United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 10, 2001 No. 95

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL K. SIMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Larry D. Ferguson, Senior Pastor, Christ Church, Plymouth, Indiana, offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, Creator of the Universe, we come to You on behalf of this Nation and more particularly on behalf of the United States House of Representatives.

Lord, we come here for several reasons.

You said in Jeremiah 33:3, ''Call unto Me and I will answer you.''

We are calling unto You now, Lord.

You said in Your great book of wisdom, Proverbs, Chapter 3, Verses 5 and 6, ''Lean not on your own understanding, acknowledge Me in all of your ways, and I will direct your paths.''

Lord, we are acknowledging You right now.

Father, You said in Matthew, 7:7, ''Ask and it shall be given to you, seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.''

Lord, we are asking, seeking and knocking right now.

Father, You are our Jehovah Jireh, our Provider, and we are looking unto You. We recognize that You have all wisdom, all power, and all understanding.

So, Father, as this House argues and debates important issues, when the vote is taken and the dust settles, we pray that the consensus will be Your will. We seek for Your will to be done on Earth, as it is in Heaven.

We pray, Lord, that when decisions have been made, that there will be a mutual respect and camaraderie between those that have taken different positions on each issue. And, Lord, after this day is completed, that somehow, You will be glorified and we and this Nation will be blessed.

In the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the One that died on the Cross and rose again that we might have victory over sin and death. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BUYER 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.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND LARRY D. FERGUSON, SENIOR PASTOR, CHRIST CHURCH, PLYMOUTH, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer for today's House session has been given to us by Pastor Larry Ferguson. Pastor Ferguson ministers at Christ Church in Plymouth, of Marshall County, Indiana, where he has been a Senior Pastor for 6 years with his wife Kathy, and the Pastor's son Darin, and his wife Kathy, who is also in the United States Air Force and is present in the gallery today.

Pastor Ferguson preached his first sermon as a freshman in high school and later completed 4 years of training for the ministry at Cincinnati Bible Seminary in Cincinnati, Ohio. Since that time, he has been involved in providing spiritual nourishment to many. Whether it is in providing leadership as a principal to a Christian school, giving guidance to Christian churches who are struggling, or nurturing the health of marriages and families, Pastor Ferguson has been following the Biblical admonition to ''heal the broken-hearted.''

Pastor Ferguson has also used his talents to proclaim the Gospel through song and over the airwaves in Christian radio ministry.

For 35 years, Pastor Ferguson has been ministering, and he has touched more lives than he may ever know. I am thankful for his prayer today, and in his prayer I agree that in this House, we do quest for the greater understanding.

ALLOW HOUSE TO VOTE OPPOSING HOLDING OLYMPICS IN CHINA

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as probably one of the most bipartisan Members of this body, I call on the Republican leadership to allow this House to vote on whether the Olympics should be held in the Communist dictatorship of China.

Printed on recycled paper.

Three months ago, with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, the House Committee on International Relations expressed itself against China holding the Olympics by approving H. Con. Res. 73. I am asking the Speaker and the majority leader no longer to bottle up our legislation and to allow the representatives of the American people to speak their minds on this issue.

Religion is persecuted, political freedom does not exist, media freedom does not exist, our airplane is forced down, our servicemen and women are held in captivity for 11 days; yet this body is not allowed to vote on whether the Olympics should be held in Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, allow us a vote.

TIME FOR GOVERNOR DAVIS TO TAKE A STAND

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the real cause of the rolling blackouts and out-of-control energy prices in California. Governor Davis and his big government cronies caused California's energy crisis through their backward and politically motivated approach to energy. Bowing to pressure from radical environmentalists and advice from his pollsters, Governor Davis increased regulation of the energy industry, thus prohibiting increased energy production and limiting modernization of infrastructure. The Davis approach is the wrong approach.

Now, in order to save his political future, Governor Davis has put political advisors on the government payroll. Not only do Californians have to pay outrageous prices to cool their homes, but they now have to pay for consultants to tell Governor Davis how to minimize the political damage caused by his mishandling of California's energy needs. Even California's Democrat State comptroller has said that she will not pay for Davis's political expenses with the taxpayers' dime.

Throughout this crisis, Gray Davis has been seeking political remedies instead of looking for positive solutions to solve the real-life problems of his citizens. All the while, California families are suffering. It is time for the Governor to take a stand and do what is right for California, instead of what is right for his career.

CORRUPTION AT THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, FBI Agent Hanssen pleaded guilty to spying for Russia. Now, think about it: First he said, the devil made me do it; now he says he just wants to make amends. Spare me.

The truth is Janet Reno sold the farm to China, FBI agents are spying for Russia, nuclear military secrets are disappearing faster than Viagra at Niagara, and nobody is doing anything about it. Nothing.

Beam me up.

Wake up, Congress, and smell the espionage.

I yield back the massive corruption at the Justice Department that goes without meaningful oversight.

AMERICANS DESERVE ENERGY SOLUTIONS, NOT BLACKOUTS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has the strongest economy in this world, and to maintain America's prosperity, America must have energy.

Over the past few months, California, an undisputed driving force in our Nation's economy, has had to endure rolling blackouts during the past several months. And now, the fastest growing city in the United States, Las Vegas, Nevada, has also witnessed rolling blackouts due to energy shortages.

Blackouts cannot and should not be tolerated.

It is time to implement real solutions to reverse the energy shortage. Through conservation methods and through expansion and development of our natural energy resource base, we can provide abundant and less costly energy. But to do this we need to implement a national energy policy that includes greater production of diverse energy supplies and an equal reliance on bold conservation measures.

This balanced energy policy will ensure that when Americans flick on that light switch, that their lights always go on, and blackouts will be a thing of the past.

SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 2

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, here we are, a year after the electricity crisis hit California and the West. The crisis and suffering continues. And where is the President? Not one item in his energy plan addresses the crisis in the West. And where is FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission? They seem more intent on protecting the industry than the consumers who pay their bills. And where is this Congress? A year after the crisis, we have not yet had a debate on this House floor on resolving the issues in California and the West.

The bill that is coming up through the Committee on Commerce does nothing to address this crisis in California. The only way to get a fair discussion on the House floor is to sign Discharge Petition No. 2. That allows and puts in order any bill that really addresses the issues in the West and electricity.

It is time to put cost-based rates on the price of electricity and refund the criminal overcharges since last year.

Mr. Speaker, let us have a debate on this House floor. Sign Discharge Petition No. 2.

PRESIDENT SHOWS STRONG COMMITMENT TO NASA

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the House Committee on Science, I am a strong supporter of NASA and our international space station. So is President Bush, but you would not know so if you listened to some of the rumors going around Houston and our Johnson Space Center.

But here are the facts. Only last year NASA told us on the Committee on Science that they would need $14.4 billion for the coming year. Even after they raised the request recently, the President's budget meets that request at $14.5 billion; meets NASA's request. The President also increases funding for the space station, for the launch initiative, and keeps a sustained level of six space shuttle flights.

Understandably, at budget time you are going to have some partisan spin, but, seriously, how can you criticize the President when he gives NASA what it asked for, at a level nearly $1 billion higher than where it has languished for 4 of the last 5 years?

The fact is, for space supporters in Congress, we have never started a budget year so strongly, and our congressional appropriators are trying to do more. Unfortunately, only in Washington are budget increases spun as budget cuts.

