, a terrible anniversary, because 5 years ago today on June 25, 1996, a truck bomb exploded outside the fence around the Khobar Towers compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. The bomb, estimated at more than 3,000 pounds, detonated about 85 feet from a residential unit housing U.S. troops, killing 19 American servicemen and wounded hundreds of other people.

The force of the explosion destroyed or damaged six high-rise apartment buildings and shattered windows throughout the residential compound. What is more, this attack demolished the illusion that American military posted in Saudi Arabia were immune from the terrorism that has plagued the rest of this very volatile region. It was a tragic and painful reminder of the risks our servicemen and women confront to protect the peace and American interests abroad.

As we honor the 19 airmen who gave their lives in Saudi Arabia, we need to remember that they did not die in vain. As a result, we are developing new ways to protect our military forces in the post-Cold War geopolitical environment. We now understand that this means deploying U.S. forces to promote stability in new and unfamiliar areas. And we have to pay more attention than ever before to the security conditions under which our troops are deployed.

Madam Speaker, a few days ago 14 Middle Easterners were indicted for this horrific act. I share a common sentiment with my colleagues and the rest of America that we regret it took so long to bring the indictments in this case. I know that we look forward to completing the court proceedings so the families of the heroes we honor today may begin to have a sense of closure.

Madam Speaker, our action on this resolution today is a message to those

who died, their family members, our Nation and the rest of the world, that we honor the sacrifices of these 19 servicemen and the families they left behind. They served with the highest and best military traditions. No one could have served better or given more.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) and the House leadership for bringing this important issue to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 161.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). As the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and I have both mentioned, we are collectively very grateful to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) for having the concern and enacting the initiative to bring this resolution to us today on this very sad anniversary.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam Speaker, my thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of committee, and on behalf of really all of us in the Congress of the United States, today to pay tribute to the 19 airmen who 5 years ago today sacrificed their lives in behalf of the people of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I thought when I was drafting this resolution, it is kind of ironic that if you think about today, just a month ago we celebrated Memorial Day, where we honored the men and women who have died in the pursuit, and subsequently the defense, of freedom in wars, domestic and foreign, since the founding of our country.

Five months from now we will celebrate Veterans' Day, where we pay tribute to every man and every woman who has ever worn a uniform on behalf of this great Nation.

In 11 days, on the 4th of July, we celebrate the founding of America; we celebrate our birthday. We celebrate our Declaration of Independence, upon which our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Today, we honor 19 airmen who gave their lives, the supreme sacrifice, at the hands of terrorists 20 miles away from Dhahran in Saudi Arabia. Today I join with all of this Congress in paying tribute to those men, who were Master Sergeant Kendall K. Kitson, Jr.; Tech Sergeant Daniel B. Cafourek; Tech Sergeant Patrick P. Fennig; Tech Sergeant Thanh Van Nguyen; Senior Airman Earl F. Cartrette, Jr.; Senior Airman Jeremy A. Taylor; Sergeant Milard D. Campbell; Airman First Class Brent E. Marthaler; Airman First Class Brian W. McVeigh; Airman First Class Peter J. Morgera; Airman First Class Joseph E. Rinkus; Airman First Class Joshua E. Woody; Captain Christopher J. Adams; Captain Leland T. Haun; Master Sergeant Michael G. Heiser;

Staff Sergeant Kevin J. Johnson; Airman First Class Justin R. Wood; Staff Sergeant Ronald L. King; and Airman First Class Christopher Lester.

As we celebrate our 4th of July or Memorial Day or Veterans' Day on their designated day, for me this day will be a constant reminder of the sacrifice of these men; and it is my hope that all of America pause on this day today and each year thereafter to give thanks for their sacrifice and also be reminded of the threats of terrorism as they exist, both domestic and abroad.

Today, in Washington D.C. the parents and loved ones of many of these who sacrificed their lives are the guests of the FBI in our city, and at this time I want to personally pay tribute to director Louis Freeh. Within hours after the announcement of this attack and this tragedy in Dhahran, Director Freeh boarded an aircraft, assembled 125 members of the FBI, and personally directed the beginning of the investigation in Saudi Arabia, which has led to the indictment last Thursday of 14 accused of conspiring in this great tragedy.

As Director Freeh announced his retirement last week, I am pleased today on the floor of this House on behalf of the many loved ones of these soldiers to express their grateful appreciation to his commitment to the very end of his tenure to attempting to bring to justice those who took the lives of our Nation's sons in defense of freedom. Today is a day for us to give thanks for the men who died on our behalf on that tragic evening.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Members of this House to join in bipartisan and unanimous support in tribute for those brave 19, and to remind all Americans that we should continue to be ever vigilant of the terrors of terrorists and their danger, and ever thankful for the men and women that serve in our Armed Forces, keep us safe and keep us free.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 161.

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

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

Madam Speaker, with a final word of appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and a final word of deepest sorrow and deepest appreciation to the families of these fallen heroes, we can never undo the tragedy that they have witnessed. We can never ameliorate the pain that I know is with them each and every day. But I would hope, and I know my colleagues join me in this hope, that with the adoption of this resolution, they will take from our action some solace in the fact that we do not forget that this Congress remains committed to the resolution of justice and to bringing to trial and to

a proper conviction those who have wrought this tragedy upon such innocence.

Madam Speaker, I again urge all of our colleagues to join us in support of this concurrent resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 161, honoring the Service Men Killed in Khobar Towers.

From the frozen battlefield of Breed's Hill, most commonly known as the Battle of Bunker Hill, to the war-torn former provinces of Yugoslavia the military has repeatedly proven its ability to meet the challenges offered by this nation's leadership. Any time the nation called the men and women of the United States armed forces has answered in the affirmative and successfully met the challenges of their mission on the behalf of a free and independent United States of America.

Five years ago, on this date, June 25, 1996, a terrorist bomb at the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia killed 19 U.S. servicemen and wounded 400 others. On June 21st of this year, a federal grand jury in Virginia returned a 46-count indictment that charged 13 Saudis and a Lebanese man with complicity in the bombing.

Although none of those charged is now in the United States, I along with members of the Judiciary Committee will be working to see that justice is served in this matter.

Prosecutors brought the charges now because the statute of limitations were to expire next week. I request that Saudi Arabia cooperate fully in our attempt to see that the guilty are brought before a court to answer for this act.

I applaud the men and women of our nation's armed forces who protect and defend our national interest around the globe. The sacrifices of the men and women who are the United States Army have for over two centuries put the country's best interest ahead of their own for the benefit of all of our freedom.

Today, we remember the sacrifices to this nation, because they have made the world a safer place for democracy and freedom. May those 19 service men killed continue to be remembered for their bravery and commitment to this great nation.

I commend the work done by Federal law-enforcement personnel in searching for those responsible for this terrible crime.

I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, June 25, 2001 marks the fifth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the U.S. military housing facility Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. Nineteen American servicemen were killed and hundreds wounded in that vicious attack. Last week the United States indicted some of those responsible for those murders. However long it takes to bring those indicted and those responsible for this terrorist act to justice, our country must pursue all guilty parties. Until those who perpetrated this heinous international crime are brought to justice, we cannot rest.

I commend the Bush Administration, the Attorney General and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for making certain that this case is not forgotten. Florida and our nation lost too many innocent victims for this matter to be brushed aside. My Congressional District and the mother and family of AIC Brian McVeigh

who was killed in Khobar Towers, continue to feel the pain of that great loss.

The United States Congress, these surviving relatives, and all the others who lost their loved ones cannot rest until justice prevails.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I commend Mr. ISAKSON for introducing H. Con. Res. 161, which honors the 19 United States servicemen who died in the terrorist bombing of Khobar Towers and the 250 other military personnel who were wounded on June 25, 1996. On the fifth anniversary of the bombing, we honor those who were killed and wounded for serving on the front lines of freedom, far from home.

On June 21st, the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicted the Hizbollah terrorists, who attacked our military personnel. Iranian officials may also have been involved.

The House International Relations has paid tribute to these brave men and women by remaining vigilant towards terrorism and Iran. Specifically, last week the Committee voted to renew for five years the Iran-Lybia Sanctions Act. That Act (ILSA) penalizes foreign firms for investing in the Iranian and Libyan energy sector to deprive those governments of revenues for their programs of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

We believe that reauthorizing the ILSA Act pays tribute to the memories of the brave men and women who died five years ago today and serves as a warning to those who attack U.S. servicemen and women. The memories of these brave men and women will always be with us.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 161. It is fitting that we take a some time today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to remember those who paid the highest price of freedom.

Five years ago, on June 25, 1996, the lives of five families in my congressional district were irrevocably changed by a horrendous act of terrorism. Five service members from Patrick Air Force Base were taken from their loved ones and from our community.

It has been a long five years for the loved ones of these men. I hope they can find solace in the fact that last week a federal grand jury indicted fourteen people suspected of carrying out this terrible act. I will do all that I can do to help bring those who committed this vicious act to justice. I call upon the U.S. Department of Justice to do all that they can to place a high priority on this.

These five men were:

Capt. Christopher J. Adams, he was engaged to be married.

Master Sgt. Michael Heiser, who was also engaged.

Capt. Leland "Tim" Haun, was a husband and stepfather.

Staff Sgt. Kevin Johnson, turned 36 on the day of the blast, and was the father of three.

Airman 1st Class Justin Wood, was only 20 years old and was working on his college degree.

H. Con. Res. 161 resolves that: "The Congress, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, recognizes the sacrifice of the 19 servicemen who died in that attack, and calls upon every American to pause and pay

tribute to these brave soldiers and to remain ever vigilant for signs which may warn of a terrorist attack."

Known to us as Capt. Adams, Master Sgt. Heiser, Capt. Haun, Staff Sgt. Johnson, Airman 1st Class Wood, and to their families and loved ones as Christopher, Mike, Tim, Kevin, and Justin, these men gave their lives in defense of peace and liberty. They must not be forgotten. Our nation owes them a debt of gratitude.

I salute each of you.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Madam Speaker, I come before the House today on the fifth anniversary of the tragic Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia.

Shortly before 10 p.m. on Tuesday, June 25, 1996, a van parked outside the Khobar Towers military complex in Saudi Arabia exploded. The van held an estimated 2,000 pounds of explosives, which killed 19 American servicemen and injured approximately 500 other people.

Of the 19 servicemen killed, 12 were member of Eglin Air Force Base's 33rd Fighter Wing, known as the Nomads, located in my district. The Nomads were on a 90-day rotation as part of Operation Southern Watch, a United Nations mission to keep Iraq's military from invading or harassing neighboring countries. Those killed were scheduled to return to Fort Walton Beach, Florida, the day following the attack.

Today, many family members of the victims will attend a memorial service at Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, Virginia.

The recent arrest of 13 Saudi Arabians and one Lebanese citizen sends a clear message to the world that America does not tolerate terrorism. The families who lost their loved ones in this terrible crime deserve to see justice and those responsible prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Madam Speaker, on the fifth anniversary of this tragic event, I urge the Congress to continue its efforts to see that justice does prevail for the parents and families of the 19 servicemen who lost their lives on June 25, 1996, in a terrorist attack on Saudi Arabia. They deserve nothing less.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 161, 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.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1615

COMMUNICATION FROM ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Kathy A. Wyszynski, Associate Administrator of Human Resources, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 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 that the Office of Human Resources, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

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

Sincerely,

KATHY A. WYSZYNSKI,
Associate Administrator of Human Resources.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 6 p.m.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS AND NAYS ON H.R. 1668, AUTHORIZING ADAMS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT JOHN ADAMS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1668, as amended, to the end that the Chair put the question on the motion de novo.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1668, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal Land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his legacy".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 160, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 99, by the yeas and nays; and
- H. Con. Res. 161, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

CALLING ON CHINA TO RELEASE LI SHAOMIN AND ALL OTHER AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF CHINESE ANCESTRY BEING HELD IN DETENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 160, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 160, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—379

Abercrombie	Boehner	Collins
Ackerman	Bonilla	Combest
Aderholt	Bonior	Condit
Allen	Bono	Conyers
Andrews	Borski	Cooksey
Armey	Boswell	Costello
Baca	Boyd	Cox
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Coyne
Baird	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Baker	Brown (OH)	Crane
Baldacci	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Baldwin	Bryant	Crowley
Ballenger	Burr	Cubin
Barcia	Buyer	Culberson
Barr	Callahan	Cummings
Barrett	Calvert	Cunningham
Bartlett	Camp	Davis (CA)
Barton	Cannon	Davis (FL)
Bass	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann
Bentsen	Capps	Davis, Tom
Bereuter	Capuano	Deal
Berman	Cardin	DeFazio
Berry	Carson (OK)	DeGette
Biggert	Castle	Delahunt
Bilirakis	Chabot	DeLauro
Bishop	Chambless	DeLay
Blagojevich	Clay	DeMint
Blumenauer	Clayton	Deutsch
Boehler	Clyburn	Dicks

Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)

Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers

Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schroek
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—53

Akin
Berkley
Blunt
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Burton
Carson (IN)
Clement
Coble
Diaz-Balart
Ehrlich
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Gephardt
Gordon
Hinojosa
Hoekstra

Hooley
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Istook
John
Kaptur
Lantos
LaTourette
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
McGovern
Millender-
McDonald
Nadler
Neal
Owens
Paul
Pelosi

Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rangel
Sanchez
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simmons
Smith (MI)
Spence
Sununu
Taylor (NC)
Toomey
Waxman
Weiner

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—379

□ 1831

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately and unconditionally release Li Shaomin and other American scholars of Chinese ancestry being held in detention, calling on the President of the United States to continue working on behalf of Li Shaomin and the other detained scholars for their release, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 186 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CALLING UPON HEZBOLLAH TO ALLOW RED CROSS TO VISIT FOUR ABDUCTED ISRAELIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 99.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 99, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)

Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers

Rohrabacher Skelton Towns
 Ros-Lehtinen Slaughter Traficant
 Ross Smith (NJ) Turner
 Rothman Smith (TX) Udall (CO)
 Roukema Smith (WA) Udall (NM)
 Roybal-Allard Snyder Upton
 Royce Solis Velazquez
 Rush Souder Visclosky
 Ryan (WI) Spratt Vitter
 Ryan (KS) Stark Walden
 Sabo Stearns Walsh
 Sanders Stenholm Wamp
 Sandlin Strickland Waters
 Sawyer Stump Watkins (OK)
 Saxton Stupak Watson (CA)
 Scarborough Sweeney Watt (NC)
 Schaffer Tancredo Watts (OK)
 Schakowsky Tanner Weldon (FL)
 Schiff Tauscher Weldon (PA)
 Schrock Tauzin Weller
 Scott Taylor (MS) Wexler
 Sensenbrenner Terry Whitfield
 Serrano Thomas Wicker
 Shaw Thompson (CA) Wilson
 Shays Thompson (MS) Wolf
 Sherman Thornberry Woolsey
 Sherwood Thune Wu
 Shows Thurman Wynn
 Shuster Tiahrt Young (AK)
 Simpson Tiberi Young (FL)
 Skeen Tierney

NOT VOTING—53

Akin Hooley Peterson (MN)
 Berkley Hulshof Platts
 Blunt Hutchinson Pomeroy
 Boucher Istook Pryce (OH)
 Brady (TX) John Putnam
 Burton Kaptur Rangel
 Carson (IN) LaTourette Sanchez
 Clement Lipinski Sessions
 Coble Maloney (CT) Shadegg
 Diaz-Balart McGovern Shimkus
 Ehrlich Millender- Simmons
 Foley McDonald Smith (MI)
 Ford Moore Spence
 Fossella Nadler Sununu
 Gephardt Neal Taylor (NC)
 Gordon Owens Toomey
 Hinojosa Paul Waxman
 Hoekstra Pelosi Weiner

□ 1839

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 187 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING 19 U.S. SERVICEMEN WHO DIED IN TERRORIST BOMBING OF KHOBAR TOWERS IN SAUDI ARABIA ON JUNE 25, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 161, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 161, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—379

Abercrombie Dreier Kolbe
 Ackerman Duncan Kucinich
 Aderholt Dunn LaFalce
 Allen Edwards LaHood
 Andrews Ehlers Lampson
 Arney Emerson Langevin
 Baca Engel Lantos
 Bachus English Largent
 Baird Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Baker Etheridge Larson (CT)
 Baldacci Evans Latham
 Baldwin Everrett Leach
 Ballenger Farr Lee
 Barcia Fattah Levin
 Barr Ferguson Lewis (CA)
 Barrett Filner Lewis (GA)
 Bartlett Flake Lewis (KY)
 Barton Fletcher Linder
 Bass Frank LoBiondo
 Becerra Frelinghuysen Lofgren
 Bentsen Frost Lowey
 Bereuter Gallegly Lucas (KY)
 Berman Ganske Lucas (OK)
 Berry Gekas Luther
 Biggert Gibbons Maloney (NY)
 Bilirakis Gilchrest Manzullo
 Bishop Gillmor Markey
 Blagojevich Gilman Mascara
 Blumenauer Gonzalez Matheson
 Boehlert Goode Matsui
 Boehner Goodlatte McCarthy (MO)
 Bonilla Goss McCarthy (NY)
 Bonior Graham McCollum
 Bono Granger McCreery
 Borski Graves McDermott
 Boswell Green (TX) McHugh
 Boyd Green (WI) McInnis
 Brady (PA) Greenwood McIntyre
 Brady (TX) Grucci McKeon
 Brown (FL) Gutierrez McKinney
 Brown (OH) Gutknecht McNulty
 Brown (SC) Hall (OH) Meehan
 Bryant Hall (TX) Meek (FL)
 Burr Hansen Meeks (NY)
 Buyer Harman Menendez
 Callahan Hart Mica
 Calvert Hastings (FL) Miller (FL)
 Camp Hastings (WA) Miller, Gary
 Cannon Hayes Miller, George
 Cantor Hayworth Mink
 Capito Hefley Mollohan
 Capps Herger Moore
 Capuano Hill Moran (KS)
 Cardin Hilleary Moran (VA)
 Carson (OK) Hilliard Morella
 Castle Hinchey Murtha
 Chabot Hobson Myrick
 Chambliss Hoeffel Napolitano
 Clay Holden Nethercutt
 Clayton Holt Ney
 Clyburn Honda Northup
 Collins Horn Norwood
 Combust Hostettler Nussle
 Condit Houghton Oberstar
 Conyers Hoyer Obey
 Cooksey Hunter Olver
 Costello Hyde Ortiz
 Cox Inslee Otter
 Coyne Isakson Oxley
 Cramer Israel Issa
 Crane Issa Pallone
 Crenshaw Jackson (IL) Pascrell
 Crowley Jackson-Lee Pastor
 Cubin (TX) Payne
 Culberson Jefferson Pence
 Cummings Jenkins Peterson (PA)
 Cunningham Johnson (CT) Petri
 Davis (CA) Johnson (IL) Phelps
 Davis (FL) Johnson, E. B. Pickering
 Davis (IL) Johnson, Sam Pitts
 Davis, Jo Ann Jones (NC) Pombo
 Davis, Tom Jones (OH) Portman
 Deal Kanjorski Price (NC)
 DeFazio Keller Quinn
 DeGette Kelly Radanovich
 Delahunt Kennedy (MN) Rahall
 DeLauro Kennedy (RI) Ramstad
 DeLay Kerns Regula
 DeMint Kildee Rehberg
 Deutsch Kilpatrick Reyes
 Dicks Kind (WI) Reynolds
 Dingell King (NY) Riley
 Doggett Kingston Rivers
 Dooley Kirk Rodriguez
 Doolittle Kleczka Roemer
 Doyle Knollenberg Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI) Skeen Towns
 Rohrabacher Skelton Traficant
 Ros-Lehtinen Slaughter Turner
 Ross Smith (NJ) Udall (CO)
 Rothman Smith (TX) Udall (NM)
 Roukema Smith (WA) Upton
 Roybal-Allard Snyder Velazquez
 Royce Solis Visclosky
 Rush Souder Vitter
 Ryan (WI) Spratt Walden
 Ryan (KS) Stark Walsh
 Sabo Stearns Wamp
 Sanders Stenholm Waters
 Sandlin Strickland Watkins (OK)
 Sawyer Stump Watson (CA)
 Saxton Sweeney Watt (NC)
 Scarborough Tancredo Watts (OK)
 Schaffer Tanner Weldon (FL)
 Schakowsky Tauscher Weldon (PA)
 Schiff Tauzin Weller
 Schrock Taylor (MS) Wexler
 Scott Terry Whitfield
 Sensenbrenner Thomas Wicker
 Serrano Thompson (CA) Wilson
 Shaw Thompson (MS) Wolf
 Sherman Thornberry Woolsey
 Sherwood Thune Wu
 Shows Thurman Wynn
 Shuster Tiahrt Young (AK)
 Simpson Tiberi Young (FL)
 Skeen Tierney

NOT VOTING—53

Akin Hulshof Platts
 Berkley Hutchinson Pomeroy
 Blunt Istook Pryce (OH)
 Boucher John Putnam
 Burton Kaptur Rangel
 Carson (IN) LaTourette Sanchez
 Clement Lipinski Sessions
 Coble Maloney (CT) Shadegg
 Diaz-Balart McGovern Shimkus
 Ehrlich Millender- Simmons
 Foley McDonald Smith (MI)
 Ford Nadler Spence
 Fossella Neal Stupak
 Gephardt Osborne Sununu
 Gordon Owens Taylor (NC)
 Hinojosa Paul Toomey
 Hoekstra Pelosi Waxman
 Hooley Peterson (MN) Weiner

□ 1846

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution honoring the 19 United States servicemen who died in the terrorist bombing of the Khobar Towers military housing compound in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, on June 25, 1996."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 188 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I was in my district attending to official business and as a result missed rollcall votes 186 through 188. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on all 3 rollcall votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 877

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

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.