SUPPORT BIPARTISAN PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, now that we are back from the Independence Day recess and the celebrations, the passage of the Patients' Bill of Rights, the one introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), must be at the top of our agenda.

This bill, the Bipartisan Patient Protection Act of 2001, is the only one which comprehensively reforms the current managed care system to better meet the needs of those who elected us.

During the break misinformation and scare tactics continued. It is important that the American public know the

truth. Many of the ads say that the bill would raise the cost of insurance. Not true. What they fail to say is that in the past 3 years or so, the cost of managed care has already increased at an average of 7.1 percent, and the increase is projected to be in double digits for this year. The ads also fail to tell us that while the costs have gone up, less services are covered.

Where the same provisions have been enacted in States, there have not been any extraordinary increases in premiums or significant increases in lawsuits. What has happened is that the people in those States have been able to access medically necessary health care, and we need to extend that to the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass the bill and let us move on to reduce disparities and provide universal coverage.

DENY OLYMPICS TO CHINA

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, what fellowship does light have with darkness? What fellowship does the symbol of the human spirit, the Olympic Games, have with Chinese tyranny?

Sixty-four years ago the Nazi propaganda machine proudly flaunted the 1936 Olympic Games as an example of the leadership of Adolph Hitler. That horrible miscalculation by the International Olympic Committee gave credibility to a man and a regime that killed 6 million Jews.

□ 1415

Amazingly, 44 years later, the IOC granted the games, the 1980 games to the Soviet Union on the very eve of their launch of the war against Afghanistan. Today, the IOC is ignoring history and considering awarding the international games of peace to the People's Republic of China in 2008.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, what fellowship does light have with darkness? What fellowship does the symbol of the human spirit have with Chinese tyranny? Let it be the voice from this citadel of liberty that the International Olympic Committee should say ''no'' to Beijing for the 2008 Olympic games.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once again, we are taking up the Patients' Bill of Rights in this House. We have already passed a good, a true, an honest Patients' Bill of Rights in the House of Representatives. We passed it in the 105th Congress; we passed it in the 106th. It was a bipartisan effort. Now we are going to be presented with a new Patients' Bill of Rights that they say is 80 percent like the real Patients' Bill of Rights, the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that we are going to try once again to fool the American people and trick them into believing that the insurance companies are not going to control their destiny when it comes to health care. The fact is, if we do not pass the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry bill in this House, the American people will still be at the mercy of the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the Ganske-Dingell-Norwood-Berry Patients' Bill of Rights.

A STRONG NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today the Blue Dog Democrats will unveil our version of what our national energy policy should look like and should be. We believe that most, if not all, of our colleagues will find tremendous interest in a program that creates a balanced approach, one that expands energy supplies, one that recognizes that energy production in the United States is equally important as that produced outside of the United States. In fact, more so. It enhances environmental standards. It promotes energy efficiency. It promotes research and development, and it provides reliable and affordable supplies.

Mr. Speaker, it matches a very important truism: we cannot produce food and fiber in the United States without oil and gas, and we cannot produce oil and gas without food and fiber. We need to be a partnership in all aspects of producing the energy needs of this country.

We encourage our colleagues to take a good look at our suggestion. We look forward to working with both sides of the aisle in developing this national energy policy, as well as with the administration.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MARK E. SOUDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MARK E. SOUDER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 3, 2001.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that my office has been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court for Allen County, Indiana in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to advise the party who issued the subpoena that I have no documents that are responsive to the subpoena.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

ENCOURAGING CORPORATIONS TO CONTRIBUTE TO FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 170) encouraging corporations to contribute to faith-based organizations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 170

Whereas America's community of faith has long played a leading role in dealing with difficult societal problems that might otherwise have gone unaddressed;

Whereas President Bush has called upon Americans ''to revive the spirit of citizenship . . . to marshal the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our Nation'';

Whereas although the work of faith-based organizations should not be used by government as an excuse for backing away from its historic and rightful commitment to help those who are disadvantaged and in need, such organizations can and should be seen as a valuable partner with government in meeting societal challenges;

Whereas every day faith-based organizations in the United States help people recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, rehabilitate prison inmates so that they can break free from the cycle of recidivism, and teach people job skills that will allow them to move from poverty to productivity;

Whereas faith-based organizations are often more successful in dealing with difficult societal problems than government and non-sectarian organizations;

Whereas, as President Bush recently stated, ''It is not sufficient to praise charities and community groups; we must support them. And this is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.'';

Whereas corporate foundations contribute billions of dollars each year to a variety of philanthropic causes;

Whereas according to a recent study produced by the Capital Research Center, the 10 largest corporate foundations in the United States contributed $1,900,000,000 to such causes;

Whereas according to the same study, faith-based organizations only receive a small fraction of the contributions made by corporations in the United States, and 6 of the 10 corporations that give the most to philanthropic causes explicitly ban or restrict contributions to faith-based organizations: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) Congress calls on corporations in the United States, in the words of the President, ''to give more and to give better'' by making greater contributions to faith-based organizations that are on the front lines battling some of the great societal challenges of our day; and

(2) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) corporations in the United States are important partners with government in efforts to overcome difficult societal problems; and

(B) no corporation in the United States should adopt policies that prohibit the corporation from contributing to an organization that is successfully advancing a philanthropic cause merely because such organization is faith based.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 170, which calls on America's corporations to increase their support of faith-based charities.

In 1999, the last year in which facts were available, a total of $190.16 billion were contributed to charities throughout America. Of that amount, corporations contributed $11.02 billion to charities, which is 5.8 percent of the total amount given to charities in America came from corporations. Unfortunately, some of America's largest corporations as a matter of policy explicitly discriminate against faith-based organizations.

Now, there are many effective charitable groups throughout our country. These organizations have developed effective programs to assist people to recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, rehabilitate prison inmates, and to teach job skills that will allow individuals to move from poverty to productivity, from dependence to independence.

Now, in this resolution, we are not encouraging faith-based groups to do any proselytizing. As a matter of fact, they do not proselytize and recommend their particular religion. They are there for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to provide assistance to people who need assistance.

For example, charities like the Alpha Alternative Pregnancy Care Center in my hometown of Hopkinsville, Kentucky. Alpha Alternative is a place where women in an unwanted pregnancy situation can turn for Christian compassion and help in a time of great personal crisis. They minister to their clients with parenting skills, classes, material assistance, and counseling. If this faith-based charity were to receive more corporate support, perhaps Alpha Alternative could also expand its services to include other medical diagnostic services and job training programs. But with corporate policies banning support for worthwhile faith-based charities, community groups like Alpha Alternative will never reach their true potential.

I ask my colleagues today to join with me in voting for this resolution calling on the conscience of America's largest companies not to discriminate against an organization that is successfully advancing philanthropic and human causes, and not to discriminate merely because they happen to be faith based. As I said earlier, these groups are not out proselytizing. They are not out trying to impose their religion on anyone, and this legislation is not trying to impose religion on anyone. This legislation simply asks corporate America to help effective organizations, whether they be faith based or secular.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly what role Congress should have in trying to dictate to American families or American corporations how they should contribute their charitable contributions and to whom they should contribute those dollars, but I would point out that this particular resolution has, in effect, no real legal teeth to it. Much of it is a sense of Congress, and to the extent that the goal of this resolution is to say to individuals and corporate leaders to take a look at faith-based organizations in America, they are doing a lot of good work addressing social problems, then I endorse that approach.