CHINA'S THREAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED DURING APPROPRIATED SEASONS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight, as my colleagues know, the first vote we had dealt with the issue of American scholars of Chinese ancestry being held in detention, and this was passed overwhelmingly by the House. Everyone supported calling on China to release these people.

I had planned last week to come on the floor and talk about North Carolina because I am one who is very, very concerned about the fact as we begin very shortly to discuss and debate the appropriations for our United States military.

Too many times I think we as a Nation fail to realize that this is a very unsafe world that we live in. When I think about China and the things that China is doing to build up their military, then I think I have a responsibility back in the third district of North Carolina, which I have the privilege to represent to talk to the people about my concerns as their elected representative.

Tonight, I wanted to take just a couple minutes of my time to say to the House and to those throughout this Nation that China has definitely positioned itself, in my opinion, to be an adversary of this country. We know what happened with our reconnaissance plane that has been held by the Chinese for several months now, which I understand is being taken apart and soon will be shipped back to America. That plane was in international airspace. It should never have been challenged by the Chinese fighter, but it was; and, therefore, the pilot, the American pilot had to land in China.

I wanted to make reference to this chart that I have in front of the podium tonight, which was in The Washington Times, February 29 of the year 2000. And it says "China Warns U.S. of Missile Strike."

Mr. Speaker, that to me is an arrogant statement and a very belligerent statement that China would be making towards the United States of America. This was when China was somewhat trying to threaten the Taiwanese Government by saying that we are going to fire missiles towards your country.

I want to read one of the subtitles to this article. Again the title of the arti-

cle by Bill Gertz is "China Warns U.S. of Missile Strike"; and the subtitle says, "It is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which the U.S. policymakers know fairly well also."

This, Mr. Speaker, was a quote of the Liberation Army Daily, the official newspaper of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Again, I think that is a very threatening statement. I think it is a statement of belligerence. That, again, was long before our reconnaissance plane was forced down in China.

Mr. Speaker, there is a book that I have finished reading that I think is an excellent book to inform the people of my district, the third district of North Carolina. It is called The China Threat. It is written by Bill Gertz. Bill Gertz writes for The Washington Times, and I think he is highly respected in certainly this city of Washington, this Nation, and throughout the world of his accuracy and his research. If people would get a chance to read this book, The China Threat, the subtitle, "How the People's Republic targets America."

I want to read you just one aspect that is contained in this book: "An international Chinese military document exposes how Beijing is willing to launch a nuclear attack on the United States if America forces an attempt to defend Taiwan."

I bring that point up again, Mr. Speaker, because you can see from this chart that Admiral Blair spoke to the House and Senate Committee on Armed Services back on March 28 of the year 2001, and the admiral warns of perilous buildup of Chinese missiles.

The commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific told Congress today that China's ongoing missile buildup opposite Taiwan is destabilizing and leads to a U.S. response unless halted.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that those of us in the United States that will soon be debating the needs of our military that we remember and the American people remember that this is a very unsafe world that we live in.

The only other chart I want to bring up, Mr. Speaker, was in The Washington Times just a few weeks ago. My colleagues can see this. It says, "China Secretly Shipping Arms to Cuba." This was just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that, when we have a chance, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services, to talk here on the floor of the House as well as back in our district, that we need to remind the people of this country that there are those who do not appreciate our way of life and those who would like to challenge this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I do want to again say that it is always a privilege for me to represent the third district of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and the Coast Guard. I have over 50,000 retirees in my

district who have served this Nation, veterans and retirees.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will close. I will say in closing this is a great book for anyone that is concerned about the national security of this Nation, The China Threat by Bill Gertz.

HIGH-PRICED PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that is not a partisan issue, but it is a very important issue that we have not talked about much on the House floor in the last year.

Last year, we passed an amendment to the House Ag appropriations bill, and ultimately was included in the omnibus bill that went to the President's desk, some language which clarified that Americans would have access to prescription drugs at world market prices.

Unfortunately, Secretary Shalala said that her department would not enforce that legislation. Up until this point, Secretary Tommy Thompson has followed suit. So we are going to be forced to offer another amendment in the next several days.

I would like to share with the Members tonight a chart talking about the outrageously high prices that Americans pay for prescription drugs. Now, unfortunately, this chart is outdated. We are having a new one made up. But even the worst news is that the differences between what we pay in the United States and what consumers around the rest of the world pay have not changed.

For example, my 82-year-old father takes a drug called Coumadin. It is a blood thinner. It is one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. A few years ago when we had this research done, the average price in the United States was \$30.25. The average price in Europe was \$2.85 for exactly the same drug in exactly the same dosage.

Now, as I said, the numbers have changed, and I have a new chart that is available. We will have it in this form probably by tomorrow at noon. But Members who would like a copy of this chart can go to my Web site. It is simply gil.house.gov. One can see for oneself the differences that Americans pay.

For example, let us take a commonly prescribed drug called Claritin that is prescribed for allergies. A lot of Americans take it. The average price for that drug in the United States is \$63.06 for a 30-day supply. But that same drug, the average price in Europe, in the European Union, is only \$16.05.

Let us take another drug that is commonly prescribed here in the United States, Prozac. In the United States, the average price for a 30-day supply is

\$71.94, but that same drug in Europe sells for \$44.10.

Now, these are the same drugs, Mr. Speaker. They are made by the same companies in the same FDA approved facilities.

Now the big pharmaceutical companies are arguing safety. They are saying we have got to worry about safety. That is a legitimate concern. I am concerned about safety as well. But remember this, a drug that consumers cannot afford is neither safe nor effective.

Today in America, 14 million seniors have no prescription drug coverage. That speaks also to the some 53 million Americans who have no other health insurance. So we may be talking about as many as 57 million Americans who were forced to pay full retail price for these drugs. They get no help.

Now, some people say, well they have price controls in other countries, and that is true. In some countries, they do have price controls. But it is also true there are countries in Europe that have no price controls. Yet, we pay in America sometimes three times more for exactly the same drug.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for bulk importation this year, although I believe an amendment will be offered, and I will certainly support it. All I am really asking for is a clarification so that American consumers that have a legal prescription for a legal drug in the United States from any G-8 country or any NAFTA signatory country ought to be able to get those drugs from those countries at world market prices.

I believe that if we could simply have access to drugs at world market prices, because I am a free trader, I do not believe in price controls, but I do believe that ultimately markets are more powerful than armies. If Americans have access to those markets, we will see drug prices in the United States come down by at least 30 percent. And 30 percent last year or the last year that we have numbers for seniors, they spent something like \$50 billion on prescription drugs. Thirty percent of \$50 billion is real money even here in Washington.

So I am not asking for the world. I am simply saying we need a clarification for our own FDA that law-abiding citizens with a legal prescription ought to be able to buy drugs at world market prices. If they want to use the Internet, that is up to them. Or if they want to go through their local pharmacy, I would certainly permit that as well. But we are not going to stand idly by.

I ask my colleagues, if they could explain this chart and these differentials to their seniors in their districts or their consumers in their districts, then they have every right to vote against my amendment. But if they cannot explain this, I expect that they will be asked by seniors and others in their district why they voted against the amendment. It will be a simple amendment. We hope to offer it later this

week. We appreciate our colleagues' support.

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH DRUG PRICES
(For a 30-day supply)

Drug	U.S. price	Euro. price
Allegra 120	\$69.99	\$20.88
Atarax	28.62	4.20
Biazin 250	113.25	61.74
Claritin	63.06	16.06
Coumadin	37.74	8.22
Glucophage	30.12	4.11
Lipitor	52.86	41.25
Premarin	17.10	9.90
Prozac	71.94	44.10
Zestril 5	25.92	5.52
Zithromax 500	486.00	176.19
Zyrtec	50.10	17.73

□ 1900

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). 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 Extension of Remarks.)

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS IN AMERICA

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 wanted to raise a couple of things that were in yesterday's newspaper that illustrate that as much as we would like the drug problem in America to go away, it has not gone away.

The front page of The New York Times says, "Violence Rises as Club Drug Spreads Out Into the Streets." And it is yet another story about Ecstasy. On the front page of USA Today just a month ago, "Ecstasy Drug Trade Turns Violent." What we see from the charts is that it is exploding on the West Coast, it is stabilized on the East Coast, in the Midwest it is soaring; and in the south it is roughly stabilized.

We are seeing more and more kids realize the extreme dangers as more and more overdose, as more and more lose ground in their schooling as they see side effects like depression, particularly at the so-called rave parties which have been featured a lot in New Orleans and other places on some national TV shows. Just as crack cocaine became an epidemic in America, we are seeing the start of the Ecstasy movement. This is partly because of the drug legalization movement in the Netherlands and in Europe. We are seeing Ecstasy exported from Belgium and the Netherlands into the U.S. It is increasingly becoming the drug of choice. We need to be aggressive in our law enforcement, we need to be aggressive in our prevention and treatment programs, in our outreach programs, as well as our interdiction programs.

In the Indianapolis Star yesterday, the headline says, "Drug Test Ban Felt at State Schools. Ball State University survey shows rise in drug and alcohol

use and student discipline since court rejected policy.'

A number of years ago, when I was a staffer for former Senator Dan Coats, we allowed drug-free schools money to be used for drug testing of student athletes. This policy had been spreading through the United States and beyond just the athletic departments to general, random drug testing. In my district, at East Noble High School, at Fremont High School, we had several model programs developed. In Anderson High School, a State court ruled that drug testing the students was illegal search and seizure.

How exactly are we supposed to do prevention programs if the court decides it is the legislative body and does not have any legal precedent with which to decide that but makes that decision?

What we do know, and ironically it took a court decision to overturn a broad drug testing policy of schools, is in fact that in Indiana drug use and alcohol use had gone down, and then when they were ordered to stop the program, in 1 year it has gone back up. So the question is, as we see the results when a program is pulled back, not whether drug testing works, it is how can we do it in a constitutional way, that is sensitive to the individual, whether in the workplace, whether at school or wherever it be? Because drug testing is one of the most effective prevention programs. We have maintained this for years, and this new study in Indiana proves it.

Unless we all work together in prevention, in treatment, in interdiction, and in law enforcement, we are going to continue to lose many more of our young people and adults to the scourge of illegal narcotics.

REJECT RENAMING OF NATIONAL AIRPORT IN METRO SYSTEM

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House is scheduled to consider the transportation appropriation bill. Within that bill there is a provision requiring that the local governments in the Washington, D.C. area spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of their own money to add the name of Ronald Reagan to the Metro system every place it says National Airport.

Now, the local governments have the authority to do this. When a local government requests a name change, the name of the Metro station within its jurisdiction is changed. That deference to local government is really one of the principal things that Ronald Reagan stood for. But this body, deciding that it did not like the fact that the local government had resisted adding those two additional names, is now going to require them to do so, even though this is not a Federal facility. It gets only 6 percent Federal money, 94 percent of

which comes from the riders of the Metro system.

So we ought to ask ourselves, do principles only apply when it is convenient, when it suits our politics; or do we vote consistently with principles like deferring to the sovereignty of local governments in opposition to unfunded Federal mandates? Because this is what this is, an unfunded Federal mandate. It would not be done in other congressional districts, but we are going to be doing it over the opposition of this local government and the regional authority. We are going to do it out of what I can only consider to be partisan petty politics.

We greatly regret the fact that Ronald Reagan today is suffering from Alzheimer's disease. But I know, and I particularly regret it for one reason because I know that if he were able to, he would adamantly insist the Congress not do this to his name. George Will wrote an editorial making this point: he quoted Cato, the famous Roman, who made the point that he would rather have people asking why is this place not named after Cato, than asking why did they name this coliseum or facility after Cato. In other words, modesty ought to be a hallmark of great people. Resistance to arrogance. Yet that is what this provision is. It is an arrogant Federal imposition upon the will of local government.

Local government did not resist adding the name out of resentment of Ronald Reagan, although they certainly resent the fact that they were never consulted when they changed the name of the airport from George Washington's honor to Ronald Reagan. Because it is on the very road that leads to George Washington's home. George Washington's family owned the land that National Airport was built on. In fact, Franklin Roosevelt, when the main terminal was constructed, had it constructed to resemble Mount Vernon. So if they had been consulted, they would have said, well, we really think it should be continued to be named after George Washington since Ronald Reagan never used this airport. It did not offer transcontinental flights. He used Andrews Air Force Base when he was President. So they resent that.

But that is not why they resisted this. They resisted because it does not make practical sense. You cannot fit four long names, Ronald Reagan National Airport, on the literature. But most importantly, all the stations are named after places, not after people. When some people wanted to honor Robert Kennedy by naming the Metro station at the RFK Stadium after Robert Kennedy, the Metro Board likewise resisted. They said, no, we name them after places, we will name it Stadium Armory, not after an individual. Likewise, this metro station should be named National Airport.

Now, many people will think this is a petty picayune issue, but it is a principle. We voted unanimously against unfunded Federal mandates. This is an

unfunded Federal mandate. That principle should be preserved, and so should respect for local government wishes.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should reject this language that purports to honor Ronald Reagan, but actually defiles his legacy.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-110) on the resolution (H. Res. 178) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman 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.)

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

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

THE ENERGY SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to devote my comments to a focus on energy and the energy shortage that we have. On one hand I think in some areas we have an energy crisis, on the other hand I think at times we really have an energy problem. In either case, whether an energy crisis or an energy problem, the fact is we need to apply an ingredient called common sense.

There is a lot of areas of common sense. We can find a lot of common sense, like conservation. Issues like conservation, when applied to energy, can be done without a lot of pain. It

does not affect our life-style. In fact, it is a contribution to our country's energy woes, so to speak. So I will visit a little about conservation this evening.

I also want to address where we are, what kind of problem we are facing in future generations. I think it is incumbent upon us, as leaders, to exercise some leadership not for today, which obviously we have to do, but for the future. Our questions about energy should not be questions about energy today exclusively, but should in fact include questions about energy for tomorrow. Of course issues like conservation and issues like alternative power, solar and other types, wind power, et cetera, are a part of our leadership obligations to help address or at least help prepare some answers for future generations on their energy problems.

I thought it would be very good this evening to take a look at what common sense does for us. For example, hydropower. Hydropower does not use coal. Hydropower does not use electricity. It generates electricity. Hydropower does not require natural gas. Hydropower does not require fuel. The fuel that generates hydropower is the natural flow of water. So we are going to talk a little about hydropower. We are going to talk about why hydropower is important for our environment.

In our mad rush to supply energy, regardless of the source, we always have to consider what is the impact to the environment and how can we mitigate the environment. In some cases, not just mitigate the environment, and in fact mitigation of the environment may be old news, the new news for the environment may mean that we have to enhance the environment, a step higher than mitigation of the environment. But I want to stress here this evening that mitigation or enhancement of the environment is not an exclusive set of its own. In other words, we can have the environment, and we can have power production regardless of the source. In fact, through utilization of common sense, we can have protection of an environment and production of energy resources that every one of my colleagues in this room and every one of their constituents is dependent upon.

Something a little interesting happened the other day. I like to mountain bike. I like to ride bikes, though I am just learning. My wife, Lori, Carey and Bruce are trying to get me educated on riding these bikes in a little more sophisticated form, but I saw someone the other day on a mountain bike and we were talking and this individual said to me, he says, You know, mining is so terrible and the energy companies are so terrible, look what they are doing. So I said, You know what, that bike you have got, that bike you paid \$3,000 or \$4,000 for, has titanium in it. It is interesting to me you criticize on one side but you take advantage on the other.

My reason for using this example this evening is to tell my colleagues that I

think this mountain biker can have a titanium bike because I think we can have production of the metals and production of the energy we need while maintaining a balance with the environment. If we do not think, and if that individual does not think, we can, then that individual should give up his titanium mountain bike. I think we can, and I think common sense will allow us.

Of course, the most basic thing that common sense can do for us is conservation.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed my colleagues any number of times about conservation, things that do not impact one's life; for example, making sure that your ceiling fan is going in a clockwise motion so it draws the cool air up to the ceiling. If it is going counterclockwise, it defeats your purpose.

We talked about the fact and I recommend to people across this country, take out your owner's manual on your car and take a look at the people who designed that car, who test drove that car, who manufactured that car, who sold that car; take a look at how often they say you should change the oil on that car, and then take a look at a quick lube recommendation, and I am not referring specifically to any quick lube. They will tell you change your oil every 3,000 miles. Guess what the manufacturer, the engineer, the salesman of that car, the owner's manual of that car will tell you? You do not need to change it every 3,000 miles. You can change it every 6,000 miles, and they will warranty the car. They will still warranty the car for 3 years or 24,000 miles.