Were this resolution more than, in effect, a sense of Congress and was actually going to dictate policy to corporate trusts, I certainly would have thought it would have made sense for the House committees to have met either the Committee on the Judiciary, or the Committee on Commerce, to at least have a hearing on this to try and direct $1.9 billion in charitable giving. It is my understanding that there was no House committee hearing of either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Commerce on this measure. However, because this resolution is basically a voluntary message to corporations to consider the good work of many faith-based charities, I would not adamantly object to the principal goal of this.

But what, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on today is why this voluntary approach toward giving to faith-based charities is much more acceptable to me and other Members of Congress and religious leaders than the President's faith-based initiative. The President's faith-based initiative in contrast to this has several fundamental flaws, and if this bill had any of these flaws built into it in the essence of law, I would oppose this resolution.

First of all, the President's faith-based initiative as exemplified in H.R. 7 would, for the first time in our country's history, direct Federal tax dollars going immediately into the coffers of our houses of worship, our churches, our synagogues, and other houses of worship. I think that approach to supporting faith-based charities is patently unconstitutional. I think giving billions of Federal dollars directly to faith-based organizations, tax dollars to faith-based organizations would inevitably and absolutely lead to government regulation of religion and our churches.

Thirdly, I think the administration approach toward faith-based initiatives as exemplified in H.R. 7 would lead to religious strife, as thousands of different faith-based groups would be coming to Washington, D.C. competing for tens of billions of Federal tax dollars. If one wants to write a prescription for religious strife in America, Mr. Speaker, I could think of no better way to do it than to have thousands of churches and houses of worship coming to our Nation's capital and competing before Cabinet Members for tens of billions of dollars of Federal money.

The fourth problem I have with the faith-based initiative and the President's program in contrast to this resolution is that the President's faith-based initiative would actually subsidize, subsidize religious discrimination. It would actually take Federal tax dollars and allow a faith-based group to put up a sign, paid for by our tax dollars, that would say, no Jew, no Catholic, no Mormon, no Baptist need apply here for a federally funded job. I think that type of approach to helping charities is really a great retreat in our 40-year march toward greater civil rights in America.

The fifth objection I have to the President's proposal on faith-based initiatives versus this sense of Congress resolution is that the President's proposal really puts Congress and faith-based groups into a Catch-22. If we say that they cannot use Federal dollars to proselytize, to push their religion and their faith upon others, then, in effect, what we are doing is giving Federal dollars to faith-based groups and saying that one cannot use their faith in carrying out one's social mission. So in effect, the President's program, if implemented, would actually take the faith out of faith-based organizations, the very thing I would believe the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and I would agree makes many faith-based organizations so special, the fact that they can inject their faith into

their process of turning around people's lives and solving their problems.

□ 1430

So my point, Mr. Speaker, is this: I am not sure exactly whether this should be a top priority today for Congress, and in fact a sense of Congress resolution, to be telling corporate foundations how to spend billions of dollars, but I do applaud the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) in what I interpret is his basic approach, to send a message to America to say, look at the good work of faith-based organizations.

As a person of faith, I believe these organizations are doing excellent work in many cases. Not in all cases, but in many cases, they truly are changing people's lives in a positive manner.

But I think it is very important for Members to know that in supporting this resolution today, they are not adopting the provisions of H.R. 7 as proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and others. We are not endorsing those resolutions that would actually allow Federal tax dollars to go directly to houses of worship. I would passionately oppose such a bill, such a proposal, or such a resolution.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), who was the author and primary sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for yielding time to me, and for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, the seeds for this resolution come from a speech that our President gave at the University of Notre Dame commencement ceremony a few months ago. In that speech, President Bush laid out for America a great challenge. In his words, that challenge ''was to revive the spirit of citizenship, to marshall the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our Nation.''

He went on to remind us that, in his words, ''It is not sufficient to praise charities and community groups. We must support them.'' This is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, unlike my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, I hope this body will take up H.R. 7, the Community Solutions Act, and take it up soon. It will create enhanced incentives for charitable giving, it will expand charitable choice, it will break down the barriers that prevent charitable sectors from being greater partners in the war on poverty.

I believe the debate on the faith-based initiative will be a great and historic one, one that may help us turn the corner in the war on poverty, so I am a strong and passionate supporter.

But in the meantime, this resolution that is before us today is designed to nudge corporate America into providing even more immediate reinforcements to faith-based organizations that are already taking up the mission that the President has called for, organizations that have heeded the President's call, and that of so many, many American leaders that have gone before him.

This resolution seeks to draw attention to charitable efforts that are already under way, that are already working so beautifully; more importantly, to draw attention to the sad lack of support that these groups have received, not from individuals but from America's wealthiest foundations.

This resolution celebrates good news, and it points out tragic news.

First, the good news. As both of the previous speakers have noted, each Member of this House can point with pride and with gratitude to organizations in his or her community that are lifting lives and healing neighborhoods and making a wonderful difference. These groups are the conscience of our people. They are helping people recover from drug and alcohol addiction. They are providing shelter, comfort, and food for the homeless. They are rehabilitating prison inmates and breaking the cycle of recidivism.

Hundreds of these organizations were represented recently at the faith-based summit here in Washington. As a participant in that summit, I can say there was more positive energy for poverty relief gathered here in the Capital than at any time in decades.

There were wonderful organizations like Rawhide Boys Ranch from northeastern Wisconsin. Established nearly four decades ago as a faith-based alternative to juvenile detention, Rawhide accepts 100 troubled boys each year without regard to race or religious belief or economic background. These boys are counseled, given personal academic and vocational training, and they are taught discipline and given love. This program changes lives because it changes hearts.

There were organizations like Urban Hope, a faith-based ministry in Green Bay, Wisconsin, committed to empowering and revitalizing people and communities through entrepreneurship; yes, entrepreneurship. It teaches credit and budgeting, entrepreneurial ideas, and has a microloan program. In its brief time of existence, it has launched over 121 new businesses in the Green Bay area.

Of course, nearly every community in America has a Bureau of Catholic Charities. There are over 1,400 agencies, institutions, and organizations that make up Catholic Charities. Over 9½ million people each year, people who are in need, turn to them for services ranging from adoption to soup kitchens, child care to prison ministry, disaster relief to refugee and immigration assistance.

In summary, these armies of compassion are fighting brush fires all across this great land.

Now the sad news, the tragic news. According to the Capital Research Center my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) has just mentioned, the 10 largest U.S. corporate foundations have given out roughly $2 billion each year to charities, but a mere fraction of that has gone to these very organizations that each of us have referred to.

It has given little to them regardless of their effectiveness. In fact, of the 10 largest corporations in America, six have specific restrictions that either ban outright giving to faith-based organizations, or greatly restricting it. In fact, of the 10 which have provided enough information, not one of them has given 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, according to that same Capital Research Center report, the leading 1,000 foundations in America have targeted just 2.3 percent of their grants to faith-based organizations. The top 100 foundations have given just 1.5 percent.

I do not know if this is political correctness, I do not know if this is a lack of awareness of what these great organizations are doing. I am wondering if these organizations, these corporations, these foundations, have become conscientious objectors in the battle against poverty. I hope not. I am sure my colleagues share that sentiment.