It is not painless to turn off the lights in your house when you leave. In fact, in Europe in many of the hotels, you actually have to have a card. When you go into your hotel room, you take a card, there is a slot, and before you can turn your lights on, you slide in the card. What happens, when you leave, as you pull the card out, all of the lights go off in your hotel room. Now you can program it in such a way that if for security purposes you needed a light on, it would leave that single light on or a couple of lights, but it helps you remember to turn them off.

These are common-sense approaches on conservation. The good news is conservation can be employed by all of us without a lot of pain in our life-style. The bad news is conservation is not the answer. Conservation is a part of the answer. Imagine that we are putting a model together. Conservation is about 10 percent of that model. Maybe we can push it to 20 percent of that model.

Alternative energy, exercising leadership in the future will allow us to go from 2 or 3 percent of alternative energy to making that a bigger part of our model. But in the meantime, we have to go to what we have been doing, and that is we have got to continue to explore for oil-based resources. There

is no other way around it. You can have all kind of pie-in-the-sky wishes. You can have all kinds of people lecture from a podium like this to you saying alternative energy is the answer. It is not the answer. Conservation is the answer. It is not the answer. It is a part of the answer.

Alternative energy is a very important part of the answer. Take a look. If you took all of the alternative energy known to mankind today throughout the world, and you put that energy exclusively for the use of the citizens of the United States of America, it would supply 3 percent of our needs. Three percent. That is assuming you take all of the alternative energy from around the world. We need to increase that percentage; but it is not the total answer. It is part of the answer.

Conservation, look at what happened in California. In California the people conserve not because Governor Gray Davis, who is trying to play like a guardian angel in this situation, and he is not, nor are some Republicans, but frankly the leader of California is trying to come across as the leader to take the people of California out of this crisis. In my opinion, he largely led them in there.

The fact is they are not conserving in California because of their Governor, it is because prices went up. It is the same thing with my wife and I. My wife and I have really been conserving on energy. Why? Not because Gray Davis out of California is having a problem. It is not because I read some government program that said you ought to conserve, it is because of the fact that my gas bill doubled, and that has a way of forcing conservation.

Off the subject for a moment, that is one of the problems with price caps. When you go out to the consumer and say, no matter how much of this energy you use, no matter what time of day you use it, whether it is during peak usage or off-peak hours, it does not matter, you are going to pay the same price regardless, do you know what that does? It encourages use and discourages conservation.

What encourages more conservation than any other factor in the last 6 months? Price. The market. Supply and demand.

What has happened in California, and by the way, when you talk about California, let me point out a couple of things. I am not one of those people that thinks that California should die on the vine. I do not think we should walk away from California. California is a State, and we are the United States. But that does not mean we should not say to California, hey, you are going to have to pull yourself up by your bootstraps. You are going to have to employ self-help. Part of the way you are going to have to help yourself is to be honest, elected officials, and go to your consumers and say this is the true cost of energy. Do not shield it and pretend that it does not exist by subsidizing it with State dollars.

The Governor is subsidizing your electrical costs. You are not paying the true costs. Does that mean you will never have to? Do not kid yourself. Soon it will come back to bite you. Right now California is spending billions and billions and billions of dollars by selling bonds and raising money to pay this. They are keeping the prices capped to a large extent. In the short run it sounds great, and in the short run it is a political recipe for success. They think you are the greatest guy in town.

In the long run, trying to artificially alter the market, in the long run it has been proved since the days of Adam Smith when he wrote the book *The Wealth of Nations*, every time the government has stepped in on rent control, on gas control, on energy control, energy price caps, it always backfires. It has never worked. It has never worked in the history of the country.

Let us go back to California. Now, remember, California, especially the Governor of California, and I am not trying to be particularly terse up here, but I have heard the Governor time and time and time again blame everybody but the people of California, blame everybody except the leadership of California. It is because of Congress. It is the utility companies. Ironically, the Governor of California wants to run for President someday, so he blames the power companies in the State of Texas. It is those villains down there in Texas.

You know what, California, we have 50 States. We have 50 States. One State is in your predicament. Why? Because California leads this country in the philosophy of do not build it in my backyard. California leads this Nation in the philosophy, no, we do not want natural gas transmission lines. Do not talk about electrical transmission lines in our State, or generation facilities in our State.

California, you are too important to this Nation for you to take those positions. California is the sixth most powerful economy of the world. If California was a country of its own, it would be the sixth most powerful economic country in the world, much more powerful from an economic point of view than the country of France.

We need, whether you like California or not, and I happen to like it, we need California. We need them healthy, and I want them to come out of this energy crisis; but let us not come out of here with some artificial wave of the magic wand and think everything is right. We have to sit down and put everything on the table. We have to come up with an energy policy.

Why do I mention energy policy? Do you know why? Because in the State of California, they had an energy policy, kind of partial deregulation. Their energy policy was sell the generation plants, tell the consumers they will not have any increase in the prices; no matter how much they use the energy, no matter how short the supply, the price stays the same.

California decided not to buy long-term contracts on the electrical market, but instead to buy on the spot market, which means you go out tomorrow and you say, what is the price? I will buy it. If the price goes up, you are stuck on Wednesday. If the price goes down, you benefit on Thursday. If the price goes up, you are stuck on Friday. That is what California decided to do. They decided to roll the dice.

Well, the consequences of that are that California got itself into this energy crunch. Can we get California out of it? The answer is, yes, of course. Do we have an obligation to help California? In my opinion, yes, of course.

But California has got to pitch in. I want California to be successful, but California has got to help us on conservation, and kudos to the people of California. In the last month, I saw a number the other day where the California people have conserved a 10 percent increase in conservation. That is a significant number. That is a big help. That shows us and the rest of the Nation that the citizens of California are taking this energy crisis seriously, and they are taking a look at this so-called energy policy that they have. They realize, most citizens of California, that it needs to be amended, but amended in such a way that your energy policy works for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, my focus here this evening is as much for future generations as it is for this generation. So California needs an energy policy that is realistic in price, that is realistic in alternative energy, that is realistic in conservation, but it is also realistic in exploration and allowing electrical transmission lines and allowing generation plants to be built.

At the national level can we stand up proudly and talk about the energy policy we have coming out of Washington, D.C.? There is no energy policy. There is none. For 8 years under the previous administration, we had no energy policy. This President, and I commend the President and I commend the Vice President, Vice President CHENEY, President Bush, they have made some tough statements. They said we have to put everything on the table. It does not mean that it stays on the table. But ANWR, and of course the publicity that you have seen about Alaska is so negative, I cannot imagine how they can get enough votes out of here. But controversial or not, the President's energy policy said let us put it on the table. Let us put together an energy policy because we owe it to the future generation and our own generation and our colleagues like the State of California to come up with an energy policy that is going to work.

And that is why I am speaking tonight, because I think all of us, putting our minds together, we have the greatest mind in the world in this country, we can resolve this. It is not really the kind of crisis that some people say. Sure, we have rolling blackouts, and sure it is a crisis for an individual like

a senior citizen who loses his air conditioning or a farmer whose fans go off for his chickens or turkeys. It is the warning sign. It is a shot over our bow. It is saying to us when Washington, D.C. is the leader of this country, you have an obligation, Washington, colleagues, we have an obligation to put together an energy policy.

The first thing we have to consider when we put together an energy policy is we have to make sure we do not buy into this pie in the sky that conservation alone is going to do it. Conservation will not. It will not do it alone. It is a part, it is a very important part, of our solution. Alternative energy will not do it alone. It is a part.

□ 1930

Do not buy this pie in the sky that we can walk right out of this without drilling another well for oil; without drilling another well for gas; without putting another electrical transmission line in place; without putting a natural gas transmission line in place; we can go ahead and get ourselves out of this and protect future generations, and I will repeat, and protect future generations by simply adopting alternative energy.

Hopefully, in 50 years or 20 years or less we will have that available; but today, for our leadership today, we need to look at what tools are there. Conservation is a part. Alternative energy is a part. Exploration is a part. Hydropower, which we are going to talk about in more depth in a few minutes, is an important part. We can put these parts together on a model, put it there, stick it here, put it together; and it is an energy policy. It is in that energy policy that we can take our leadership roles. It is that energy policy that we can employ in this country so that not one State ends up in the kind of situation that the State of California is in. Because our country is much too strong a country to allow even one State like California or any State to get into the kind of crunch they are in.

But, like I said, California. I am a big fan of California. I love California. But I want you to know, it is like talking to your son or your daughter, tough love, you have got to help us out. There has got to be a little self-help involved here.

Let us look at the fundamental thing that we need to take into consideration as we begin to construct this model of energy policy. Let us take a look at growth in U.S. energy consumption. Obviously, we know that growth in consumption is outpacing production. This is the energy production, 1990 to 2000, so this is a 10-year growth rate, the green line. That is the projected. That was the production. This red line is energy consumption. Take a look at how this line, look at the angle of it versus the angle of our production, energy production. In this country, by the way. In this country.

So my colleagues say, SCOTT, that's fine, you've got production here,

you've got energy consumption there, this country would be in collapse. You're not meeting your demand. You've got too big a gap, this huge margin. How do you meet that gap? I will tell you how. We meet that gap because we are becoming by the day more and more and more dependent on foreign oil. In other words, the leaders like Saddam Hussein, the leaders in different countries throughout this world who are not necessarily friendly to the United States, they will bargain with the United States with money, green; but they are not necessarily our friend. They can shut off the tap anytime they want to. We are becoming more and more dependent.

As long as this blue space continues to grow in width, it means we are becoming more dependent, not on alternative energy as we should, not on consumption as we should, but on foreign oil as we should not. If we could apply to this line energy consumption and we could put in some serious conservation, and by conservation I do not mean you cannot drive your car anymore. I do not mean that you have to walk to the grocery store, that you cannot have a mountain bike that is not made of titanium, or you cannot have a boat made for you so you can river raft on the river or a lawn mower, these different things, refrigeration in your house and so on. I am not saying you have to shut that off, although if you have an extra refrigerator, by the way, in your garage, empty it. More likely than not you are not even using it. You could save yourselves \$17 a month. That is just a little conservation hint there.

So we can lower consumption. But the fact is this: we can with conservation lower this a little. The demand will continue, but we can lower consumption through conservation there. Alternative energy helps us. It does not lower consumption, but it gives us a different method, a different angle of consumption. Those are answers, but they do not come anywhere close to filling the gap, which means we become more and more on a daily basis dependent upon foreign oil. That is not good energy policy.

Now, let us take a look at power plant generation. There seems to be a phobia out there that we are not building generation facilities anywhere in this country, that we have completely ignored electrical generation facilities. That is not true. Remember that primarily the problem that exists today is in the State of California. One State. There are reasons that that specific State got into trouble versus the other 49 States.

There are problems up in the Northwest. That is not because of a failure of planning or a failure of leadership. It is because they are having a drought. The Columbia River is way short on water. They do depend on hydropower up there. But in fact when you take a look at what we have coming online, believe it or not, last year we had 158 generation plants come online. Obviously,

they came online in most of the States except for the State of California, which did not have them in California. They were not building generation. But we are throughout the rest of the country.

So I wanted to point out, last year 158 new power units were completed nationwide, or three plants a week. Three generation facilities a week last year came online. Construction this year is slated to set a record for new power generation. A March report by the firm Energy Ventures Analysis found that power units already in operation or under construction will add 51,805 megawatts in 2001, enough to power half the homes in the Nation. In fact what this suggests is we may very well in certain areas of this country within the next 12 to 18 months actually have an electrical glut, an energy glut. Can you imagine, after what we have been through the last 3 months that actually we would go into a glut-type situation? That is possible.

Let us go on. Utilities and generators have announced plans for equally ambitious additions for 2002 through 2004. According to the filings, the electricity industry expects to build 1,453 new power units during that 4-year period of time, taking time off for weekends. So if you take weekends off, that amounts to one new plant a day for 5 years running. Not all of these may ultimately be built, but the point is this: we are now building generation plants; we will have the generation plants that are necessary for us to meet electrical demand. This is not oil consumption. This is electrical demand.

But there is another factor to this. You may have a lot of power plants in the State of Texas, but you have got to have the ability to share that power, move that power among transmission lines. So you cannot just build an electrical generation facility. You have got to be able to put in transmission lines to distribute that to the areas where the demand is high and the supply is low. But I think there is pretty good news in the future, especially for future generations, as far as our capability to generate electricity. I think even California, that the market, once you get to the market, the less you try and artificially manipulate the market, the more market common sense comes into play.

What do I mean? If a town closes its own hamburger shop, the only hamburger shop in the town, and there is a demand for hamburgers, what tends to happen? You not only have it replaced by one hamburger operation, you end up with two or three hamburger operations. It is the same thing here. If you do not artificially toy with the market, I think we are going to have adequate supply. But that means that we have to have capability to put that supply where the demand is. That means, Governor of California, you have got to build transmission lines in your State. Frankly, every other State has got to do the same, because we are not in

California's situation today. Forty-nine States are not. Forty-nine States in my opinion did more appropriate planning. The reason that we are not in that crisis is because we planned for today.

But the big question is: Have we planned for tomorrow? Every State should pay attention. Let us learn from the painful lessons that California has suffered. Let us take a look at what our own energy demands are. What can we do for conservation? What can we do for electrical generation? Where can we put transmission lines? Where can we put natural gas transmission lines? Those are the questions that an energy policy brings up.

Earlier I mentioned to you that the predominant problem was right here in the State of California. And of course we have explained why. California has tried to artificially toy with the market. They tried partial deregulation. They did not do full deregulation. They put on price caps promising the consumers that for at least a 3-year period of time, no matter how much energy they used, no matter what time of the day they used it, no matter where the generation or transmission was, the price would not go up.

California continued to toy with the market. California continued to manipulate in an artificial fashion the market. That is why California is one of 50 States that now has that problem. The rest of the States are not problem-free. I mentioned earlier the Pacific Northwest, the Columbia River. They are very dependent on hydropower. Texas actually has an ample supply of energy, in part I think because of what their previous Governor and their current Governor, Rick Perry, has instituted; but we do not have the transmission lines that we should have to move it out of Texas to other parts of the country. I think that will be answered within the near future.

In the mid-Atlantic, most of these States have planned very well for the energy problems that they have got. You have got an isolated problem in New York City, although New York City has not hesitated. As soon as the Mayor of New York realized, Mayor Giuliani, that there were problems with electrical supply, they not only tried to slow down demand through conservation but they also figured out slowing down demand through conservation is not the only answer, it is a part of the answer; the other part is we have got to put in some temporary generation facilities to get us through the summer until we can put our energy policy in place. That is what New York has done. It appears that New York is going to have much less of a problem getting through this summer than everyone originally anticipated.

As I mentioned earlier, there are a number of different alternatives that can provide energy that I think utilize the factor of common sense. There are a lot of things if we slow down enough to assess what kind of situation we are

in and how we want to go out of it, i.e., an energy policy which this President, frankly, has decided to put forward, despite the criticism, despite the controversy, it has brought up the debate onto this House floor, which is going to be healthy for all of our constituents. The issue here is, What are some good, commonsense ways of producing the energy that we need? One of them, of course, is hydropower.

Let us talk about hydropower for a moment. Hydropower electricity. Conservation combined with common sense. Conservation combined with common sense, the two C's. Worldwide about 20 percent of all electricity is generated by hydropower. In our country it provides about 10 percent of our power. We are the second largest producer of hydropower. Canada is the first.

Now, keep in mind that every time you talk about hydropower, or you talk about new hydropower, you are going to have the radical environmentalists, the ones who in many cases are very hypocritical, hypocrites. They come to work; they drive up to the meeting to protest hydropower. They go home and use their lights. They have all kinds of recreational vehicles, whether it is a mountain bike, a motorcycle or whatever. They are very dependent on the energy market, and they are dependent on hydropower. Yet it is the radical environmentalists that are not using common sense. It is the commonsense environmentalists that are helping develop and deploy an energy policy that will work for this country.

Let us move and talk for a moment about hydropower. I know my colleagues have an understanding of hydropower; but to some of them out here, they are in areas where they are not dependent on hydropower. Out in the West we are very dependent on hydropower. In fact, Lake Powell provides a great deal of hydropower. Ironically, the national Sierra Club, the radical environmental policy of that club, not all Sierra Club members, but the radical policy of the national Sierra Club is to tear down Lake Powell. That is not a commonsense approach.

Let us take a look at how a hydroelectric dam works. You have the dam. Here is your dam that has to be built. Behind the dam obviously you end up with a reservoir. That reservoir does a number of things. Environmentally, while some of the radical environmentalists will tell you that all it does is damage the environment, in fact at Lake Powell, it has provided lots of water and habitat for species. It has become very important. It is one of the major recreational areas, if not the major recreational facility, in the entire west of the United States. We talk about being able to bring family and unite families. You go down to Lake Powell. That is the family recreation spot of the West.

□ 1945

So you get a lot of benefit out of the reservoir. What you do with the reservoir, you drop the water through the reservoir. It turns the turbine and this is your generator. The turbine goes up to your generator and produces electricity. Hydropower plants capture the energy of falling water. It is the fall of the water, the creation of that energy. It is that that generates the electricity. We do not have to use natural gas here. We do not have to use coal. We do not have to use gasoline or oil. It is a part of nature. We are able to take water, drop it at a steep enough angle; and that water, the power, the energy of that water, generates that electricity.

It supplies 10 percent of the needs of this country. Imagine what we could do if we could have smart, environmentally sensitive hydropower plants and reduce our dependence on oil coming out of the ground. We could do a lot with hydropower. Hydropower is probably the cleanest energy of which we use a major component. In other words, natural gas generators, obviously we are using natural gas. Coal generation, we know that we have an impact there but hydropower has a lot of positive attributes. So my point in bringing up hydropower is I wanted to talk about how we can use hydropower in a commonsense approach and not hurt the environment, mitigate the impact to the environment.

Hydropower is clean. When you use hydropower, it prevents the burning of 22 billion gallons of oil. Listen to this. The hydropower in our country, which provides 10 percent of the power of our country, because we use the energy off the drop of that water it saves us from having to burn 22 billion gallons of oil, or 120 million tons of coal each year. Imagine that. Because we have been able to capture the energy from the drop in that water, we do not burn 120 million tons of coal. Think of that. You want to talk about cleanliness for the environment. We save and do not burn 22 billion gallons of oil.

So the next time you have a radical environmentalist come up to you and talk to you about how evil hydropower is, say, wait a minute. If we did not have the hydropower but we continue to have the need for the electricity, how would you meet that need?

Now, sure, conservation helps; and, sure, some alternative solar helps some. Wind, it helps but not much. How do you meet that margin, Mr. Radical Environmentalist? Why do you want to do go back to burning 22 billion gallons of oil? Do you want to go to 120 million tons of coal?

Hydropower has a lot of positive benefits. It does not produce greenhouse gases or other higher pollution. Hydropower leaves behind no waste. Reservoirs formed by the hydropower projects in Wisconsin, for example, have expanded water-based recreation resources; and they support diverse, healthy, and productive fisheries. In

fact, there are some catch rates for game fish like walleye and smallmouth bass are substantially higher on hydropower reservoirs than natural lakes. It comes back to the point that I am trying to make. We have renewable energy and it is utilized with common sense.

Hydropower is the leading source of renewable energy. It provides more than 97 percent of all electricity generated by renewable resources.

Now, what are the other resources? The other sources include geothermal, wind, and biomass and solar is in there, too, but that only counts for 3 percent. The 97 percent of our renewable resources, in other words we can drop that water and drop that water, 97 percent of it in this country is hydropower.

I will very quickly just show you an illustration of hydropower. Take a look at that hydropower. The next time a radical environmentalist comes up to you and says, Hi, we should not have a dam, we should not use hydropower, that it is evil for some reason. And you say well, what is the alternative? Well, the alternative is let us rely on the other renewable energy. That is it, that is what they are telling you. They are telling you that instead you can drop this hydropower and replace it with this little tiny sliver.

Now there is no doubt, as Vice President CHENEY has said on occasions, numerous occasions, and the President has said, we need to expand this if we can, this red slice of the pie make it bigger and bigger, come up with other alternative energy but today it is not realistic and tomorrow it is not going to be realistic, but maybe for future generations we can put it on the right track and it can become more realistic.

I thought this was very interesting, and I wanted to point it out to my colleagues. This is the average power production expense per kilowatt hour. That is how you measure electricity, per kilowatt hour. Here is fossil fuel steam, generating steam. In other words, you burn coal, you create steam and the steam drives the turbine. Right there, those are the costs.

Now the green represents the amount of fuel you have to consume. How much coal? Remember that 127 million tons of coal? How much fuel do you have to use? That is maintenance to keep the turbine, to oil it, to make sure it is running correctly and in operation, your operational expenses. For fossil-fueled steam, there is operation, there is maintenance, and there is the cost of fuel. For nuclear, the operational expense, because of the safeguards they have to deploy, are extensive in nuclear. Here is maintenance and right there is the cost of fuel, nuclear fuel.

Now remember that we should not say that any of these are not efficient. We are going to need a combination of all of these in combination with conservation, in combination with solar and so on.

Look at hydroelectric. Hydroelectric has operation. It has maintenance, but

there is no fuel expense with hydroelectric generation. Why? As I have said earlier, the fuel for hydroelectric generation is the result of the energy that is created with the drop of the water. That is what this chart shows you. Here is the gas turbine. Look how much energy it takes, how much fuel it takes to turn that gas turbine to create that generation of electricity.

That is why hydropower is important. That is why when you hear comments by people that say take it out, dams are terrible, keep in mind that dams do a number of things. One, they provide recreation. Two, they provide fisheries. Three, they provide flood control. Four, in the West, as you know, in the West it is arid. Out where I live, we get all the water we could possibly use for about 5 weeks. It is called spring runoff from the mountains.

I live at the highest elevation in the country. My district is the Rocky Mountains of Colorado. Now, for 6 weeks we have all the water we can use. Unfortunately, most of the time it comes when we are not using it. So what do we have to do? We have to store it. For 6 weeks we are okay, but we have to get through all of those other weeks in the year. We have to go through 46 or whatever other weeks are left we have to go through those weeks, and we have to have storage. So the dams provide storage. So if you are going to go ahead and provide storage and you are going to provide recreation and you are going to provide flood control and you are going to provide fisheries, why not generate electricity? Why not use hydropower to the extent that we can?

That is not speaking to the elimination of nuclear. In fact, most of France is generated, their electricity is nuclear. It is not to say we should not use natural gas. It is not to say we should not use the coal generated or oil generated, but it is to say that when combined with conservation, when combined with alternative energy, this commonsense approach of putting hydropower is a major factor of generation in this country of electricity in this country, is something we simply cannot ignore and we should not ignore it.

Let common sense dominate every other approach we are using in here.

Time allows me to bring up another chart here. Let us talk about it, the primary purpose or benefit of all U.S. dams. So this chart takes a look at all the dams in the United States and figures out in a pie chart exactly what is that dam utilized for. Remember, I told you that you will often hear the radical side of environmentalism, the radical side, not the commonsense approach, not the approach most of us use, but the radical approach will say no dam is a good dam.

For example, the national Sierra Club, the radical environmentalist leadership of that group that exists are the ones who want to take down Lake

Powell, have never in their organization's history supported a dam storage project. Well, can you find out very many situations where never is always the answer? Never have hydropower? Never have conservation? Of course not.

There is a balance in there. Somewhere there is a balance. Take a look at what the balance does. Irrigation, 11 percent. Do not discount what irrigation means. In the West, as I told you, most of our water comes in a very short period of time. We do not have heavy rainfall. In fact, it was not until I left the mountains and came out here to Washington, my home is in the mountains but this is my work station, I could not believe the rains you guys get back here.

It is incredible, but back there we have to store it. And a lot of what you ate today is a result of somewhere water being stored so the crops can be irrigated.

Recreation 35 percent. Most of my colleagues here, somewhere during their year they will enjoy recreation provided as a result of storage of water, in some sport, whether it is sitting on a houseboat, whether it is fishing, et cetera, et cetera.

Stocked farm ponds, very important, again storage of water. Flood control. Now, in the West that is huge. Anywhere it is huge. Flood control, take a look at what happened, the devastation of floods before we were able to control floods, before we were able to get a hand on water and control it.

Public water supply, 12 percent. Now when you buy on, when somebody comes to your door and they do this all the time, some of the radical environmentalist approach is to come to your door with a petition and they ask for a contribution, by the way. It is usually a money raising racket but they will come to your door and they will say, hey, help us stop the terrible oppression of the environment, because they want to build a hydroelectric. What your response should be is, first of all, I care about the environment. I want that environment protected.

On the other hand, we are enjoying lights and our municipality needs water. When you are at your home, we kind of take for granted, especially when you live in a city, anywhere really but I guess in a city you kind of take for granted you turn on the water in the city you better have the water running.

The city supplies the water. It comes out of city hall. It is clean. It tastes good and it is there whenever we want it. Know what? The way the cities, most cities in this country, are able to provide that is because they have stored it somewhere, because it does not rain equally every day. It does not rain necessarily when you need it. So you have to store it.

So when people ask you to sign a petition and want to lead you down the path of the London Bridge for sale in the U.S. by telling you that there is no

need for dams or hydropower, step back, use common sense and say, in some cases a dam may not be right and in all cases that it is right, the environment must be mitigated or enhanced. It cannot be ignored. In the past, I would be the first to admit that in some cases it was ignored, and we have paid for that and paid for that. We cannot allow it ever to happen again, but somewhere in the middle there is common sense. Somewhere in the middle this energy warning that we are getting in California, it is more of a crisis than it is anywhere else in the country. Let us listen to the message that is being sent to us and that is we, as mature leaders, we have an inherent obligation, it is inherent and it is an obligation, it is a fiduciary responsibility to provide for the future generations and to exercise leadership for today. The way we do that is we take a look at the energy package as a whole. We put everything on the table. We put conservation on the table. We put energy exploration on the table. We put alternative energy on the table. We put the environment on the table. You know what? Common minds with a little sense can put together common sense, and that is how we are going to be able to do this.

As I said, and I want to reiterate a couple of very important points, I have a chart here on conservation, I have a couple of charts on conservation, I said earlier in my comments this evening I complimented the people of California. Now I have been harsh on the people of California, particularly the elected leadership of the State of California, because frankly they are trying to make believe that there is an easy way out of this. Well, it is too good to be true. If it sounds too good to be true, it is. So I have been critical to the leadership. I have been critical of price caps, which are great on a short-term basis. I am sure that the Governor of California will continue to lift his numbers up in the polls because artificially he is telling people no pain in the short run. He will not be there in the long run when the pain begins to develop.

□ 2000

The fact is, and what is important here that I want to compliment, is that the people in California have in the last 30 to 40 days, not as a result of their Governor, not as a result of their elected leadership, but as a result of the market, have begun conservation more seriously than they have in many, many years. And the rest of us, taking a look at California's pain that they have suffered, have decided too maybe we ought to conserve.

Look, I am the first one to tell you, I am the first one to step forward and tell you last year at this time, when natural gas was plentiful, when electricity was plentiful, I ran the air conditioning probably cooler than I needed it. I probably had it running when I ran out to the grocery store. I probably did not check to see what direction my fan

was running to make sure it was cooling the house instead of defeating the purpose.

But you know what? I saw what happened in California. I have an obligation. All of us have an obligation, and we can do it without a lot of pain to help conserve.

But while we conserve, and again I compliment those people of California who have done that, and throughout the rest of the Nation, do not kid yourself. I remember once when I was young, my father told me, my father and mother both sat us all down, they are wonderful people, both are alive and well in Glenwood Springs, they sat us down and said to us, The last person you ever want to fool is yourself. Don't fool yourself. Don't pretend that what is happening is not happening. Figure out what is happening and figure out how you are going to adapt to it.

That is exactly my point here this evening. Let us figure out what is going on. We know we have an energy shortage, but do not buy into the pie in the sky that we can resolve it all through conservation, because we cannot. Do not buy the pie in the sky that we can do it all through alternative energy, at least today. We cannot. Do not buy that all we need to do is build and build and build power plants and put oil wells wherever they want to put them, because that is not common sense.

That does not work, to destroy our environment like that; and I do not know anybody that is seriously proposing anything like that. But what we have to do is meet in the middle. We have to use a combination of conservation. As I said earlier, we have to use a combination of conservation, alternative energy, exploration and transmission. We have got to be able to move the power that we produce from the supply point to the demand point all at the same time.

When we deal with demand, conservation helps lower demand. Alternative energy helps answer demand, like hydropower. That is why I focused this evening on hydropower. There is an energy production facility that does not use fuel. It does not need coal, it does not need natural gas, it does not need oil-generated steam to produce electricity. Hydropower produces it without fuel.

Now, that does not mean every river or every location is good for a dam. Obviously, as I said earlier, and I want to stress it again, because there is misinterpretation that is often taken advantage of when you speak like this, hydropower and the environment can go hand in hand, and there will be times where the protection in the environment overrides the need of hydropower in a particular location. But it is just as crazy to say that the environment will always prevent hydropower as it is to say that the environment should never be a consideration and hydropower should go wherever we want to put hydropower.

Again, coming back to the theme of my remarks this evening, in the middle, as I think our President and Vice President have attempted to say, in the middle we need to have an energy policy; and in the middle of America, meaning the people, not the geographical location, but the middle of common sense, we as a people can figure out how to provide, without a dramatic change in our life styles, because I do not think it is necessary, we can provide the energy needs on one hand for the people, the demands that they have, while at the same time protecting and enhancing our environment, while at the same time reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

That is not a dream, but it can only be accomplished if we have an energy policy; and we have not had one in the last administration, 8 years. We had plenty of gas; we had plenty of oil and plenty of transmission. We did not plan for the future.

We should have been planning then, but we have got to plan today. And despite all the criticism and all the controversy that is being heaped on the President and the Vice President, primarily, by the way, by the Democratic operatives, not by the conservative Democrats on this House floor, but by the Democrat operatives, by the people who are more focused on the election of the next President than they are on the needs of this Nation, those are the people that are really developing the criticism and manipulating it and marketing it in such a way that some people can be convinced we should not have an energy policy that involves any type of electrical generation, any type of exploration. They simply are not aware of what I have tried to emphasize this evening, and that is it will always demand a combination, a combination of protection in the environment, combined with exploration, combined with alternative energy, combined with conservation.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue to come to you, to urge that we as a body come up with commonsense solutions. It may sound repetitive, but I have got to drill it in and drill it in. We all need to drill it into each other.

This country demands and deserves that its leaders provide an energy policy. We should follow the direction of the President and the Vice President in trying to put one together. It does not have to be his, but at least we ought to have this debate that we are having tonight.

STRONG HMO REFORM NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to follow my colleague from Colorado. I appreciate his statements

on Texas and our power success. Typically, we do have success in power because we build generation plants.

But that is not what I am here tonight to talk about. I am really here to talk about managed care reform and the Patients' Bill of Rights and HMO reform, and give a Texas perspective, because we have had since 1977 a very strong HMO reform bill that is in Texas law. Let me give the reasons why we need a Federal law to that effect.

For one thing, last week the Senate kicked off their debate on legislation that is critical in importance to our Nation's health care system, which is a Patients' Bill of Rights. In the Senate it is the McCain-Kennedy-Edwards bill, and in the House it is the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood Bipartisan Patient Protection Act. They both do the same thing, the Senate and House bills. They ensure patients and their doctors have control over the important medical decisions, and not HMO bureaucrats or someone else who may not know anything about medicine except what they may look at in files.

America's health insurance system has changed dramatically over the last 25 years. When Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act in 1975, most Americans had some type of traditional insurance indemnity plan, an 80-20 plan like most of us used to have. They went to their doctor, they received the health care they needed, and the doctors were reimbursed by insurance companies.

But all of that has changed with the advent of managed care, which has meant most patients first get preapproval for their health care from their insurance company. If the HMO does not approve the treatment, the patient cannot get it. If that patient is hurt because they are denied appropriate health care, that is just too bad under Federal law.

Even worse, a patient cannot seek redress against that HMO for the damages in State court or even Federal Court, although there have been Federal cases filed recently; and some of them may sound better than others. But, again, typically Federal law does not allow a patient to sue under ERISA. ERISA exempts HMOs from being sued in State court, and requires them to be filed in Federal Court.

Again, the Federal courts have not always been the place where you can get real redress for insurance-type lawsuits. Even if an HMO is found guilty of wrongdoing in Federal court, they are only responsible for the cost of the care they denied. So, in other words, if you are not given appropriate treatment for cancer, and 6 months or a year later that HMO is found to have wrongfully denied treatment, then they go back and give you that cancer treatment. But, again, 6 months or a year later health care delayed is health care denied, and your cancer may grow.

So what does all that mean? Let us say an HMO denies bone marrow trans-

plant to a cancer patient, even though it is medically necessary and the only way the patient will survive. That patient dies as a result of that bone marrow transplant being denied. The family of that cancer patient can now sue in Federal Court and only recover the cost of providing that bone marrow transplant. They cannot recover anything for that lost loved one, whether it be lost wages for that spouse or their children who may still be minors, and they cannot be compensated for their loss of that individual.

Really what that means is that insurance company knows that the only thing they are going to have to do is provide that treatment, so why not deny your initial amount, when they know the only thing they are going to have to pay ultimately is that amount? So, in other words, they earn the interest while they are waiting for you to get to Federal Court, which, in most cases, can take months and years. That is hardly justice for anyone who has lost a loved one.

With more than 160 million Americans receiving their health insurance through some kind of managed care, Congress needs to act. That is exactly what the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood Bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights does. The legislation would hold insurance companies accountable for their decisions that hurt or kill patients, just like a doctor is held responsible for his or her medical decisions that hurt or kill a patient.

Mr. Speaker, there are two entities in this country currently not held responsible in State courts: HMOs and diplomats from another country. It was never Congress' intent to provide HMOs with the blanket immunity part of the ERISA bill passed in 1975 before we even had managed care and HMOs. It is time we corrected that mistake and close the ERISA loophole and provide for all Americans a meaningful and enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights.

Now, let me get to the point of why it is important to examine the Texas experience, because, again, States can pass laws, and those affect the insurance policies that are licensed and sold and regulated by that.

For example, the State of Texas. That is why insurance policies that are licensed or come under ERISA are not covered by State law. So even though Texas passed a Patients' Bill of Rights in 1997 that is similar to the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood Bipartisan Patient Protection Act, it does not work unless it is under State law.

Sixty percent of the people in my district in Houston, Texas, receive their insurance coverage under Federal law regulation and not State law. The State of Texas passed a Patients' Bill of Rights in 1997. It had a number of good things in it. One was access. Texans had direct access to specialists. Women could directly go to their OB-GYN, and children had direct access to their pediatrician. Communication.

The Texas bill eliminates gag clauses which prohibited doctors from discussing treatment options with their patients, even though those treatment options were not part of or provided for in their plan.

It provided for emergency room care for patients who reasonably believe they are suffering and went to an emergency room, an emergency medical condition.

One of the important parts of Texas law is required for internal and external appeals. That ensures patients have access to independent objective panels to determine if treatments are medically necessary, so it is not just the HMO saying you are not eligible for that treatment. You can appeal to an independent and external panel and that decision is made.

Accountability. That is why it is important that any Patients' Bill of Rights includes accountability, because all the other things I have listed are not important if you do not have accountability, accountability in health insurance plans. Denial of claims results in that injury or death to that patient, so you have to have accountability.

In 1997 in Texas they originally passed, maybe it was 1995, they originally passed a Patients' Bill of Rights that then Governor Bush, now President Bush, vetoed. But in 1997 there were compromises made and the bill passed the legislature overwhelmingly. Governor Bush at that time did not sign the bill, but he let it become law without his signature.

My concern is we are hearing some of the same arguments today that we heard in 1997 about the cost and the increased number of lawsuits against doctors and other health care providers in Texas that they used in 1997. We are hearing that same argument today here 4 years later on the Federal level.

But the exact opposite is true in Texas. Since Texas enacted that law, only 17 cases have been filed. Texas has a strong independent review organization, the external review. Insurance patients must exhaust all appeals processes before they can go to court.

□ 2015

Also, a patient can only sue their HMO if that HMO disregards that recommendation, that independent review organization. If a plan follows the independent review organization, then they cannot be held liable in State court for that. So we only have had 17 cases in 4 years.

This process ensures that patients get their health care that they need in a timely fashion. They do not have to go to court and wait 2 or 3 years like we do now under ERISA before we get any kind of justice on treatment. Despite cries that this would increase the cost of health care premiums in Texas, premiums have not climbed any faster in Texas than they have in the rest of the Nation, who may not enjoy a State Patients' Bill of Rights. Texas' Pa-

tients' Bill of Rights provided patient protections for many of its residents and many Texans, but many Texans cannot benefit from that Texas law because they receive their health insurance through their employer who is covered under ERISA. That is why we need to close the ERISA loophole and enact the Patients' Bill of Rights on a Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague from San Antonio, Texas, who was in the legislature in 1997 and debated the Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas, so I would be glad to yield to my colleague from San Antonio to talk about a little bit of what went on in the Texas Legislature and what he sees that we need to do here on the Federal level now.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman for being here tonight. I know it is kind of late, and it is difficult to be home during the weekend and then coming here and spending some late hours at night talking about an issue that is so important to all Americans, including Texans.

Let me just say that the Patients' Bill of Rights is very straightforward. It allows the opportunity, first of all, to see the doctor of one's choice. It makes all the sense in the world. One of the basic principles is that one wants to be able to see the doctor of one's choice, and that is important.

Secondly, what it also does is it allows an opportunity, especially in those cases, and I had some particular constituents of mine who had some difficulties with lupus and some of the serious illnesses that they needed to see specialists for, so that when one has a very serious problem and requires specialists, one does not have to find that they are not only fighting the disease, but also fighting the HMO because they are not being responsive. So it becomes really important that we allow that opportunity, that a physician should have the right to be able to determine whether one should see a specialist or not. We all recognize that they are the ones that are the most qualified to be able to do that, and that we should not depend on someone who is doing the accounting or some insurance company to make their decision based on economics, but it should be based on what is the best thing for that particular patient in terms of seeing a specialist.