Whatever the cause, whatever the reason, it is time for these restrictions to fall. It is time for the reticence of corporate America to end. It is time for corporate America, it is time for foundations and American citizens everywhere, to take up the cause of these organizations; to contribute, to give them what they can, whether it be financial resources, tools, expertise, whatever they can give to help them help us fight poverty and the consequences of poverty.

We are not asking these corporations to do any more than we should do each as individuals to turn citizenship and civic responsibility from an all too passive term to an activist philosophy, because it is only when each of us and these foundations and these corporations take up the fight, I believe it is only when that happens that we will make a difference.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is a sense of the Congress resolution, but it shines a spotlight on the wonderful work that is being done, and it shines a spotlight on the sad tragedy that too many corporations, too many foundations have not been there to help. I think shining this spotlight is important, and I hope it will make a difference.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, not knowing the facts, since there was not a committee hearing on this, that some of the corporations whose charitable contributions are in effect

being criticized today might not want to give to some faith-based groups because they do proselytize.

I know the gentleman from Kentucky talked about groups that do not proselytize. There are many faith-based groups that provide soup kitchens, alcohol and drug rehabilitation programs, and they do not proselytize. But there are many other faith-based groups that part of their very mission as a religious, pervasively sectarian entity is to proselytize, to sell their faith to others to try to change their lives.

So not knowing what the policy is, these corporations, that might be one valid reason why many of these corporations choose not to give their philanthropy to faith-based organizations.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky today for pointing out the good work done by faith-based groups of many different religious faiths across the country. But Mr. Speaker, as we begin this opening chapter in the debate this summer on the role of government and faith-based organizations, I think it is important that we keep in historical perspective the reason why our Founding Fathers felt so strongly about the separation of government and its ability to regulate religion.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans would be surprised that God is not mentioned in America's governing document, our Constitution. Was this an unintended omission? Did our Founding Fathers intend to show disrespect toward God and faith? Did they not understand the importance of religion in our country?

One could imagine modern-day politicians railing against this ''discrimination'' against religion shown by our Founding Fathers. Worse yet, they could be attacked for beginning the Bill of Rights with these words: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.''

Were Madison, Jefferson, and others guilty of anti-religious, anti-faith discrimination? The truth is, our Founding Fathers did not mention God in our Constitution not out of disrespect to God or religion, but out of total reverence for religious liberty. They believed human history proved that government involvement harmed rather than helped religion.

Jefferson wrote reverently of the wall of separation between church and State. Mr. Speaker, that wall of separation is not designed to keep people of faith out of government, but rather, to keep government and its regulations out of religion and our faith.

Were our Founding Fathers right or wrong in separating politics from religion? Let us fast-forward to today's world. In Denmark, churches are subsidized by taxes, and church attendance is extremely low. In China, citizens are put in prison for their religious beliefs. In Afghanistan, the government is taking religious minorities and forcing them to wear identification symbols that evoke Nazi tactics. In the Middle East and Sudan, religious differences have been the basis for conflict and hatred and terrorism.

In contrast to those countries where government and religion are so entwined, in the United States religious faith and freedom, tolerance, and generosity are flourishing. The difference is that in the other countries, government and religion are intertwined. But in the United States, our Bill of Rights prohibits government from direct involvement in our religion and our own personal faith.

Madison and Jefferson were not so anti-religion after all when they created the wall of separation between church and State. As I said, that wall is not intended to keep people of faith out of being involved in government or having a voice in government, but rather, it was clearly intended to keep government from being able to control religion.

How wise they were in establishing that wall. Maybe our Founding Fathers expressed true reverence in recognizing that faith should be a matter only between an individual and God, with no need for government interference.

Despite the wisdom of our Founding Fathers and all the lessons of human history, I believe it should alarm Americans of all faiths that the administration and some Members of Congress propose other legislation, in contrast to this, that would allow the Federal government to send billions of dollars directly to churches, synagogues and houses of worship. This proposal, soon to be voted on in the House, is known as charitable choice. Unlike this resolution, it would have the teeth of law.

So-called charitable choice legislation is a bad choice. Direct government funding of our houses of worship would inevitably lead to government regulation of religion. Government simply cannot spend billions of tax dollars without audits and regulations. Do we really want Federal auditors and investigators digging through the financial records of our churches, synagogues, and houses of worship? Do we really want prosecutors going after pastors and rabbis who have not handled their faith-based Federal money properly?

It would be also a huge step backwards in our march of civil rights for charitable choice legislation to not only allow but to actually subsidize religious discrimination. Under that bill, a religious group using tax dollars could refuse to hire someone for a secular job simply because of that person's sincere religious faith.

Do we really want government officials deciding which religions and which houses of worship should receive billions of Federal tax dollars? I could not think of a better cause or a better basis for religious strife in America than to encourage the competition between churches, synagogues, and mosques, causing them to compete for billions of Federal dollars.

Even the short recent debate over the charitable choice issue has already caused religious tension in our country as some religious leaders have recently said they do not want other religions different from their own to receive Federal tax dollars. The President even several weeks ago accused those opposed to his faith-based initiatives as being skeptics who do not understand the power of faith.

□ 1445

Forgetting the fact that numerous religious leaders oppose the President's proposals on church-State grounds, is it healthy to have a President challenging citizens' religious faith because they differ with him on a public policy issue? I think not.

In the face, Mr. Speaker, of religious strife throughout the world, I would hope that Americans would understand that religious freedom and tolerance, protected by the Bill of Rights, is the crown jewel of America's experiment in democracy. We tamper with that freedom at our own peril.

As a person of faith, I am willing to say that this resolution today is well intended, is intended to voluntarily encourage corporations to give their money to faith-based organizations if they believe those organizations are doing good work for our country. But let us be very clear in drawing the line between this voluntary-type Sense of Congress Resolution and actually using the power of government to regulate and fund our faith in our houses of worship.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor, his enthusiasm for the concept, as he has battled through committee and defended the whole concept, but particularly this in the private sector.

I would like to make a couple other comments here at the beginning as well. Those in the gallery and those who have been here to the House floor can see we are surrounded by lawgivers, all whose heads are turned sideways, except for Moses, who looks straight down on the Speaker of the House, or the acting Speaker; and it says ''In God We Trust.'' Clearly, Congress has decided that what is wrong, and the reason in the Constitution they decided what was wrong, was to use government funds to proselytize for sectarian purposes. They did not mean a total separation of church and State.

When the wall of separation line was developed, it was developed in Virginia because they were paying even for the pastor's home and the actual church in Virginia, and the Evangelicals objected to funding the Anglicans. That is not

what the founding fathers intended. They did not want proselytization, but they did not have a complete separation as long as there was no proselytizing.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). I appreciate his support of this resolution today and working with me and others on tax alternatives. He has been consistent. We have a disagreement on charitable choice and government funding, but we do not oppose private funding. It is wrong for us to cast aspersions on others who disagree with certain parts because we have an honest disagreement about what this country should do and how we should proceed. And we have had several good debates on that. This resolution is not part of that debate.

This resolution should be unanimous because those who oppose public funds also speak in favor of private funds, and this encourages more private-sector funding. But if corporate private-sector funding does not go to faith-based and is biased against faith-based organizations as well, where do these resource-poor organizations go?