In addition, we also talk about the importance of independent review. The gentleman explained it pretty clearly. A lot of times we have a situation, and now, this is one of the areas that we need to correct back at home, where we have a decision that is made by a company that has their own doctor, and the company decides that they are not going to allow that particular doctor to refer or do certain things, and then it is detrimental to the patient, and then that patient has the right to sue.

The guidelines right now in Texas are that if they choose not to go based on the independent review organization recommendations, and something dras-

tically happens that is wrong and bad, then they should have that right to sue.

But as the gentleman indicated, and I have seen some statistics, I just saw an article that showed only 10 lawsuits. There is one other that showed 17.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are 17, from my understanding. Again, in Texas, we do not have any hesitation at all about going to the courthouse when we feel aggrieved, and so after 4 years, only 17 lawsuits. We have not had an overwhelming number of lawsuits filed under that law, but we have had people get the health care that they need.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman indicated, also one of the things that we still have to do that we did not do in Texas, and that is with the businesses. We have a lot of businesses that have their own insurance where they have their own company doctor, and where they might have some other obligations besides the fact of what they are supposed to be doing in terms of access to health care where we need to make sure we hold them accountable.

So this is a very straightforward piece of legislation that allows one to see the doctor of one's choice; that allows one to see a specialist if it is so determined by the physician, and not by an accountant or for financial reasons, and it allows for an external review group that is independent and makes the decision and decides whether one should have access to specialists or not, or whether one should have additional treatment or not. That is important.

I think that it is funny to see right now the amount of money that is being expended by the insurance companies on ads that say that the cost is going to go up. That has not occurred in Texas. In fact, in California they just passed a similar piece of legislation in January; they have not seen any lawsuits as of yet.

I think that with this piece of legislation, and I am really proud that we were able to pass it in a bipartisan effort in the House last year, and we have been able to do that, but it was killed in conference committee. So we are hoping that we can get that bipartisan effort, both in the Senate and the House, and get it out so that the President will sign it. I know that he did not sign our piece of legislation, although he talked about it very proudly in a debate that he had with Al Gore when he talked about the fact that he had done this in Texas, and so that because of that, I think if it is sent to him, I feel very optimistic that he will do the right thing and sign it and allow it to become law, because it is the right thing to do. It is something that has worked in Texas, and it is something that makes all the sense in the world.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for his hard work, not only in this area, but in other areas that help out all Texans and other Americans.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman from San Antonio, Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), my colleague. There are 200 miles, or really 199 miles separates Houston from San Antonio. San Antonio is a great city. The gentleman and I served in the legislature together before we came to Congress, and I enjoy serving with the gentleman, working on national issues, particularly his effort on national defense with veterans' issues and a number of military bases that we have in San Antonio. I tell people the only military base, outside of our Reserves in Houston, is our Coast Guard station, and they cannot take that away, because we have the highest foreign tonnage port in the country, so we have to have a Coast Guard station.

Let me go back and talk a little bit about the employer liability sections, which is a big issue here in Washington, just like it was in Texas. Many opponents of the Patients' Bill of Rights argue that employers will be faced with a barrage of frivolous lawsuits if they pass the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood bill. That claim is untrue. The bill exempts employers from liability so long as they do not directly participate in medical decision-making, and that is why I am following my colleague in saying that that is a divergence in Texas law. This provision encourages employers not to get involved in health care decisions.

Some Members of Congress and Senators believe that all employers should be exempted from liability, even if they are involved in medical decisions. Well, at one time as a business manager, I never wanted to be involved in medical decisions. That is why we contracted that with insurance carriers. But it is bad public policy to create a blanket exemption for employers, even when they actually make medical decisions.

I hope our employers out there are not making those medical decisions. If they buy a policy or they hire someone to administer a plan, that plan needs to be fairly plain, and that employer should not be the one who makes the decision about whether one receives a bone marrow transplant; again, something that is readily accepted all across the country for the treatment of cancer. It is worse policy to create an incentive that gets employers more involved in medicine.

I have said this before, but I think it bears repeating: The Ganske-Dingell-Norwood bill has very strong internal and external review provisions similar to Texas. Any insurer or employer who follows that process will be building a very strong evidentiary record that they had neither acted negligently or maliciously in dealing with a patient, and it would be virtually impossible for an enterprising trial lawyer to build a case for any damages. But one has to have accountability to be able to have a successful internal and external appeals process. Employers who are in-

involved in medical decision-making will be protected from frivolous lawsuits and unlimited liability as long as they play by the rules.

Again, as a former business manager, we have lots of rules we have to play by if one is a businessperson. But if employers are going to play doctor or medical provider, then they should be held accountable, just like doctors and medical providers should be.

Let me talk a little bit about why we need to go to State court, because that is a concern, not only as a former business manager, but as someone who practiced law and enjoyed practicing in State courts instead of Federal courts, because you could get to trial quicker in State courts.

Some proponents of the Patients' Bill of Rights argue that patients do not need access to State courts if they are injured by their plan. They think Federal courts are the appropriate venue to resolve health coverage disputes, but legal experts disagree. The American Bar Association, the National Judicial Conference, the State attorneys general, and numerous Federal judges take the position that medical injury cases belong in State and not Federal court. Even Chief Justice William Rehnquist stated that, "I have criticized Congress and Presidents for their propensity to enact more and more legislation which brings more and more cases to the Federal court system. Matters that can be adequately handled by States should be left to them."

Well, the States clearly can adequately handle these types of cases. State courts have been the traditional forum for medical injury cases for more than 200 years and have vast experience in dealing with these types of matters. Federal courts, on the other hand, are not an appropriate place for all civil cases for several reasons. First, there are significantly fewer Federal courts than there are State courts. In my home State of Texas, there are 372 State courts available to hear these cases, but there are only 39 Federal courts.

Geographical obstacles also prevent patients from accessing the Federal court. Families may have to travel significant distances to have their cases heard, when we think about the State of Texas with our long distances. Again, there are only 39 Federal courts and 372 State courts.

That is why I say State courts are the best venue. One can get justice quicker for both the plaintiff and the defendant in State court. Keep in mind, in many of these cases an individual suffers from an injury or physical condition, forcing them to go to court in the first place, and this should not happen. Even if an individual gets to the Federal court, there may not be anyone to hear their case. There are currently more than 60 vacancies on the Federal bench.

Mr. Speaker, the Speedy Trial Act of 1974 promised Federal courts to give priority to criminal cases. This means

that patients have to wait at the back of the line while the Federal courts deal with all of their criminal cases, including drug cases. And with criminal cases growing into the double digits, this can mean even longer access for individuals with the health care they need.

State courts have always been the appropriate venue for resolving personal injury cases. I know in the State of Texas we have certain criminal courts that handle criminal cases, but we have civil courts that handle our State civil cases. Personal injuries caused by negligent HMOs should not be any different than personal injuries caused by the negligence of a doctor. They should go to the State court.

I hope my colleagues will consider these arguments and recognize that patients need access to the State courts if the Patients' Bill of Rights is to be effective.

Let me talk a little bit about the frivolous lawsuits and independent review organizations. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the Patients' Bill of Rights often claim that the passage of this legislation would cause a barrage of frivolous lawsuits. Well, my colleagues have heard about the situation in our State of Texas. We have not had that barrage of lawsuits; in fact, there have only been 17 of them since 1997, considering how many thousands have been filed in State court in Texas.

This law provides nearly identical protections in the State of Texas that we would have in the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood legislation that resulted in the only 17 cases in the State of Texas. That is approximately 4 lawsuits per year, hardly the onslaught that we hear from the naysayers that they warn against.

The reason is that in Texas we have a very strong independent review organization, or an IRO. If a health care plan denies treatment to a patient, he or she must appeal that decision to that independent review organization before proceeding to State court. The IRO is made up of experienced physicians who have the capability and authority to resolve the disputes and the cases involving medical judgment. Their decisions are binding on both the plans and the patients. If an IRO determines that a course of treatment is medically necessary, then an HMO must cover it. If a plan complies with the independent review organization decision, they cannot be held liable for punitive damages.

They have worked well. Since 1997, we have had 1,000 patients and physicians who have challenged the decision of their plans. The process is fair. The independent review organizations do not favor patients or health plans. In fact, in only 55 percent of the cases, the independent review organization fully or partially reversed the HMO.

□ 2030

Although that shows me that the HMO was wrong more than half the

time, but they were corrected without having to go to a courthouse. In fact, the process worked so well that despite the U.S. 5th Court of Appeals' ruling that external appeals are violations of ERISA, Aetna and other HMO agreed to voluntarily submit disputes to the Independent Review Organizations for resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I stated earlier there have been only 17 lawsuits filed in Texas since we passed the Patients' Bill of Rights, and I believe the external appeals process has been instrumental in the success of our plan and is giving the patients what they really want, access to timely, quality medical care while protecting the insurers from the costs of litigation.

I believe that the success of the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood bill provides that same process that we would have. Patients must exhaust all internal and external appeals process before they can proceed to the courts.

They need to be swift appeals, and there is no doubt that any patient who is trying to get health care really does not want to sue their insurance plan. They really want to get their health care.

Let me talk about the costs. We have heard the opponents of the Patients' Bill of Rights argue that it would increase costs so much that an employee would start dropping their coverage. In Texas, however, providing patients with the same kind of protections has not lead to an increase in costs.

Like I said earlier, the costs of insureds, HMOs managed care insurance in Texas has not grown any more than in States that do not have the same protections. Texas premiums are growing at the same rate of insurance rates in other States that do not have a patients' bill of rights.

Even if the costs do go up, as some estimates suggest, it will only rise 4 percent, that equals about \$2 per month per patient. Let us face it, \$2 a month is not a lot of money these days. It barely buys you anything, maybe a cup of coffee, no frills. If you want a cappuccino, you are going to have to pay \$3; six first class stamps; two 20-ounce bottles of Coca Cola or Diet Coke, if you are like I am; for \$2, a 30-minute long distance call; and in some parts of the country, \$2 will not even buy you a gallon of gas.

But, for Mr. Speaker, \$2 a month patients can have access to specialists and emergency room visits and their doctors are working for them and not against them. That is why I do not think it will even be \$2; but even if it is, it is worth that amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague here and there are a lot of issues that I know this House will be talking about that. We passed an HMO reform bill last year, the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood bill, and I would hope this House would again pass a strong HMO reform bill similar to what is passed in some of our States.

Serving 20 years in the legislature, I have always said that States are a lab-

oratory, if States can successfully pass legislation and it works, then we need to look at that on the national basis.

We have had 4 years of experience in Texas, and I think we need to pass a similar law to what Texas has on the national basis, but we also need to make sure that if employers are involved in medical decisions that they are also held liable just like doctors. Again, I do not want our employers involved in medical decisions because they have enough trouble producing their products and in trying to keep this country great.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the great state of Texas and a former nurse. I am particularly concerned about this House's ability to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. We have all heard the horror stories of patients denied treatment or hospitalization as a result of the assessment of an insurance company or HMO. We have all heard questions from our constituents about federal action on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We all know there is a desire and a need to have a system which allows patients a voice in their health care. Yet because of the fear that the cost of lawyers will drive up the cost of health care, we have failed to act. Mr. Speaker, it is time to replace fear with facts.

In Texas, we passed a Patients' Bill of Rights in 1997. This bill was passed over the veto of then-Governor George Bush. Since that time, the Texas Patients' Bill of Rights has provided patient protection for many of the residents of my state. The bill of rights allows Texans with health insurance to have direct access to specialists. When a patient sees a doctor, the medical professional is allowed to discuss all treatment options, even those not covered by the plan. If there is a disagreement between patient and provider, there is a strong Independent Review Organization that ensures that patients have an appeal process that recommends solutions. All of these protections have been accomplished with only a slight increase in health care premiums. America deserves the kind of patient protections that Texans currently enjoy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members of this House can explain to their constituents, why they cannot have the standard of care currently enjoyed in Texas.

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will engage in a debate on this floor which I think will be the first volley of what will be a very long discussion here in the House about the future of agriculture in America.

Tomorrow we will pass legislation here that provides emergency disaster assistance to our producers. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, as that bill moves through the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a Member, it was pared down from what was originally proposed. I believe that it was a mistake,

Mr. Speaker, to do that, because we have a responsibility to the producers of this country.

Frankly, we had set expectations at a certain level about what we were going to do to help address the catastrophic low prices which we have seen now for year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that will move through the House tomorrow, is in my judgment inadequate and insufficient to get the job done for American agriculture in this year. What that debate will do, Mr. Speaker, is begin to lay the groundwork for the ensuing debate and that is the debate over foreign policy in this country.

We are long overdue of making some changes in agricultural policy for America. The farm bill debate is under way in the House of Representatives. It has been for some time. We have been listening intently across this country to producers about what they want to see in the next farm bill and we have listened from coast to coast in different regions. And we have had hearings after hearings after hearings here in Washington from different commodity groups and grower groups.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear in my mind that producers across the country want a bill, a farm bill that is written specifically for producers, not one that is written with some ulterior policy objective in mind or some other agenda, but a farm bill that is specifically written by producers for producers and hopefully will lay the framework that will help govern our foreign policy as we head into the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very desperate time for American agriculture. We are seeing people leave the farm. We are seeing outmigration from rural areas. We are seeing the family farm structure which, in my mind, is the backbone of America, start to disintegrate partly because farmers and ranchers cannot make a living on their farms and ranches, as a consequence, we have seen prices fall; we have seen costs go up; we have seen the bottom line get squeezed to where producers are either forced to sell out, go out of business.

They are, unfortunately, in a position where the future of agriculture is very much in question in America, and I think it is high time that this Congress take necessary steps to correct that.

Granted, foreign policy is not going to solve this. We are going to write a farm bill. That is not going to be the only solution. There are a lot of issues that impact agriculture today. We lost some foreign markets. We need to recapture those markets.

We need strong trade policies that recognize that we have to have a level playing field around the world in order for our producers to compete and compete fairly, but when we write this foreign policy, we need to bear in mind, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are some very necessary component parts that need to be in it. Of course, the

most immediate is what do we do when prices are where they are today.

We need to have a countercyclical repayment program that provides assistance to our producers when prices fall; and as they begin to improve that, that government assistance begins to phase out, but we need a program that recognizes those types of rises and falls in the market and allows our producers to continue to farm.

I believe that we need a heavier emphasis on conservation. We need a farm bill that encourages our producers, provides incentives so that they will implement conservation practices, enhance our soil and our water, add the wildlife production across this country.

It is going to be very important, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in this next bill that we have a strong conservation component and make the necessary investment to not only support our producers, but also to improve the land and the water, to help address the questions of marginal lands and erodible lands that oftentimes have led to problems in our streams and our rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I would also add that as we look at this farm bill, I think it is important that we also look at the entire context of rural economy. Yes, we talk about commodity programs and all of these other issues, but we are losing jobs on our Main Streets.

We are expressing an economic downturn that has gone on now for several years, and we need to do something to reverse that.

I think it is critical that this farm bill also highlight and recognize the importance of value-added agriculture, of allowing our producers and providing incentives and encouraging them to take what we grow, what we do well, which is production agriculture. We do it very efficiently in this country, and to reach up the ag marketing chain and capture more of the value of our agricultural products by processing, whether it is ethanol, which is something that has been a huge success story in my part of the country, soybean processing, flour milling, seed crushing, value-added meats, finding those markets, Mr. Speaker, that will enable our producers not only to compete by putting more money into their pocket, but by adding economic activity and jobs on Main Streets around this country.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this bill tomorrow, it is the first step in what I hope will be a very spirited and vigorous debate about the future not only of agricultural policy, but about the future of rural America and what we are going to do to save and preserve our rural way of life.

It is not just an economic issue. It relates to health care and education, to telecommunications, all of those things that people in rural areas expect and need to survive and to prosper and to continue to add to the overall well-being and the overall Gross Domestic Product of this great economy, because, I believe, that as our rural econ-

omy goes, eventually so will our national economy go.

Food security is very closely tied, Mr. Speaker, to national security.

I would like to touch on another subject, which I think ties into that whole issue here in a moment, and that is the question of energy policy and where we need to be going, because not only have we seen prices fall in agriculture, but we have also seen costs go up.

Agriculture is a very energy intensive industry and we need to address what I believe has become a crisis not only in agriculture but a crisis in America, and that is our lack of affordable energy for farmers, for ranchers, for working families, for our small businesses to keep this economy expanding and adding to the quality of life here in America.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I am joined here on the floor by the gentleman from the third district of Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). He is a new Member of Congress. He has been a leader on the Committee on Agriculture. He cares deeply about the future of agriculture in his district which borders mine.

I think we share a lot of similar concerns, a lot of similar anxiety as we view down the horizon and look at the future of agriculture and the future of our rural economy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska has had a very distinguished career prior to coming to this body, but I know that he cares as deeply as I do and as passionately as I do about the future of our rural economy and wants to be engaged in the debates that are going to ensue here in the next few weeks and months about how we shape and build a better quality of life for people who live in rural areas of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and welcome him to this discussion and let him know that I am anxious to work with him as we begin the debate over foreign policy in this country.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) for yielding to me. The gentleman is very correct in the fact that we do share a great deal of interest in agriculture.

We come from similar geographical regions; a lot of problems that are very common in South Dakota are very common in Nebraska.

The gentleman really set a very fine backdrop as to some of the difficulties in agriculture, and so often as I travel around people will say, why do we need to help agriculture? Nobody helps the grocer and nobody helps the implement dealer. In coaching, if you do not win enough games, they fire you, so why should you get any help from agriculture?

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to expand on some of the things that the gentleman said earlier that seemed to make some sense to me. First of all, in our country we spend only 9 percent of our discretionary income for agri-

culture; and in most nations around the world, we are probably spending anywhere from 30 percent to maybe 60 percent.

Food is very cheap, relatively speaking, in the United States. Many people go to the supermarket and think it is very high, but compared to the rest of the world, it is very cheap.

The farmer only gets a fraction of that 9 percent, probably 1 percent, 1½ percent at most of that 9 percent. So farm income is very marginal.

The other thing I would like to point out is that food is critical. Everybody is very aware of the great agony and the anguish that we are currently experiencing in regard to energy. Certainly if OPEC decides to tighten the screws or double or triple our petroleum costs, this country could very well grind to a halt within 2 months to 3 months, but that crisis is nothing compared to what we would have if we had a food crisis.

So one of the interesting things that I have noticed is that in Europe agriculture is subsidized to the tune of anywhere from \$300, \$400, \$500 an acre, and some people say, why would they subsidize food to that degree or agriculture to that degree, because in the United States, the subsidy is roughly \$60 to \$70 per acre.

□ 2045

I think the reason is that those folks have run out of food. They know what it was like in World War I, World War II, and they have experienced it. They realize that a good, safer food supply is critical to their survival. So there is no question that what our farmers and ranchers are doing is very, very important.

The other thing I would like to point out is that, compared to most industry, agriculture is different. Let me flesh that out a little bit.

First of all, if General Motors overproduces and they have got too many automobiles, they shut down a plant or an assembly line, and they bring their inventory into line with the demand. But in agriculture, you cannot do that. Farmers sitting out there cannot align his crop to world conditions. So one really cannot control the supply side like one does in most industry.