Many of our most effective poverty-fighting organizations are in the country's poorest areas, in the poorest areas of my hometown of Fort Wayne, of Milwaukee, of Chicago, of New York, of Boston, wherever you go, they are people rich but resource poor. They are often struggling to get through that day or that week. They often have volunteers who work many, many hours and into the night. When government employees often leave at 5 o'clock, we see these people volunteering, because many of the problems in our toughest neighborhoods occur between 10 at night and 4 in the morning; not often when government employees are there. Often they work without health benefits or any other kind of benefits. Also, the churches from which they rise often have no financial resources.

We are not here talking about the church itself or the ministry. Because I agree, if the money goes straight to the churches and gets incorporated and they become dependent on that, we will wreck the churches of America, like has happened to some degree, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) pointed out, around the world. But this is in their outreach ministries. Can they, if they do not proselytize with government funds, can they be included in faith-based organizations?

Now, the problem, as President Bush has pointed out and the Capital Research Center and as previous speakers have previously pointed out, many of our top organizations ban funding for faith-based organizations. Number one, General Motors, says that contributions generally are not provided to religious organizations. Number three, the Ford Motor Company, says as a general policy they do not support religious or sectarian programs. Number four, ExxonMobile, says we do not provide funds for political or religious causes. Number six, IBM, does not make corporate donations or grants from corporate philanthropic funds to religious groups.

Where are they to turn? If the biggest funders deny them, if the government denies them, if their churches are poor, and yet they are the most effective, where do they turn?

In President Bush's Notre Dame commencement speech, and I am proud I graduated from Notre Dame and I am thrilled he gave this speech at Notre Dame, he quoted Knute Rockne, certainly the most famous football coach in American history, next to our fellow congressman, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), Knute Rockne said, ''I have found prayers work best when you have big players.'' Big players in this case are the volunteers and also the dollars.

There has been a lot of misunderstanding about President Bush's faith-based initiative. He has always said from the beginning that private giving is first and foremost. The amount of private giving in America far exceeds anything that the government will do in these areas.

Number one are individual contributions, which are in this bill, which would allow nonitemizers to tax deduct, as well as some other incentives for individual giving and corporate giving; and, number two, is to urge corporate foundations and corporate entities themselves to give private donations. That is where the real dollars will come, and that is where there is the least strings. At a minimum, this Congress should not only pass this resolution today but the tax part of the President's initiative.

His second most important part was the so-called compassion fund, because even now faith-based organizations are eligible but they have no idea where the grants are. They have no idea, a lot of times, what the laws are on proselytizing, how to set up 501(c)(3)'s, how to have an isolated fund so they do not get sued and so they do not get intermingled. That compassion fund is a critical part of the President's agenda. All the focus has been on number three, which we have already passed through the House, which is already law in welfare reform, and which is law in other areas, and that is the so-called charitable choice provision. It is important. I strongly support it.

The bill that passed out of the committees just before we left for the July 4th break made the differentiations that I believe are needed to follow constitutional law, and I strongly support that. But it is most important for us to remember that the key thing is to get the dollars to where the resources, the people resources are. And that starts first and foremost with individual giving and corporate giving.

Once again, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his resolution today, for our House leadership, for the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and others, for doing this. We are a diverse country. We need to protect our diversity. But our multiple faiths in this country will always be the anchor of our diversity.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the commencement speech the President gave at Notre Dame, which I referred to earlier.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Father Malloy. Thank you all for that warm welcome. Chairman McCartan, Father Scully, Dr. Hatch, Notre Dame trustees, members of the class of 2001. (Applause.) It is a high privilege to receive this degree. I'm particularly pleased that it bears the great name of Notre Dame. My brother, Jeb, may be the Catholic in the family—(laughter)—but between us, I'm the only Domer. (Laughter and applause.)

I have spoken in this campus once before. It was in 1980, the year my Dad ran for Vice President with Ronald Reagan. I think I really won over the crowd that day. (Laughter). In fact, I'm sure of it, because all six of them walked me to my car. (Laughter.)

That was back when Father Hesburgh was president of this university, during a tenure that in many ways defined the reputation and values of Notre Dame. It's a real honor to be with Father Hesburgh, and with Father Joyce. Between them, these two good priests have given nearly a century of service to Notre Dame. I'm told that Father Hesburgh now holds 146 honorary degrees. (Applause.) That's pretty darn impressive. Father, but I'm gaining on you. (Laughter.) As of today, I'm only 140 behind. (Laughter.)

Let me congratulate all the members of the class of 2001. (Applause.) You made it, and we're all proud of you on this big day. I also congratulate the parents, who, after these years, are happy, proud—and broke. (Laughter and applause.)

I commend this fine faculty, for the years of work and instruction that produced this outstanding class.

And I'm pleased to join my fellow honorees, as well. I'm in incredibly distinguished company with authors, executives, educators, church officials and an eminent scientist. We're sharing a memorable day and a great honor, and I congratulate you all. (Applause.)

Notre Dame, as a Catholic university, carries forward a great tradition of social teaching. It calls on all of us, Catholic and non-Catholic, to honor family, to protect life in all its stages, to serve and uplift the poor. This university is more than a community of scholars, it is a community of conscience—and an ideal place to report on our nation's commitment to the poor, and how we're keeping it.

In 1964, the year I started college, another President from Texas delivered a commencement address talking about this national commitment. In that speech, President Lyndon Johnson issued a challenge. He said, ''This is the time for decision. You are the generation which must decide. Will you decide to leave the future a society where a man is condemned to hopelessness because he was born poor? Or will you join to wipe out poverty in this land?

In that speech, Lyndon Johnson advocated a War on Poverty which has noble intentions and enduring success. Poor families got basic health care; disadvantaged children were given a head start in life. Yet, there were also some consequences that no one wanted or intended. The welfare entitlement became an enemy of personal effort and responsibility, turning many recipients into dependents. The War on Poverty also turned too

many citizens into bystanders, convinced that compassion had become the work of government alone.

In 1996, welfare reform confronted the first of these problems, with a five-year time limit on benefits, and a work requirement to receive them. Instead of a way of life, welfare became an officer of temporary help—not an entitlement, but a transition. Thanks in large part of this change, welfare rolls have been cut in half. Work and self-respect have been returned to many lives. This is a tribute to the Republicans and democrats we agreed on reform, and to the President who signed it: President Bill Clinton. (Applause.)

Our nation has confronted welfare dependency. But our work is only half done. Now we must confront the second problem: to revive the spirit of citizenship—to marshal the compassion of our people to meet the continuing needs of our nation. This is a challenge to my administration, and to each one of you. We must meet that challenge—because it is right, and because it is urgent.

Welfare as we knew it has ended, but poverty has not. When over 12 million children live below the poverty line, we are not a post-poverty America. Most states are seeing the first wave of welfare recipients who have reached the law's five-year time limit. The easy cases have already left the welfare rolls. The hardest problems remain—people with far fewer skills and greater barriers to work. People with complex human problems, like illiteracy and addiction, abuse and mental illness. We do not yet know what will happen to these men and women, or to their children. But we cannot sit and watch, leaving them to their own struggles and their own fate.

There is a great deal at stake. In our attitudes and actions, we are determining the character of our country. When poverty is considered hopeless, America is condemned to permanent social division, becoming a nation of caste and class, divided by fences and gates and guards.

Our task is clear, and it's difficult: we must build our country's unity by extending our country's blessings. We make that commitment because we are Americans. Aspiration is the essence of our country. We believe in social mobility, not social Darwinism. We are the country of the second chance, where failure is never final. And that dream has sometimes been deferred. It must never be abandoned.

We are committed to compassion for practical reasons. When men and women are lost to themselves, they are also lost to our nation. When millions are hopeless, all of us are diminished by the loss of their gifts.

And we're committed to compassion for moral reasons. Jewish prophets and Catholic teaching both speak of God's special concern for the poor. This is perhaps the most radical teaching of faith—that the value of life is not contingent on wealth or strength or skill. That value is a reflection of God's image.

Much of today's poverty has more to do with troubled lives than a troubled economy. And often when a life is broken, it can only be restored by another caring, concerned human being. The answer for an abandoned child is not a job requirement—it is the loving presence of a mentor. The answer to addiction is not a demand for self-sufficiency—it is personal support on the hard road to recovery.

The hope we seek is found in safe havens for battered women and children, in homeless shelters, in crisis pregnancy centers, in programs that tutor and conduct job training and help young people when they happen to be on parole. All these efforts provide not just a benefit, but attention and kindness, a touch of courtesy, a dose of grace.

Mother Teresa said that what the poor often need, even more than shelter and food—though these are desperately needed, as well—is to be wanted. And that sense of belonging is within the power of each of us to provide. Many in this community have shown what compassion can accomplish.

Notre Dame's own Lou Nanni is the former director of South Bend's Center for the Homeless—an institution founded by two Notre Dame professors. It provides guests with everything from drug treatment to mental health service, to classes in the Great Books, to preschool for young children. Discipline is tough. Faith is encouraged, not required. Student volunteers are committed and consistent and central to its mission. Lou Nanni describes this mission as ''repairing the fabric'' of society by letting people see the inherent ''worth and dignity and God-given potential'' of every human being.

Compassion often works best on a small and human scale. It is generally better when a call for help is local, not long distance. Here at this university, you've heard that call and responded. It is part of what makes Notre Dame a great university.

This is my message today: there is no great society which is not a caring society. And any effective war on poverty must deploy what Dorothy Day called ''the weapons of spirit.''

There is only one problem with groups like South Bend's Center for the Homeless—there are not enough of them. It's not sufficient to praise charities and community groups, we must support them. And this is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.

The War on Poverty established a federal commitment to the poor. The welfare reform legislation of 1996 made that commitment more effective. For the task ahead, we must move to the third stage of combating poverty in America. Our society must enlist, equip and empower idealistic Americans in the works of compassion that only they can provide.

Government has an important role. It will never be replaced by charities. My administration increases funding for major social welfare and poverty programs by 8 percent. Yet, government must also do more to take the side of charities and community healers, and support their work. We've had enough of the stale debate between big government and indifferent government. Government must be active enough to fund services for the poor—and humble enough to let good people in local communities provide those services.

So I have created a White House Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives. (Applause.) Through that office we are working to ensure that local community helpers and healers receive more federal dollars, greater private support and face fewer bureaucratic barriers. We have proposed a ''compassion capital fund,'' that will match private giving with federal dollars. (Applause.)

We have proposed allowing all taxpayers to deduct their charitable contributions—including non-itemizers. (Applause.) This could encourage almost $15 billion a year in new charitable giving. My attitude is, everyone in America—whether they are well-off or not—should have the same incentive and reward for giving.

And we're in the process of implementing and expanding ''charitable choice''—the principle, already established in federal law, that faith-based organizations should not suffer discrimination when they compete for contracts to provide social services. (Applause.) Government should never fund the teaching of faith, but it should support the good works of the faithful. (Applause.)

Some critics of this approach object to the idea of government funding going to any group motivated by faith. But they should take a look around them. Public money already goes to groups like the Center for the Homeless and, on a larger scale, to Catholic Charities. Do the critics really want to cut them off? Medicaid and Medicare money currently goes to religious hospitals. Should this practice be ended? Child care vouchers for low income families are redeemed every day at houses of worship across America. Should this be prevented? Government loans send countless students to religious colleges. Should that be banned? Of course not. (Applause.)

America has a long tradition of accommodating and encouraging religious institutions when they pursue public goals. My administration did not create that tradition—but we will expand it to confront some urgent problems.

Today, I am adding two initiatives to our agenda, in the areas of housing and drug treatment. Owning a home is a source of dignity for families and stability for communities—and organizations like Habitat for Humanity make that dream possible for many low income Americans. Groups of this type currently receive some funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The budget I submit to Congress next year will propose a three-fold increase in this funding—which will expand homeownership, and the hope and pride that come with it. (Applause.)

And nothing is more likely to perpetuate poverty than a life enslaved to drugs. So we've proposed $1.6 billion in new funds to close what I call the treatment gap—the gap between 5 million Americans who need drug treatment, and the 2 million who currently receive it. We will also propose that all these funds—all of them—be opened to equal competition from faith-based and community groups.

The federal government should do all these things; but others have responsibilities, as well—including corporate America.

Many corporations in America do good work, in good causes. But if we hope to substantially reduce poverty and suffering in our country, corporate America needs to give more—and to give better. (Applause.) Faith-based organizations receive only a tiny percentage of overall corporate giving. Currently, six of the 10 largest corporate givers in America explicitly rule out or restrict donations to faith-based groups, regardless of their effectiveness. The federal government will not discriminate against faith-based organizations, and neither should corporate America. (Applause.)

In the same spirit, I hope America's foundations consider ways they may devote more of their money to our nation's neighborhood and their helpers and their healers. I will convene a summit this fall, asking corporate and philanthropic leaders throughout America to join me at the White House to discuss ways they can provide more support to community organizations—both secular and religious.

Ultimately, your country is counting on each of you. Knute Rockne once said, ''I have found that prayers work best when you have big players.'' (Laugher and applause.) We can pray for the justice of our country, but you're the big players we need to achieve it. Government can promote compassion, corporations and foundations can fund it, but the citizens—it's the citizens who provide it. A determined assault on poverty will require both an active government, and active citizens.

There is more to citizenship than voting—though I urge you to do it. (Laughter.) There is more to citizenship than paying your taxes—though I'd strongly advise you to pay them. (Laughter.) Citizenship is empty without concern for our fellow citizens, without

the ties that bind us to one another and build a common good.

If you already realize this and you're acting on it, I thank you. If you haven't thought about it, I leave you with this challenge: serve a neighbor in need. Because a life of service is a life of significance. Because materialism, ultimately, is boring, and consumerism can build a prison of wants. Because a person who is not responsible for others is a person who is truly alone. Because there are few better ways to express our love for America than to care for other Americans. And because the same God who endows us with individual rights also calls us to social obligations.

So let me return to Lyndon Johnson's charge. You're the generation that must decide. Will you ratify poverty and division with your apathy—or will you build a common good with your idealism? Will you be the spectator in the renewal of your country—or a citizen?

The methods of the past may have been flawed, but the idealism of the past was not an illusion. Your calling is not easy, because you must do the acting and the caring. But there is fulfillment in that sacrifice, which creates hope for the rest of us. Every life you help proves that every life might be helped. The actual proves the possible. And hope is always the beginning of change.