The second thing is that agriculture is almost entirely dependent upon the weather. Most industry, of course, is somewhat independent of the weather. Usually, most of it is conducted indoors. So one can do everything right, and one can have everything going just perfectly, and a-20 minute hail storm finishes the whole year's work. Of course, the drought is the same way. So it is very dependent upon the weather.

Then lastly, as compared to most industry, in agriculture the farmer does not set the price. So if one is manufacturing a product, or if one is selling in a grocery store, one sets the price. If people do not buy it, one lowers it. But the farmer essentially takes what he can get. He does not set the price.

So there is some significant differences, and I think that is one reason why people have to understand that there needs to be a farm program. It is not something we can simply throw open on the world market and hope that we will survive.

Lastly, just let me mention this. If we do try to go to the low-cost producer, we did that in energy. Back in the 1970s OPEC would sell us oil for \$3, \$4, \$5 a barrel. So we said, okay, that is great. We cannot produce it, we cannot pump it for that amount. So we are going to cap our wells and quit exploring, and we are going to farm our energy, our petroleum supply out to OPEC. We did that, and they took it gratefully.

Of course, now that price has gone up as high as \$35 a barrel, and they are in control, and we have got 60 percent of our dependence on petroleum going to OPEC.

We can do the same thing in agriculture very quickly. We can say, okay, in Brazil one can have two growing seasons. Land is 2- or \$300 an acre. One has no environmental regulations. Labor is cheap. So we are not going to help our farmers, and we are going to let the low-cost producer win. Then in that case, we will be dependent on overseas sources for our food supply. I do not think we can allow that to happen in terms of national security.

So, basically, those are some of my thoughts as to why we need a farm program. I know that the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is interested in many different aspects of this issue.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations and comments, and I would echo much of what he just said in terms of the need to have a level playing field. The United States has not had the experience that many of the countries around the world have had, knowing what it is like to go without. A lot of the countries that we have to compete with subsidize their agricultural sectors on a level that we do not in this country. Yet we arguably are trying to compete with them, and the international marketplace has become very competitive.

So it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we look at what we can do to drop those trade barriers internationally so that America can compete, and compete on a level playing field with our foreign competitors, because I believe our producers are the most efficient producers in the world, but they have to have that opportunity, and they have to have the same set of rules to adhere to and abide by and play by as the other countries around the world.

As the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) noted, one of the things I think is going to be very important in the future, too, is that we have renewable resources. We have corn. We have products that can be used and converted into other products, that can help address and diversify our energy supply in this country, our production,

and make us less dependent upon foreign countries for our energy supply.

One of the people who has become a new leader on that subject is the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), whose district also shares the border with mine, someone who has been a very strong advocate for ethanol, for other value-added industries, who understands clearly how important it is that we take what we do well, that we take production agriculture, figure out a way to harness that, to add value to our commodities, our raw commodities, and then be able to put more dollars in the pockets of our producers, and also to add economic activity in our rural economies and our rural main streets.

So I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for his thoughts on that subject as well as his thoughts on where we go in terms of farm policy as we get into this debate in the weeks and months ahead here in the Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for all his good efforts and for yielding to me. We look forward to working together to improve the farm bill for our farmers in southwest Minnesota.

I also thank the references to growing demand by tapping the energy market. I often tease groups of farmers that I am with that we all seem to be well enough fed in southern Minnesota, at least in most parts of our State, and we have room to go in terms of feeding the world and feeding our country. But we have our best opportunity for growing demand in our energy markets.

I am just still very pleased with the President's decision to deny California to waiver from their Clean Air Act and know in my recent conversations over the weekend with farmers across our district and with people that work with ethanol plants, that is going to result in a great boon to our farmers throughout the country.

This is something, in the case of ethanol, that is a win-win-win situation. It is win in that it helps us create a renewable and domestic source of energy, something that we are in great need of today. It helps us with the environment by helping gas burn cleaner. It helps us provide jobs to many of our local communities. I have six ethanol plants throughout our district. It helps as well very much with the growing demand for our products. There is that. There is biodiesel we will be working on and certainly opening up markets, as the gentleman from South Dakota referred to.

These are all not necessarily parts of our farm bill, but something that we in the Committee on Agriculture are fighting hard to make sure we advance. In the end, they result in more flexibility to do things with the farm bill because they naturally increase the price of products.

But our farm bill needs to be focused on making sure that we have counter-

cyclical payments to help our farmers in times of need as we clearly have today, and coming up with a program that gives them better support than they currently have; also, making sure that we have a strong insurance program and expanding our conservation efforts to make sure that we are nurturing the environment at the same time that we are growing the food to feed the world.

Finally, in rural development, and I was pleased to be able to award two rural development grants in our district to help increase value-added farmer-owned production.

So those are the things we will be focusing on. But I, too, was disappointed in the House Committee on Agriculture's recent votes to reduce supplemental aid to farmers in the new farm package to \$5.5 billion. I opposed the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to reduce that supplemental aid and supported the proposal of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), our committee Chair, to provide \$6.5 billion of funding.

Our farmers are struggling, and we need to provide them with the aid they need. I voted for the final passage because we need to give them support. I hear that over and over as I am out in the district.

But we are at a time when our prices remain low. We have had very poor planting conditions in our part of the country, and it is likely to reduce our yields. Our production costs are higher than they have been with the increased cost of energy. So this is really not the time to reduce the funding that the farmers have historically received during these times of need.

I hope this is a first step in progress that we can make to continue to assist our farmers. We do need to move forward on a fast timetable on passing the farm, a new farm bill this year. I am very pleased that the House is moving forward on that.

I am working together with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), and I received over 90 signatures from my fellow colleagues here in the House to encourage that both bodies move forward on a pace to get the farm bill done this year. Our farmers have waited long enough. We have ideas for needed relief. We need to move forward on them.

We have the budget flexibility. It is time to write the farm bill this year. Besides, I think we would all prefer, our farmers would prefer and deserve that we focus on policy this year rather than politics next year.

With that, I look forward to working with the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I simply note as well that it is important in my mind that we do this farm bill this year, that we set the policy parameters so that our producers know with certainty going into the next planting season.

Now, there is a tendency among some in this body and some here in the Congress to say, well, let us wait and do this next year. After all, then it will be a political year. But, frankly, I think heads think a lot more clearly and judgment is a lot more focused in the absence of the political climate that we will be encountering next year. I think this is the time that we need to do this.

So as the House prepares to write their farm policy, I would hope that we will be joined, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) noted, by our colleagues in the Senate, because it is important that we get it put in place this year.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that I think ties into this whole debate is the cost of doing business in agriculture. We have all talked about prices. Farmers cannot control prices. They have to take what they get at the elevator, what they get from the packer. They do not have a whole lot of control of what they receive. But of late, it has also become true they do not have a whole lot of control of what it costs them to do business.

Look at the input and cost of energy in this country and what has happened as we have seen prices go up and up and up in natural gas, so fertilizer is up 90 percent, the price for diesel fuel. Farming is a very energy-intensive business.

In States like my State of South Dakota, the second, probably one of the next major economic benefits in my statement is tourism, the travel industry. As gas prices go up and up and up, one sees people look into their pocketbooks and saying, I have less and less to spend, to travel.

The farmer cannot control the rising costs of what the expense is for him to stay in business and to continue to plant the crop every year and harvest it.

Mr. Speaker, that is something that this Congress needs to zero in on. We have a responsibility because we have for, I should not say we, but for the last, essentially last administration, last 8 years, not had an energy policy. We sit and we point fingers, and we will blame the Clinton administration, and they will now blame the Bush administration, and the Republicans blame the Democrats, and the Democrats blame the Republicans, and it goes on and on and on.

The American people are sitting out there and saying, wait a minute. What about us? What about what it costs us to drive to work in the morning? What about the cost of transporting our kids to and from school, the cost of the family vacation, the cost of the home heating bill in the winter months?

These are issues that impact directly and profoundly people across this country. It is important that we focus on this, that we develop an energy policy, forget the fact about who is responsible and the reason that we did not have an energy policy for the last 8 years, and we all have our opinions about that. I

do not think that the last administration paid much attention to this.

But the reality is we have a problem that is not a Republican problem or Democrat problem, it is an American problem. It is something that directly impacts working families across this country.

Now, this President, President Bush, has put forward a proposal. And not everybody may like it, but he has provided leadership. He has put together an energy policy for this country. This manual is 170 pages long. It has 105 specific recommendations. It is comprehensive. It is detailed.

It has been roundly criticized because people say, well, it does not put enough emphasis here or here or here. The fact is this is a balanced approach. Now, there are parts of it I may not like. There are parts of it that the individual Members of Congress may not like. But the reality is the President of the United States has given us a framework to work with. He has given us an energy policy that is specific and comprehensive and detailed, that includes recommendations for executive action, that includes directives to agencies, the changes they can make, and which includes specific recommendations for the Congress to act on through legislation. Some of them deal with energy supply. Some of them deal with renewable energies and alternative sources of energies, something that I care deeply about. Some of them deal with conservation. In fact, half of the recommendations in here deal with conservation or renewable sources of energy, alternatives.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we need to be looking at this in the context of what can we do to, one, increase supply of energy in this country, or, two, reduce demand. The rest is conversation.

We can have this discussion, but the fact is how do we get more supply of energy, because the demand is growing for energy, and the supply is staying flat or even dropping off. So the gap between what we use, what we consume, and what we produce is growing every day to the point that Saddam Hussein is going to be writing the energy policy for this country if we fail to do it.

□ 2100

So I hope we can have an honest debate. Let us talk about finding sources of oil. Let us talk about domestic sources of petroleum, and, if we can, get at that in an environmentally sound way; and I happen to believe there are places in this country where that can be done. But let us have an honest debate, not one that is based on emotion, not one that is based upon some preconceived notion about how things ought to be, but one based on science and fact and truth, Mr. Speaker. Let us get after this problem for the American people.

I am also joined this evening on the floor by the gentleman from the first district of Kansas, what they call The

Big First. My State of South Dakota, the district I represent, is 77,000 square miles, just slightly larger than the gentleman from the first district, which I think is about 66,000 square miles. But the gentleman from Kansas is someone who has been a strong advocate, a strong leader on agricultural issues in this country, someone who cares deeply about the plight of rural areas of America, about the quality of life of our citizens who live there.

So I am happy to be joined on the floor this evening by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN); and, Mr. Speaker, I yield to him.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding to me, and I am pleased to participate with my colleagues from Nebraska and South Dakota and Minnesota. And I know there are many other Members of Congress who care deeply about the issues we are attempting to address and to bring to our colleagues and the country's attention this evening.

I came to Congress with a goal in mind, and that goal was to do what I could do as one Member of Congress, as one individual, to have a little prosperity in rural America, to have an opportunity for my children to raise their families in rural communities in our State or across the country. So much of what goes on in this body, in this House of Representatives, and goes on here in our Nation's capital, affects whether or not there is prosperity in Kansas and whether or not there is prosperity across the country. It also affects the likelihood that the next generation can enjoy the quality of life that we have enjoyed in my State of Kansas and across the country in rural States around our Nation.

So we have our challenges and our tasks before us. It is difficult to meet those challenges. Rural America is suffering. We have heard a lot during my early days in Congress about the booming national economy, and it became clear to me that the folks of my State in agriculture and in the oil and gas industry were financing this booming national economy and that we were left behind. Seems to me that those of us who care about rural America, the tasks before us are related to agriculture and whether or not farmers can break even and can earn a little money and whether or not the next generation of our young people in the farming communities have the opportunity to return to their communities and return to their family farms.

It is about small business and whether or not businesses are going to remain on Main Street America across our country. It is about the rules and regulations and taxes and all the requirements and paperwork and bureaucracy that we put in front of businessmen and women and tell them to compete and to survive. And yet in many of the communities I represent, whether or not a grocery store is on Main Street is the main talk of economic development in the community.

It is not about whether or not there is a new factory arriving in town but whether or not there is a hardware store and a pharmacy.

So much of what we do here increases the cost of being in business, and yet we do not have growing populations such that we can spread those increased costs to meet those rules and regulations and taxes and workers compensation premiums and health care costs among more customers. So it is agriculture, it is small business, it is transportation. How do we make certain we can get from one community to another, that we can get our agricultural products to market?

Not too many months ago we received complaints from our constituents about soybeans being imported into the United States from Brazil, from South America. And my constituents, my farmers who grow soybeans, could not understand how can they bring soybeans and soy meal from South America to the United States and sell it in North Carolina cheaper than we can get it there from the middle of the country. The answer was our transportation costs. It was cheaper to put it on a boat from South America and ship it to the United States than it was to put it on a train and move it just halfway across our country.

Transportation costs matter to us; and whether or not we have roads and bridges and highways and railroads, and even airports and aviation will affect whether or not rural America remains alive and well.

It is about education and technology. I know the gentleman from Nebraska has championed issues related to whether or not we are going to have access to technology in our communities.

And awfully important to us is whether or not we have access to health care. Our ability to keep hospital doors open, to keep physicians and nurses and home health care agencies in our communities has a great effect upon whether or not those communities survive. So many of our people living in rural communities are seniors, and they will not be able to take the risk to live in a community where the hospital is not there anymore. Young kids who are just starting their families do not want to raise their children where there are no doctors.

So those of us who care about rural America need to make certain that we protect the delivery of health care in rural America. And this issue called Medicare that we deal with in this Congress and in this Nation's capital affects us greatly.

So we have our challenges. Tonight we wanted to talk a bit about agriculture. It is clear to me that without prosperity on the farm, there is no prosperity in the communities of Kansas. And that is true whether you live in Topeka, Wichita, or Overland Park, the larger cities of our State, or whether you live in Goodland, Smith Center, or Protection. Agriculture matters, and the future of our economy and our

State is determined whether or not our farmers and ranchers are surviving, whether or not they are making ends meet, and whether they have anything left over at the end of the year.

I was taken to task by one of my constituents for the amount of time that I spend dealing with agricultural issues, and the thought was the farmers are doing just fine and that I do not need to worry so much or work so hard. The reality is that we have almost no sons, no daughters either staying in our communities or returning to the family farm after going to college. And if there was any prosperity or any money to be made in agriculture, those young men and women would be back on the farm. It is not happening.

This is certainly an agricultural week in Congress. The plight of our farmers and our ranchers is not forgotten here. We have, as has been mentioned earlier tonight, addressed an issue of lost payments for market, the low price, what I call disaster assistance. The Committee on Agriculture will have a bill on the House floor tomorrow dealing with this assistance to try to tide the farmers over for a while longer until we can do some other things to keep them in business.

Farmers do not want payments from the government; they want to earn their living from the markets. But unfortunately, government puts many stumbling blocks in their way. And as the gentleman from Nebraska said, our competitors, those particularly in the European communities, they are subsidized eight times what we are in the United States. My hands are going up because there is a bar graph in the office which reflects the Europeans subsidize agriculture eight times what we do in the United States. Yet we tell our farmers to farm the markets, to compete in the world. It is not a level playing field at all.

A pie chart in my office reflects that 82.5 percent of all subsidies to help export agriculture commodities around the world is provided by the European Community. Our slice of that pie is 2.5 percent. Yet we tell our farmers to compete in the world. Go out and grow the crops, sell them. Yet we have such an unlevel playing field.

We have trade embargoes and sanctions against other countries. The farmer did not ask for those; yet because of foreign policy, we conclude we cannot sell wheat or grain or meat products to some country around the world because we do not like their behavior. The reality is we do not change their behavior; we just cause our farmers, our ranchers to lose one more market.

It seems to me those of us who care about agriculture have to care about a farm bill and farm policy. That farm bill is going to be discussed, debated and written. This is my first time in Congress in which we have tried to draft a farm bill, and I am looking forward to being fully engaged in that debate. That will take place in the House

Committee on Agriculture during the month of July, and we will be back on this House floor with an agricultural bill that will be important to farmers.

But we have had low prices in many farm bills, so that is not the total answer. We have issues related to trade and sanctions and exports. These farm commodities must be assumed. We have great concerns about lack of competition in agriculture. Everybody that the farmer buys from and sells to is getting larger and larger, and the farmer feels the squeeze. We need to make sure our antitrust laws are effective and are enforced. So the challenges are there; and yet the reality is that without prosperity in agriculture, there is no prosperity in rural America.

We are in the middle of a wheat harvest in Kansas, and it is working its way from south to north. It has been to Texas and Oklahoma, it is now in Kansas working its way into Nebraska and South Dakota. We have lived in Kansas for the last several years with these terribly low commodity prices because we have had good yields. Last year the drought hit Kansas and decimated the soybean crop.

This year, in wheat harvests, the number of acres that will be harvested in Kansas is expected to be the lowest number of acres since 1957. So now this year not only will we have terribly low commodity prices but we have no crop to harvest, or a smaller crop to harvest; 56 million bushels less wheat to be harvested in Kansas it is estimated. And although the early harvest reports have been good, we have concerns about kernel bunt and rust. And, unfortunately, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, the increased cost of inputs, particularly fuel and fertilizer, estimated by our Kansas farm management database, is an increase of 33 percent in costs for fuel.

So our work is cut out for us. I look forward to working with my colleagues across the country to see that we have disaster assistance, the market loss assistance program tomorrow on the House floor, that it is passed and sent to the Senate and that it is addressed quickly, and that we have an agricultural policy, a farm bill through the Committee on Agriculture later this year. And I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota, it is critical that the Senate join us in addressing this issue. Our farmers and their bankers need to know what farm policy is going to be in this country.

This issue is important to me. It is not just whether farmers make a living. This is about a way of life, and it is a way of life that is evaporating in this country. It is about a way of life in which sons and daughters work side by side with moms and dads and grandparents, and where character and values and integrity is passed from one generation to the next. So although tomorrow we will be talking about dollars, what we are really talking about is a way of life, and a way of life that was the history of our Nation.

I look forward to joining my colleagues tonight and my colleagues throughout the year and my colleagues across the country to make sure that rural America is not forgotten in the United States House of Representatives. I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding, and I would simply again say that we are joined geographically by the gentleman from Nebraska, but strong similarities in the concerns, the people that we represent, the topography of the land, the things that we raise, and absolutely the issues that we are concerned about with respect to the quality of life in rural areas of America.

As the gentleman from Kansas noted, so much of it is about agriculture because there is no prosperity in rural America unless agriculture is prospering. When we see these succeeding years of low prices, and in agriculture the last few years it seems like the prevailing economic theory has been that we lose a little bit on each sale, but we make up for it in volume. We have tried to make up for what we have lost in price in the numbers of bushels we produce; yet this year, as the gentleman from Kansas noted, we are seeing, because of weather and other related issues, all sorts of problems in getting the kinds of harvest and the kinds of yields necessary in order to make our farmers pencil out and break even.

I am anxious, along with my colleagues, to engage in this debate. I do believe that there is no question that when we deal with this whole issue of farm prosperity that it is about prices; it is also about the cost of production, the cost of energy, and that it is an issue which we are going to have to address.

I understand the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), over here on my left, would like a minute; and I would be happy to yield to him for a moment.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman first of all for bringing this up tonight. I think it is so important. I think we forget that we are all involved in agriculture when it comes to the issue of eating.

I represent a district that runs from San Antonio north to south, all the way to the Mexican border, and I take pride that I am the seventh producer of peanuts in the Nation. But I also do not take pride in the fact that we are having a rough time, as the gentleman has indicated. Nature determines a lot of times what happens to our farmers. It is something where they basically put all their money into that crop. I had one year, in 1998, where I had a major flood that destroyed a lot of the crops that we had. Previously, we had about 5 years straight where droughts hit and devastated a lot of our farmers. Those kind of things we forget.

One of the things that I think the gentleman mentioned, and that I think is important, is that we continue to

mention the importance of our national security when it comes to agriculture and food. We cannot depend on foreign food when it comes to our national security. We have got to make sure that we continue to grow that food in this country. Because I think that is also important, as mentioned earlier in the discussions, the fact that a lot of our farmers now are senior citizens. The young are choosing not to go into it because it is very difficult, and a lot of times there are not the profits, and the risks are just tremendous.

So we as a Congress and as a people need to make sure that we protect our farmers, and we need to do everything we can to make that happen. We talk about the minimum wage and the prevailing wage, but we very seldom talk about a prevailing price for that product that those farmers have. I think it is important that we do that. There is no doubt there is no way we can compete with Europe when they get subsidized. There is no way we can compete with Latin America, when they almost do not get paid for anything.

The bottom line is, for our national security, we have to make sure we have our farmers. And I want to thank the gentleman for being out here tonight talking about the ag bill and what we need to do. We need to make sure that that food continues to be on the tables.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for his comments. Again, agriculture is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. It is something that is important to the future of America and to our national security, and it is something that we need to be working as a body and focusing on in a cooperative way, in a bipartisan way, to try to solve some of these problems and see that our producers have a living wage, because they do not. All they ask for is a fair price for their products.

Unfortunately, as the gentleman from Nebraska pointed out earlier, because of the way that we have to compete with countries that subsidize their farm economies at much higher levels, it does put our producers at a competitive disadvantage. And that is something that we have to try and correct through our trade policies. But we have a responsibility as a Congress to right now focus like a laser beam on the farm bill, on writing a new farm policy, on the energy policy in this country to help increase the prices that farmers receive and to lower the prices they have to pay for their inputs so that that bottom line will begin to show up in the black again instead of in the red. This will help us, hopefully, keep our young people in this country on those family farms that form and shape the bedrock values of America.

□ 2115

I believe we are much better served as a culture if we have family farmers farming the land and producing the products and the commodities that we consume in this country and we export around the world.

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) has been a leader on a number of issues, one of which is technology, and so many other issues which are important to rural America. I yield to him at this time for his thoughts on that matter.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the preceding comments from the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the new farm bill, and many times people hold out great promise on the farm bill, and it is not the whole answer. It will hopefully provide a safety net which will allow people to continue in farming. We have been losing 10 percent of our farmers every year. Sometimes people say you are keeping the inefficient people in business, but all the inefficient people are long since gone. All of the people left have skill and ability.

As I talk to the farmers in the Third District of Nebraska, so often I hear the statement, we do not want a subsidy, we want profitability. We want to make our living in the marketplace. I think other than a safety net, there are some things that we need to focus on.

Of course, Freedom to Farm had some good ideas behind it. One is basically the philosophy of Freedom to Farm was that the farmer would produce all that he could. The farmers produced fence row to fence row, and the government's part of the bargain were that they were going to provide the markets, make sure that we had free trade, fair trade. And I am sad to say that part of the bargain was not kept. We did not fully fund market access programs, foreign market development, and we continued to have foreign trade sanctions, trade embargoes.

We have great hope for the WTO and NAFTA. We would like to see tariffs on our goods at 40 to 60 percent come down to 10 percent, which is basically what we are charging goods coming into our country. In theory, these two organizations, NAFTA and World Trade Organization sound good, but most of the farmers I talk to are not happy about implementation. They do not feel that we have a level playing field and that we have been aggressive enough in our trade practices. We need to open up markets and fully fund the programs that we have in place to help our marketing procedures.

The President needs fast track authority, the ability to negotiate quickly trade negotiations. In the last few years, we have had over 200 international trade agreements drawn up, and the United States has participated in 2, 2 out of 200. So the President needs to be given this authority. This is something that will be coming down the road fairly quickly.

We have touched on value-added agriculture. That is a big part of profitability. We have talked about ethanol, which will add 15 to 20 cents per bushel of corn; and ethanol could triple with MTBE going by the wayside.

We currently have 62 ethanol plants in the United States, and that should

double or triple in the United States. We have 200,000 people employed in the ethanol industry, and \$4.5 billion a year being brought in by ethanol. And again, those numbers could double or triple very quickly, which would be a huge shot in the arm for agriculture.

Co-ops need to spring up. Some are occurring right now, where the farmer participates in all levels of the process, and, of course, makes more profit in the process. We think that value added is going to be very important.

Let me just touch on one other thing, and that is the research issue. So far the advantage that we have had in the United States has been technology in agriculture and infrastructure, the ability to move our products. As the gentleman from Kansas mentioned earlier, the infrastructure advantage is quickly disappearing. Other countries are beginning to move their products equally as well.

So the thing that leaves us with that is an edge in technology. So often groups that come before the Committee on Agriculture and present their ideas, research is sometimes left out. It is left out of the equation. For instance, in ethanol alone right now we can get a better conversion rate. It takes so much energy to produce a gallon of ethanol. The ethanol that is produced produces more energy than what it takes to produce the ethanol; but that could be double or even triple. We could use switchgrass and all kinds of products. We could plant switchgrass on CRP acres, which would make CRP more profitable. We need to keep working on BSE. Foot and mouth disease. Karnal bunt was mentioned earlier in regard to the wheat industry. This is a great concern. So I am a great advocate of making sure that we can ensure and maintain our edge in technology.

Of course, one last comment would be simply the fact that we are losing young people and losing population in rural areas. The reason we are losing them is that they are going places where they can get more money. And the reason that they can make more money is there is more technology and more telecommunications. So the digital divide has hit rural America very hard.

People will tell you that roughly 90 percent of new industry is not willing to go into an area unless there is broadband service and high-speed Internet access. We have to do everything that we can to make sure that the rural America has the ability to provide those kinds of services which will allow us to keep more of our young people at home.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota for allowing me to participate in this dialogue.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would reinforce what the gentleman from Nebraska just said about technology. We do have a digital divide in this country. One of the things that separates us from more populated areas of the coun-

try is that having access to broadband services, high-speed Internet services, all of those things that improve the quality of life, allow for greater speed and efficiency in conducting business, and connecting rural areas with the rest of the world in a very timely and convenient way.

So as we talk about the issues that impact rural areas, obviously agricultural policy is at the heart of that, energy policy is at the heart of that. Also appropriate investment in our education for our young people, rural health care, quality of life, as the gentleman from Nebraska mentioned. We have aging population areas of this country which present some unique challenges and unique needs.

One of the things that we want to see is the young people have the opportunity, if they choose to, to grow up and raise their families in rural areas of this country, in our small towns and farms and ranches. We have seen a continual decrease in the number of farms across the country. In my State of South Dakota, we have about 32,000-plus farms and ranches. The average size of those operations is about 350 acres. So it is the small, it is the family farms that constitute the real backbone of the economy in rural areas. So many of these issues tie into that.

Again, as we talk about what we can do to improve the quality of life and provide incentives for investment there for the need for technology, I am co-sponsoring legislation that provides a tax credit for those companies that would go out and offer broadband services in rural areas. I believe we need tax incentives in place for value-added agriculture, small-producer ethanol tax credit legislation which I am sponsoring. Another piece of legislation that will help lower the capital barrier to investment in agriculture, value-added-type industries; tax credit for producers that will encourage farmer-owned cooperatives so farmers can take more control of their own destinies and begin to create opportunities and increase in the overall prices that they receive for their products. These are all issues that impact the future of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, as I would simply say in closing again, I think if we look at the things that the Congress has to deal with, they are many. We have all of the appropriations bills, the Patient Bill of Rights, campaign finance reform, and they are all important. But when you come down to it, there is nothing more important to the future of this country than putting in place a solid farm policy and an energy policy for America's future that will lessen our dependence on foreign sources of energy by utilizing the great renewable sources we have in America and finding those sources additional sources of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to discuss these issues and look forward to engaging in colloquies with my colleagues on these important issues for all Americans, including

those of us who choose to live in rural areas.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN AMERICA DENIED VITAL MEDICAL AND FOOD BENEFITS BECAUSE OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this special order tonight is to highlight some injustices, an injustice that is not only unfair, but unwise. Tens of thousands of women and children in this country are denied vital medical and food benefits because of their immigration status. What does this policy say about our country, the richest in the world, especially now in these times of surplus? What kind of country are we building for our children when we say some are eligible and some are not, even though they have played by the rules?

These are people that are legal immigrants that have played by the rules. Today hundreds of thousands of women and children are left outside without assistance in times of need. These are people who are here legally. They have followed the guidelines. They have paid taxes. They work. They are individuals that are out there baby-sitting our children, that pick up our trash. These people have been working hard, and they are strong Americans.

But in 1996, Congress decided that it was not the American benefit to provide safety net services to the communities that contribute so much. Last week we observed the first International French Citizen Day. It is only fitting that we recognize the contributions of this community and restore their access to the food and medical assistance that they need. I strongly believe that we need to look at this as a national public health issue.

When children go sick because their families cannot afford care, it is a public health issue. When pregnant women cannot get prenatal care, it is a public health issue. When pregnant women and young children do not have essential nutrition that they need, it is a public health issue. Ultimately it impacts on more than just our health, it hurts our educational system and economic possibilities.

□ 2130

Children who go to school hungry will not perform to the best of their abilities. Nor will they achieve the full potential that they have. We all lose when we do not provide them access to good quality care and good nutrition.

As I need to remind my colleagues, this is a Nation of immigrants, a Nation whose strength has come from hard work, of those who have fled persecution, from those who have left

other countries to find better futures in our country, and who have left with their families and have come here. None of us would be here if it were not for immigration. Our country would have not had the academic, scientific, nor the industrial strength it does today without the contribution of our immigrants.

So why do we choose to raise obstacles in the way that we have? It is wrong. We should change our misguided policy as soon as possible. Numerous bills are pending in the House under the banner of health solutions for hardworking American families that offer solutions for correcting this problem. The Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act, H.R. 1143, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families and Seniors Act, which is H.R. 2142, introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act, H.R. 2258, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and others. These three bills help to basically address one of the problems that we have encountered.

Should we deny health care and nutrition to this baby? The answer should be no. This baby should have access to good nutrition. We need to understand that these people are here legally and they have gone through the process. But because of our laws that we passed in 1996, we excluded them from participating in access to Medicare and the CHIP program that helps youngsters to be able to have access to insurance coverage; and in addition, we have excluded them from food stamps that are very critical, and in some cases we will find different families that have one that was born here, one that has come abroad, some that qualify, some that do not. So we have in our laws things that need to be corrected. Hopefully, we will have an opportunity to do this in this session.

In addition, the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act, which is the third piece of legislation that is important, we have a lot of women that are abused. They do not have the opportunity to be able to get the services that they need. It is important. The third piece of legislation that we are going to be talking about tonight is the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act. I want to take this opportunity to also thank my fellow colleague who is here from Texas, Congressman GENE GREEN from Houston, who has been in the forefront on a variety of issues. He just spent some time talking about the Patients' Bill of Rights. I know he is up here tonight to talk about these issues. I thank him for being here with us.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and also for his taking this hour, 9:30 Wash-

ington time, 8:30 Houston and San Antonio time. We have thousands of immigrants who come to this country with the hope that they will be able to fulfill their own American dream. They want to work, pay their taxes, and contribute to their and our society. They want to raise their children in a democracy where all people are created equal.

Unfortunately, our current laws do not treat all people equally, especially legal immigrants. Most Americans who pay their taxes can count on food stamps, Medicaid or other safety net programs if they fall on hard times. But as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), mentioned, the 1996 welfare reform act denies this kind of assistance to many lawfully present immigrants, including children up to 5 years. As a result, immigrants and their children who played by the rules and are here legally face the impending threat of hunger and sickness in a way that no other taxpayer in our country could fathom. Additionally, because of the 5-year ban, U.S.-citizen children in immigrant families are less likely to be enrolled in Medicaid or CHIP programs even though they are still eligible for these programs.

Mr. Speaker, each year immigrants pay approximately \$1,800 more in taxes than they use in services; but in their time of need we slam the door in their face and say, Come back when you've been here 5 years. This law is arbitrary, unfair and I think we should overturn it. That is why I am proud to speak in support as my colleague is of H.R. 1143, the Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act of 2001. I was a cosponsor of this in the last Congress and a cosponsor in this Congress. This legislation gives the States the option of allowing low-income legal immigrant children and pregnant women access to Medicaid and the State Children's Health Improvement Program, the CHIP program. If States opt to cover pregnant immigrant women and their children, then Federal matching funds would be available, because again if you are here legally and you are pregnant, we want that mother to have a healthy child. And if we provide those women with prenatal services, we will make sure that child is healthier; and in the long run it is to the benefit of all of us because we want healthy children.

I also support H.R. 2142, the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families and Seniors Act. This important legislation restores food stamp program eligibility for low-income legal immigrants and makes other modest improvements in programs for working families and our elderly. I represent a very urban district. We have Hispanic elderly who literally have been here almost their whole life, although in the last few years they have been becoming citizens at a record pace; but there still are individuals who have built this country and need this assistance.

I am also a strong supporter of the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor, or the WISH Act, which would provide vital support service to immigrant women who must endure the tragic and difficult situation of domestic violence. Immigrant victims of domestic violence are especially dependent on their abusers because of the restrictions passed in the 1996 welfare reform act. This law inhibits battered immigrant women from accessing the resources they need to leave their abuser. The WISH bill would allow legal immigrants who are victims of domestic violence to apply for critical safety net services such as medical and food assistance if they are victims of battery or extreme cruelty by a family member; and, two, demonstrate that receiving benefits would significantly lessen the risk of that battery.

Mr. Speaker, eligibility for vital support services should be based on need and not just your immigrant status. Many tax-paying legal immigrants work in low-wage jobs and their families could use these vital support services to continue to succeed in our country.

I want to thank my colleague for asking for this Special Order tonight to highlight the need for our immigrants because he is right, we are an immigrant Nation. Some of us just got here sooner than others. We need to be able to have them conform and succeed in our country because we all came from somewhere. That is why I am proud to be not only an American but also allow for legal immigrants to come and build this country, to continue to build this country like our forefathers did whether you be in San Antonio, Houston, or anywhere in our country.

I thank the gentleman for taking this time tonight.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) as he so eloquently indicated was the fact that we are talking about legal immigrants. We are not talking about individuals that are here illegally. These are people that went by the rules and played by the rules and abide by all the laws that we have. They have not become citizens as of yet and find themselves in this situation. At this time to make the system fair for everyone, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor these important pieces of legislation that I have mentioned.

Once again, it is the Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act, H.R. 1143 and S. 582; number two is the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families and Seniors Act, which is H.R. 2142; and the third is the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act. These are three important pieces of legislation that I feel will correct some of the injustices that exist out there and try to correct the situation where these individuals will be able to apply.

As the Congressman has also indicated, when we look at those two pieces of legislation, first the Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act, it is one about making sure

that people get included into Medicaid. The legislation does not require any State to cover these immigrant children and pregnant women. It merely allows the State to draw down Federal moneys to be able to provide the care. And so if States choose to do that, they can; but it is not mandatory. Secondly, the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families, once again it allows the State the option of creating a fixed 6-month transitional food stamp benefit for those moving from welfare to work in addition to providing them access to those food stamps that are critical.

I want to take this opportunity to look at the specific problem that we have encountered with the existing piece of legislation. Current law bars legal immigrants, including pregnant women and children who arrive after August 22, 1996, for 5 years from receiving health benefits under Medicaid or under the CHIP program. Remember the CHIP program is that program of those youngsters, those families that are working hard and making money but yet do not have access to any kind of coverage. They are not poor enough to qualify for Medicaid, but they are finding themselves that they could qualify for CHIP; but because of the fact that they are in this status that they arrived here after August 22, 1996, they have to wait 5 years. Children and pregnant women who are denied coverage through the CHIP and Medicaid 5-year ban usually can get other vital health care coverages.

We all know and recognize that preventive care minimizes emergency room visits, a costly and inefficient way of providing health care. More alarming is a recent Kaiser study that was done which reports that even though noncitizens are more likely to be without usual sources of care, they are less likely to go to emergency rooms than citizens. This particular study finds that if you are a noncitizen but here legally, you are less likely to have access to health care. This means that noncitizens are less likely to be able to have those opportunities, to be able to have preventive care, to be able to get to the emergency care when it is needed.

The second piece of legislation, the Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act, gives States the option to allow low-income legal immigrants, children and pregnant women to have access not only to Medicaid and CHIP, but it also looks in terms of access to additional services. When we look at the health of children in immigrant families, it is important that now the States are having a crisis in this particular situation. Certain States are burdened, in addition, more than others. Some have more noncitizens than others. So we see the disparity that exists.

According to a recent Urban Institute study, children of immigrants are three times as likely as children of natives to lack the usual sources of health care and more than twice as

likely to be as fair or poor in health. For pregnant women and their children, regular prenatal care and early intervention saves lives and dollars as we all know. Children who have routine office visits and immunizations grow to be healthier adults with less medical complications. Children monitored by pediatricians are less likely to be victimized by chronic and communicable diseases. The 5-year ban on providing Medicaid and CHIP coverage has been the greatest barrier to health care for legal immigrants. As a matter of decency and as a matter of economics and as a matter of public health, legal immigrant children and pregnant women deserve the same access to essential health care coverage offered to citizens.

We are talking about people who also pay their taxes, and we are talking about individuals that are here legally. This group has been singled out, and they are forbidden from accessing the very programs their tax dollars support. Studies show that each year, immigrants pay approximately \$1,800 more in taxes than they use in services. This is according to the National Academy of Science.

I would like to point out that the vast majority of immigrant families are mixed-status families that include at least one U.S. citizen and typically a child. The mixed status makes it impossible to have continued good continuity of services for the family. For instance, one foreign-born child may rely on emergency room care while a U.S.-born sibling might qualify for Medicaid.

And so you find those situations in particular households where you have the parents that are here legally, then have children and now find themselves that the children might qualify, but they do not or the other children do not. The same complications are true for accessing other services such as food stamps. The Second Harvest National Food Bank Network study that was recently done found nearly 38 percent of emergency food assistance for clients that were children. That is, 38 percent of emergency food assistance clients were children. So we find a situation where children are lacking good nutrition.

□ 2145

The food stamp program has played a vital role in helping low income working families, the elderly and the disabled make ends meet. It is a crucial support for hard-working families trying to make ends meet. For families who are in mixed immigrant status and that is where they have some kids that are citizens and some that are in the process of becoming citizens, it is the child that is hurt the most. Children who are U.S. citizens may not receive food stamps because their parents have immigrant status. Participation in the food stamp program among citizen children with legal permanent resident status declined 70 percent from 1994 to

1998. So we have actually had a decline in the participation from 1.35 million to 350,000. Twice the overall rate of participation declined in the food stamp program.