Thank you for having me, and God bless. (Applause.)

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for bringing this important issue to the forefront. We have a lot of people in America reaching out asking for a helping hand. We have a lot of organizations who have programs in place that can assist those people. This resolution today simply calls on corporate America to not discriminate against a group simply because they are faith based.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks today.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H. Con. Res. 170, which calls for increased support of faith-based charities by U.S. corporations.

The United States is blessed with an industrious people and great wealth; we are the envy of the world. But a great and prosperous nation can and must do better—each of us has a duty to alleviate the suffering of the poor and oppressed in our own communities. Some of the most effective organizations for meeting the needs of impoverished Americans are faith-based, yet these are the very groups that face discrimination by corporate America.

According to Leslie Lenkowsky in last month's edition of Commentary, in 1998 only some 2 percent of the money donated by the nation's largest foundations went to religiously affiliated institutions, and much of that was earmarked for institutions like hospitals and universities. The Capital Research Center found that six of the ten largest companies in America explicitly ''ban or restrict'' donations to faith-based charities.

Why would some of the greatest corporations in the country institute policies that prevent funding of some of America's most effective charities at a time when Congress has taken a leading role in knocking down discriminatory barriers that prevent faith-based charities from competing for government grants and contracts?

On a bipartisan basis, Congress first started the work of expanding charitable choice in 1996 with welfare reform, and followed up with the welfare-to-work grant program in 1997. In 1998, Congress added charitable choice to the Community Services Block Grant Program and in 2000 we added charitable choice to substance abuse treatment and prevention services under the Public Health Services Act.

We know that these programs work, and the States are also finding great success. A study of Indiana's ''Faith Works'' program, which allows welfare recipients to get assistance from faith-based charities instead of secular providers, found that those opting for such charities came from more distressed family situations and had deeper personal crises than those opting for the secular alternative. The study concluded that what these people found at faith-based charities was more emotional and spiritual support than what could ever be offered by a secular institution. In some personal situations, that additional support might be the difference between life and death.

I predict that Congress will knock down more barriers against faith-based charities in programs like the Community Health Centers program this year, and many more next year. As Congress has already moved to provide more access to faith-based charities by Americans in the greatest need, I believe that Congress should call on American corporations to give more even-handedly and generously to faith-based charities.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H. Con. Res. 170, a Resolution Encouraging Corporations to Contribute to Faith-Based Organizations.

I am a strong supporter of corporations increasing donations to philanthropic organizations to help the most needy in our society. Even with the strong economy over the past few years, many Americans have not shared in this nation's prosperity. Thus, more corporate donations are needed to help the many Americans living in poverty.

However, I do not support the government advocating corporate support of one charitable organization over another. Our Founding Fathers included the establishment clause in the United States Constitution to ensure that the government did not play the role of endorsing religion. This policy has given Americans the freedom to carry out their religious worship in whichever manner they choose without fear of government oppression. Today, this resolution takes the first step toward the government playing the role of supporting religious charitable organization over others and challenging the Founding Fathers' wisdom to include the establishment clause in our constitution.

Even more disturbing, it appears that this resolution is the first step in the Bush Administration attempt to promote their faith-based initiative that supports the ungodly action of promoting government sponsored discrimination. it has been reported that the Bush administration has agreed to create a regulation that would allow religious charitable organizations to legally avoid hiring gay employees because of their sexual orientation in exchange for these groups' support for their faith-based initiative.

In the mid-20th century, many racial minorities, women and gays began the long fight for equal rights in this nation. It is a fight that still has a long way to go. The struggle of these groups to obtain equality continues to inspire a nation to make America a better place where all men and women are truly created equal.

If the reported allegation about the administration creating a regulation to promote discrimination is true, then the Bush Administration has signaled to the nation that it wants to return to the dark days in this nation's history when our government sponsored discrimination against certain groups. If today, the Bush Administration is willing to support government sponsored discrimination against homosexuals, then which group is next? Will it be women? Will it be African Americans or Hispanics? Will it be religious worshipers of Catholicism, Judaism or the Nation of Islam?

It is time that the leaders in this country stood up together and stopped usurping the principles of separation of church and state and the principle that all are created equal. These principles help to create a nation that cherishes tolerance for all groups and should be preserved.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H. Con. Res. 170 and say no to discrimination.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 170, which encourages corporations in the United States to increase their support of faith-based organizations.

America is privileged materially, but there still remains poverty and a lack of hope for some. Government has a duty to meet the needs of poor Americans, but it does not have to do it alone. The indispensable and gracious work of faith-based and other charitable service groups must be encouraged as a means of people helping people—as a significant addition to government service.

Faith has played an important role in America's handling of serious social problems. Faith-based organizations in the United States help people recover from drug and alcohol addiction, provide food and shelter for the homeless, and teach people job skills that will allow them to move from poverty to productivity. These organizations have proven to be effective in solving some of society's troubles.

Corporations donate billions of dollars to philanthropic causes every year. However, of these billions of dollars, faith-based organizations receive only a small portion. In fact, many corporations specifically ban or restrict contributions to faith-based organizations.

This legislation encourages them to make greater contributions to faith-based organizations and recommends that they refrain from policies that prohibit corporations from donating to faith-based organizations. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 170.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 170.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF VICTIMS OF TORTURE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 168) expressing the sense of Congress in support of victims of torture.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 168

Whereas the people of the United States abhor the use of torture by any government or person;

Whereas the existence of torture creates a climate of fear and international insecurity that affects all people;

Whereas torture results in mental and physical damage to an individual that destroys the individual's personality and terrorizes society and the effects of torture can last a lifetime for the individual and can also affect future generations;

Whereas repressive governments often use torture as a weapon against democracy by eliminating the leadership of their opposition and frightening the general public;

Whereas more than 500,000 survivors of torture live in the United States;

Whereas torture has devastating effects on the victim which often require extensive medical and psychological treatment;

Whereas both the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–320) and the Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–87) authorize funding for rehabilitation services for victims of torture so that these individuals may become productive and contributing members of their communities;

Whereas the United States played a leading role in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and has ratified the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Forms of Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and

Whereas June 26th of each year is the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, on the occasion of the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, Congress pays tribute to all victims of torture in the United States and around the world who are struggling to overcome the physical scars and psychological effects of torture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment underscores that freedom, justice, and peace rests on the recognition of the inalienable rights of all members of the human family.

It further states that these basic rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person. Thus, when one individual suffers, all of humanity suffers. When one individual is tortured, the scars inflicted by such horrific treatment are not only found in the victim but in the global system, as the use of torture undermines, debilitates, and erodes the very essence of that system.

Torture not only terrorizes individuals but entire societies, the impact of which is felt in future generations as well. It is used as a weapon against democracy by eliminating the leadership of the opposition and by frightening the general population into submission.

As a Member of Congress who represents men, women, and children who have fled repressive regimes, I have witnessed firsthand the mental and physical damage that torture inflicts on the individual and on society as a whole. I have constituents who are Cuban refugees, for example, who have been subjected to electroshock treatment by Castro's authorities because of their pro-democracy activities.

I represent one of the largest Holocaust survivor communities in North America. My district includes victims of right-wing authoritative regimes as well as oppressive leftist totalitarian dictators. I have seen the anguish in their eyes as well as the strength of their spirit, their courage, and their determination.