I think that a lot of this is attributed to the piece of legislation that we have now and we will hopefully be able to correct that. I find this appalling, especially when you consider the reports that document hunger among children in America. This year the Urban Institute reported that nationwide 37 percent of all children immigrants lived in families worried about encountering difficulties with purchasing food. Should we deny food and nutrition services to children that are babies and would you deny this particular baby the right to have access to good quality nutrition and to good care?

I think it is important for us that we be responsive and treat everyone in an equitable manner. So you have thousands of children throughout this country that find themselves in this particular loophole that I feel that needs to be corrected and these three pieces of legislation helped do that.

So as we move forward, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families and Seniors Act, which would restore food stamp benefits to qualified immigrants and primarily affecting families with children.

I also want to say a few words about a bill recently introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) on Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act, which is H.R. 2258. This particular legislation allows legal immigrants, who are victims of domestic violence, to be eligible for public benefits such as food stamps and Medicare and SSI for the period of time long enough to allow them to escape from their abusers. I will say that time and time again we need to care for the most vulnerable in our communities. Individuals fleeing domestic violence certainly need our help. It is time to talk about compassion, about fairness, about keeping our community healthy. Now is the time to give legal immigrants a chance to escape their abusive relationships. Under the present situation, they cannot. Now is the time to restore both the Medicaid and the CHIPS benefits to lawfully presenting in any event women and children. Now is the time also to restore the food stamp benefits to working families and children and the seniors who rely on the assistance in time of need.

I urge my colleagues to support the healthy solutions of American hard working families. This is the right thing to do for the immigrants, for the children and for all Americans.

I want to take this final opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to just indicate that it is three pieces of legislation that will help correct the problems that we see now. Once again, it is the Legal Immigrant Children's Health Improvement Act that talks about only people that are legally in this country. I am not

talking about illegal. These are people once again that went by the rules, played by the rules and now they find themselves in that 5-year gap. I ask for assistance and for people to sign up.

Secondly, when it comes to nutrition and food stamps, we want to make sure that the Nutrition Assistance for Working Families and Seniors Act also is passed so they will have access to food stamps if they are in need.

Finally, the Women Immigrants Safe Harbor Act allows women that are being abused the opportunity to qualify for these programs as they flee from those situations that are not healthy.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. 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 tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. POMEROY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. PAUL (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family illness.

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of his father's illness.

Mr. SHADEGG (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of undergoing a medical procedure.

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal business.

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. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. CON. RES. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used on July 26, 2001, for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1029. An act to clarify the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the use of fees during fiscal year 2001 for the manufactured housing program.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 26, 2001, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2000 and the first quarter of 2001, by Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for a miscellaneous group in connection with official foreign travel during the first quarter of 2001 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Scotland, Germany, Italy, Qatar, Jordan and England, August 7-19, 2000:											
Delegation expenses	8/12	8/14	Italy				3,774.38		13,356.14		17,100.52
	8/16	8/18	Jordan				666.43		3,253.31		3,919.75
Total									16,609.45		21,020.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB STUMP, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2001.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Korea, Thailand, Singapore and Taiwan, November 30-December 2, 2000:											
Delegation expenses	11/24	11/28	Thailand						4,402.00		4,402.00
Total									4,402.00		4,402.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB STUMP, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Travel to Chile, January 12–18, 2001:											
Hon. Martin H. Meehan	1/12	1/18	Chile		1,776.00						1,776.00
Commercial airfare							5,112.60				5,112.60
Travel to Guatemala, Ecuador and El Salvador, January 21–25, 2001:											
Hon. Robin Hayes	1/21	1/22	Guatemala		190.00						190.00
	1/22	1/24	Ecuador		422.00						422.00
	1/24	1/25	El Salvador		222.00						222.00
Travel to Ecuador and Colombia, January 23–26, 2001:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	1/23	1/25	Ecuador		420.00						420.00
	1/25	1/26	Colombia		208.00						208.00
Commercial airfare							1,816.00				1,816.00
Travel to Italy, Germany, France and the United Kingdom, February 16–25, 2001:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	2/16	2/19	Italy		966.00						966.00
	2/19	2/22	Germany		319.00						319.00
	2/22	2/23	France		263.00						263.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		702.00						702.00
Hon. Jim Turner	2/16	2/19	Italy		966.00						966.00
	2/19	2/22	Germany		319.00						319.00
	2/22	2/23	France		263.00						263.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		702.00						702.00
Hon. Baron Hill	2/16	2/19	Italy		966.00						966.00
	2/19	2/22	Germany		319.00						319.00
	2/22	2/23	France		263.00						263.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		702.00						702.00
Mr. J.J. Gertler	2/16	2/19	Italy		966.00						966.00
	2/19	2/22	Germany		319.00						319.00
	2/22	2/23	France		263.00						263.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		702.00						702.00
Travel to Russia, Moldova, Ukraine and Russia, February 18–24, 2001:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	2/18	2/21	Russia		979.50						979.50
	2/21	2/22	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	2/22	2/23	Ukraine		269.00						269.00
	2/23	2/24	Russia		326.50						326.50
Commercial airfare							801.38				801.38
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	2/18	2/21	Russia		979.50						979.50
	2/21	2/22	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	2/22	2/23	Ukraine		269.00						269.00
	2/23	2/24	Russia		326.50						326.50
Commercial airfare							801.38				801.38
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	2/18	2/21	Russia		979.50						979.50
	2/21	2/22	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	2/22	2/23	Ukraine		269.00						269.00
	2/23	2/24	Russia		326.50						326.50
Commercial airfare							801.38				801.38
Delegation charter aircraft							33,620.00				33,620.00
Travel to Ecuador, Peru and Colombia, February 19–24, 2001:											
Hon. Gene Taylor	2/18	2/21	Ecuador		318.00						318.00
	2/21	2/22	Peru		153.00						153.00
	2/22	2/23	Colombia		542.00						542.00
Mr. George O. Withers	2/18	2/21	Ecuador		318.00						318.00
	2/21	2/22	Peru		153.00						153.00
	2/22	2/23	Colombia		542.00						542.00
Commercial airfare							321.00				321.00
Total					19,664.00		43,274.34				62,938.34

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB STUMP, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Nathan Deal	2/16	2/17	Netherland Antilles		307.00						307.00
	2/17	2/19	Colombia		271.00		2,398.50		1,014.20		3,683.70
	2/19	2/20	Honduras		96.00						96.00
James Greenwood	2/20	2/23	Bolivia		511.50		3,794.00		1,347.00		5,652.50
	2/04	2/08	Kenya		1,010.00						1,010.00
Total					2,195.50		6,192.50		2,361.20		10,749.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILLY TAUZIN, Chairman, May 16, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	2/17	2/19	Thailand		846.00		5,249.22				6,095.22
	2/20	2/21	Hanoi		252.00						252.00
	2/22	2/23	HoChiMinh City		249.00						249.00
	2/24	2/27	Singapore		1,484.19						1,484.19
Todd Schultz	2/17	2/19	Thailand		846.00		5,249.22				6,095.22
	2/20	2/21	Hanoi		252.00						252.00
	2/22	2/23	HoChiMinh City		249.00						249.00
	2/24	2/27	Singapore		1,484.19						1,484.19

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Total					5,662.38		10,498.44				16,160.82

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Chairman, May 3, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND APR. 23, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Phil English (Int'l Rel.)	1/13	1/19	Chile		888.00		5,056.60				5,944.60
Hon. M. McNulty (Gilman Code)	1/22	1/25	Italy		966.00		(3)				966.00
	1/25	1/27	Greece		376.00		(3)				376.00
	1/27	1/28	Israel		523.00		(3)				523.00
	1/28	1/30	Ireland		472.00		(3)				472.00
Hon. W. Watkins (Gilman Code)	1/22	1/25	Italy		966.00		(3)				966.00
	1/25	1/27	Greece		376.00		(3)				376.00
	1/27	1/28	Israel		523.00		(3)				523.00
	1/28	1/28	Ireland		472.00		(3)				472.00
Hon. M. McNulty (Watts Code)	4/5	4/11	Senegal		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/11	Nigeria		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/11	Ghana		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/11	Morocco		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. C. Shaw (Rogers Code)	4/5	4/16	France		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/16	Turkey		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/16	Italy		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. R. Lewis (Rogers Code)	4/5	4/16	Turkey		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/16	Italy		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. B. Cardin (Kolbe Code)	4/18	4/20	Israel		380.00		(3)				380.00
	4/20	4/22	Jordan		228.00		(3)				228.00
	4/22	4/23	Egypt	223.00			(3)			223.00	
	4/18	4/18	Italy		346.00		(3)				346.00
	4/23	4/23	Ireland		124.50		(3)				124.50
Hon. Phil English (Combust Code)	4/20	4/22	Canada		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. S. Levin (Combust Code)	4/20	4/22	Canada		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. J.D. Hayworth (Rogers Code)	4/5	4/16	France		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/16	Turkey		n/a		(3)				n/a
	4/5	4/16	Italy		n/a		(3)				n/a
Hon. R. Lewis (Rogers Code)	4/5	4/16	France		n/a		(3)				n/a
Total											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, June 5, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, May 11, 2001.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	1/10	1/16	Europe		1,604.00						1,604.00
Commercial airfare							5,829.00				5,829.00
Michael Sheehy, Staff	1/10	1/16	Europe		1,604.00						1,604.00
Commercial airfare							5,829.00				5,829.00
Jay Jakub, Staff	1/22	1/27	Europe		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							6,615.81				6,615.81
Robert Emmett, Staff	1/23	2/3	Europe		3,015.00						3,015.00
Commercial airfare							6,251.13				6,251.13
Patrick Murray, Staff	2/7	2/10	Europe		459.00						459.00
Commercial airfare							4,742.85				4,742.85
Jay Jakub, Staff	2/7	2/10	Europe		459.00						459.00
Commercial airfare							4,742.85				4,742.85
Merrell Moorhead, Staff	2/7	2/10	Europe		459.00						459.00
Commercial airfare							4,742.85				4,742.85
Merrell Moorhead, Staff	2/16	2/26	Europe		1,432.00						1,432.00
Commercial airfare							5,168.43				5,168.43
Michele Land, Staff	2/19	2/23	Europe		773.00						773.00
Commercial airfare							4,663.90				4,663.90
Patrick Murray, Staff	2/19	2/25	Europe		525.00						525.00
Commercial airfare							4,328.22				4,328.22
Timothy Sample, Staff	2/19	2/26	Europe		876.00						876.00
Commercial airfare							5,454.79				5,454.79
Christopher Barton, Staff	2/20	2/24	South America		934.00						934.00
Commercial airfare							2,001.60				2,001.60

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2001—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Brant Bassett, Staff	2/20	2/24	South America		934.00						934.00
Commercial airfare							2,001.60				2,001.60
Christopher Barton, Staff	3/8	3/12	South America		791.00						791.00
Military aircraft											
Timothy Sample, Staff	3/9	3/12	South America		652.00						652.00
Commercial airfare							995.80				995.80
Timothy Sample, Staff	3/14	3/20	Europe		1,992.00						1,992.00
Commercial airfare							5,721.66				5,721.66
Delores Jackson, Staff	3/14	3/20	Europe		1,992.00						1,992.00
Commercial airfare							5,721.66				5,721.66
Patrick Murray, Staff	3/22	3/30	Europe		2,338.00						2,338.00
Commercial airfare							6,030.08				6,030.08
Jay Jakob, Staff	3/22	3/30	Europe		2,338.00						2,338.00
Commercial airfare							5,865.64				5,865.64
Total					13,590.00		58,368.83				71,958.83

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, May 17, 2001.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2632. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled, "Assessment of the Cattle and Hog Industries, Calendar Year 2000"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2633. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Water and Waste Disposal Programs Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0572-AB57) received June 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2634. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyprodinil; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301120; FRL-6778-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2635. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tebufenozide; Re-establish Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301141; FRL-6788-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2636. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final—Pyridaben; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction [OPP-301013A; FRL-6786-5] received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2637. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Isoxadifen-ethyl; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301135; FRL-6786-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2638. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—L-Glutamic Acid and Gamma Aminobutyric Acid; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-301136; FRL-6785-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2639. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301138; FRL-6787-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2640. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Protections for Children in Research"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2641. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District [CA 226-0271; FRL-6998-3] received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2642. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina: Approval of Revisions to Miscellaneous Volatile Organic Compounds Regulations Within the North Carolina State Implementation Plan [NC 95-200034a; FRL-6993-9] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2643. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Control of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) for Aerospace Operations and Miscellaneous VOC Revisions [PA155-4114a; FRL-6998-6] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2644. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan Revisions; Ohio [OH148-1a; FRL-7001-6] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2645. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Determination of Attainment for the Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Metropolitan Denver; State of Colorado [CO-001-0063a; FRL-7000-7] received June 20, 2001, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2646. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; States of Illinois and Missouri; 1-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstrations, Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets, Reasonably Available Control Measures, Contingency Measures, Attainment Date Extension, and Withdrawal of Nonattainment Determination and Reclassification [Tracking No. MO-0132-1132, IL 196-3; FRL-7001-7] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2647. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the President's bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question, covering the period April 1 to May 31, 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2648. A letter from the Under Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Imposition of Foreign Policy Export Controls On Certain Fertilizers To Terrorist Supporting Countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

2649. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Policy Terminating the Arab League Boycott of Israel and Expanding the Process of Normalization Between the Arab League Countries and Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

2650. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulation: Sweden—received June 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2651. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2652. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2653. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report

pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2654. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2655. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2656. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2657. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2658. A letter from the Acting General Counsel and Designated Reporting Official, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2659. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Non-essential Experimental Population of Whooping Cranes in the Eastern United States (RIN: 1018-AH46) received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2660. A letter from the Staff Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and International Civil Aviation Organization's Technical Instructions [Docket No. RSPA-2000-7702 (HM-215D)] (RIN: 2137-AD41) received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2661. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Captain of the Port Detroit Zone [CGD09-01-048] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2662. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CFM International (CFMI) CFM56-2, -2B, -3, -5B, -5C and -7B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-12246; AD 2001-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2663. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increased Allowances for the Educational Assistance Test Program (RIN: 2900-AK41) received June 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2664. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Rates Payable Under the Montgomery GI Bill—Active Duty and Survivors' and Dependents' Educational

Assistance (RIN: 2900-AK44) received June 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2665. 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. 2001-34] received June 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2666. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Office, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Proc. 2001-39] received June 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2667. A letter from the Chair, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled, "The Year in Trade 2000: Operation of the Trade Agreements Program"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2668. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Progress made toward opening the United States Embassy in Jerusalem and notification of Suspension of Limitations Under the Jerusalem Embassy Act (Presidential Determination No. 2001-19), pursuant to Public Law 104-45, section 6 (109 Stat. 400); 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 June 21, 2001 the following report was filed on June 22, 2001]

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2299. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 22, 2001]

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1954. A bill to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 107-107 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 25, 2001]

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 645. A bill to reauthorize the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994; with an amendment (Rept. 107-109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-110). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE X

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on June 22, 2001]

H.R. 1954. Referral to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and

Government Reform for a period ending not later than July 13, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 2300. A bill providing for a National Day of Reconciliation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 2301. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a bridge on Federal land west of and adjacent to Folsom Dam in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 2302. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain individuals who would be eligible for military retired pay for nonregular service but for the fact that they did not serve on active duty during a period of conflict may nevertheless be paid such retired pay if they served in the United States merchant marine during or immediately after World War II or the Korean Conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to increase the sale and use of certain ethanol and biodiesel fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2304. A bill to provide that Federal reserve banks and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System be covered under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, relating to labor-management relations; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2305. A bill to require certain Federal officials with responsibility for the administration of the criminal justice system of the District of Columbia to serve on and participate in the activities of the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2306. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the Federal share of the cost of constructing treatment works in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 2307. A bill to establish the National Commission on Budget Concepts; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 2308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to allow investments by certain retirement plans in principal residences of children and grandchildren of participants who are first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the Young Men's Christian Association on the occasion of its 150th anniversary in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H. Res. 178. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending 2002, and for other purposes.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

115. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, relative to Joint House Resolution No. 130 memorializing the United States Congress to closely examine the impact of the gasoline price increases, and initiate actions that will mitigate the impact of the gasoline price rise both on a short and long-term basis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

116. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 88 memorializing the United States Congress to recognize the campaign called the "National Domestic Violence Health Care Standards Campaign Kick-Off Day in Pennsylvania" and to promote nationwide screening for domestic violence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

117. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, relative to Joint House Resolution No. 128 memorializing the United States Congress and the National Capital Planning Commission to proceed expeditiously in completing the review process of the proposed World War II Memorial; to the Committee on Resources.

118. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 76 memorializing the United States Congress to make the \$1.5 billion of Federal moneys already earmarked for abandoned mine land reclamation available to states to clean up and make safe abandoned mine lands; to the Committee on Resources.

119. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 106 memorializing the United States Congress to allow states to privatize safety rest areas located on the rights of way of the Interstate highway system; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 64: Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MATHESON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 168: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 189: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 190: Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 239: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 287: Mr. COYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 303: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 311: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 356: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 389: Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 479: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 480: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 510: Mr. DRIER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 526: Mr. WU, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. VISLOSKEY, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 555: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 572: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 608: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 612: Mr. ISSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 699: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. VITER.

H.R. 704: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KIND, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 746: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 751: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 756: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 778: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 832: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 902: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 959: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 967: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 969: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 981: Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 984: Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 1038: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1073: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1076: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HILL, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 1077: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1090: Mr. CAMP, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1097: Mr. HOLDEN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1121: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1266: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 1293: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1340: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1348: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1354: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1363: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1388: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1405: Mr. WU.

H.R. 1434: Mr. WYNN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1438: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 1487: Mr. FROST, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1494: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1556: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1585: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1592: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1624: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois,

Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SUNUNU, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1644: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. EVERETT.
 H.R. 1645: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1657: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1660: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 1668: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1672: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1673: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1675: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1694: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 1707: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1716: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1770: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1781: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1784: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1839: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1891: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 1896: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1911: Mr. FROST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1931: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1941: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 1979: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 2002: Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 2020: Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 2030: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 2074: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2104: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2125: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KING, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 2143: Mr. COOKSEY and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2145: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2148: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2149: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. GANSKE.

H.R. 2160: Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 2180: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2206: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2272: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 2278: Mr. ESHOO.

H.R. 2280: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 38: Mr. EVERETT.

H.J. Res. 42: Ms. HART, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. TIERNY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 161: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H. Res. 121: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 152: Mr. WOLF and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 160: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 172: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS 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. 877: Mr. MOORE.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2299

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT No. 1: In section 326 (relating to Amtrak Reform Council), after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$335,000)”.

H.R. 2299

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 2, line 8, after “\$67,726,000” insert “(increased by \$720,000)”.

Page 9, line 14, after “\$6,870,000,000” insert “(reduced by \$720,000)”.

H.R. 2299

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Amendment No. 3: Page 53, lines 15 through 17, strike section 329.

H.R. 2299

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 15, line 24, before the period insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make available \$5,000,000 of the amount made available in this paragraph for the operation of the control center that monitors traffic in Houston, Texas, known as ‘Houston TransStar’”.

H.R. 2299

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be made available to any person or entity convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

Agriculture FY 2002 Appropriations

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 1:

SEC. ____ . No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the “Buy American Act”).

Energy and Water FY 2002 Appropriations

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this act may be made available to any person or entity convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).