There are more than 500,000 survivors of torture in the United States; and this resolution, Mr. Speaker, seeks to honor them.

House Concurrent Resolution 168 uses the occasion of the United Nations Day in Support of Victims of Torture as an opportunity to remember and pay homage to the victims of torture and to underscore the commitment that the United States Congress has outlined in the last few years through passage of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 and the Torture Victims Relief Reauthorization Act of 1999.

It is a message to the survivors in the U.S., and indeed throughout the world, that the U.S. has not forgotten their suffering nor its obligation as a global leader to help prevent such violations of the inherent dignity of human beings. I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 168. I want to commend my dear friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have the dubious distinction of being the only Member of Congress ever to have lived under and fought against both a Nazi and a communist dictatorship. So torture is something with which I am personally and intimately familiar with.

The resolution before this House today pays tribute to the millions of courageous men and women who have suffered truly terrible mental and physical damage perpetrated by other human beings. It is an unfortunate reality, Mr. Speaker, that around the globe on every continent men, women, and even children are abused by those who are in positions of authority and who abuse their power by inflicting harm on others.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, every year our Department of State in its country reports on human rights practices, catalogs for us the numerous countries involved in this heinous practice. Torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment is a violation of international law, Mr. Speaker, as reflected in the Convention Against Torture to which I am proud to say the United States is a party. But more than that, it is an attack on the decency of every human being who lives in a world where such heinous practices exist.

Mr. Speaker, this House has been at the forefront of trying to ease the suffering of the many who have survived these awful practices. We have initiated and passed legislation creating U.S. programs that address the psychological and physical needs of those who have survived brutal torture. These programs have helped thousands of such victims. It is only fitting that the House pay tribute to all of the victims of torture around the globe who are struggling to overcome the effects of torture.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 168.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, although the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) has been with us only a short time, she has made an excellent name for herself in her commitment to the finest causes that we deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a special organization located in Minnesota. It is The Center for Victims of Torture. The Center was established in 1985 to healed the emotional and physical scars of government-inflicted torture on individuals, their families, and

our communities. Torture victims face debilitating and unimaginable social, physical, emotional and spiritual scarring.

Many survivors are challenged with daily constant anxiety, depression, and suffer from fear. Torture is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against all of us.

Today I stand here with my colleagues to ensure that the United States works in collaboration with all nations to end government-sponsored torture, to end policies and practices that violate human rights. Although the memories cannot be erased, the wounds can be healed.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

(Ms. WATSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 168, the resolution that expresses the sense of Congress in support of victims of torture. But first I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this important legislation. I also wish to express my gratitude to the honorable gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for allowing me the opportunity to speak on this very important international issue. As both a former Ambassador and member of the Committee on International Relations, I stand before this esteemed body to speak on the necessity of highlighting the plight of the many victims of torture around the world.

Today, there are over 500,000 survivors of torture who live in the United States as a result of fleeing from those repressive governments that use various tactics to torture to combat democracy.

This bill is very significant, for it pays tribute to all the victims in the United States and the world who are struggling to overcome the physical and mental scars of torture on the occasion of the United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture.

Torture is a violation of international law as reflected in the convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment to which the United States is a party. Furthermore, such actions are an attack on the decency of every human being who lives in a world where such horrible practices exist.

In light of these atrocities, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 168, to express support for victims of torture, and I thank Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for bringing this issue to the floor.

Although torture and other cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment is prohibited under international human rights law, state-officials in countries all over the world are responsible for the ill-treatment of individuals. Today, hundreds of thousands of victims of torture live in the United States. They are typically well-educated, well-trained people who were subjected to politically motivated torture by repressive regimes. They were tortured because of what they believe, what they said or did, or for what they represented.

Many torture survivors suffer in silence, enduring incessant physical and emotional anguish. These courageous individuals, who often suffered for speaking out for freedom and justice, deserve, our full and uncompromising support.

When Congress passed the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998, we agreed that victims should have access to rehabilitation services, enabling them to become productive members of our communities. I also encourage my colleagues to support the Torture Victim's Relief Re-authorization Act—H.R. 1405, to fund domestic torture treatment centers and the Human Rights Information Act—H.R. 1152, to facilitate the prosecution of torturers.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Human Rights, I join Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and Congressman SMITH in this recognition of all victims of torture in the United States and around the world who are struggling to overcome their physical and psychological scars. I urge support of H. Con. Res. 168.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to thank the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Operation and Human Rights, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), for reminding us of the role that the United States must take in combating the use of torture and other forms of degrading treatment or punishment throughout the world.

However, it is not enough to merely denounce torture without assisting the victims in their recovery from the physical and psychological effects that they suffer. People suffering from the effects of torture suffer from severe impediments, often requiring lengthy medical and psychological treatments. Torture victims are often ashamed or too traumatized to speak out against the practice, both in their countries of origin and abroad.

Because torture victims sometimes cannot speak for or help themselves, Americans want their government to speak for those victims, to provide assistance to stop human rights abuses, to investigate allegations of torture, and also to provide rehabilitation services for the victims of torture through the Torture Victims Protection Act. They also want us to press for universal protection against torture through the enforcement of the rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention Against Torture, and the UN Charter. These are the themes of the worthy resolution now before us, and we should start with expressing our solidarity with the victims of torture in the United States and throughout the world.

Accordingly, I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting H. Con. Res. 168.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 168.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TROPICAL FOREST CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2131) to reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2004, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2131

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

SECTION 1. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.

Section 805(a)(2) of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2431c(a)(2)) is amended by striking ''major''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO SUPPORT REDUCTION OF DEBT UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961 AND TITLE I OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 806 of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2431d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2001.—For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) for the reduction of any debt pursuant to this section or section 807, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President the following:

''(1) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

''(2) $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

''(3) $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 808(a)(1)(D) of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2431f(a)(1)(D)) is amended by striking ''to appropriated under sections 806(a)(2) and 807(a)(2)'' and inserting ''to be appropriated under sections 806(a)(2), 807(a)(2), and 806(d)''.

SEC. 3. CHAIRPERSON OF THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS BOARD.

Section 811(b)(2) of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 2431i(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''from among the representatives appointed under section 610(b)(1)(A) of such Act or paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection'' and inserting ''and shall be the representative from the Department of State appointed under section 610(b)(1)(A) of such Act''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2131, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2131, the Tropical Forest Conservation Act reauthorization, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation. I am proud to be one of the 28 original cosponsors of this piece of legislation.

Tropical forests provide a wide variety of benefits to the entire world. They act as carbon sinks, helping to reduce greenhouse gases as they absorb large amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, and provide habitat for many plant species that are used to develop lifesaving medicines and pharmaceutical products.

It has been estimated that up to 30 million acres of tropical forests are lost each year, an area roughly the size of Pennsylvania. This alarming rate of destruction emphasizes the need to act, and act quickly, to preserve these valuable assets for future generations.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act reauthorization is a sound, free-market approach to a very serious global environmental problem. It will encourage the preservation of tropical forests without creating a burden on the American taxpayer. It is a good, sensible piece of legislation. It is worthy of our support, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for proposing this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2131 which reauthorizes the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998, and commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for introducing this reauthorization bill, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for moving it so expeditiously through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago Congress overwhelmingly approved the landmark Tropical Forest Conservation Act. This legislation provided funding for the administration to pursue actively debt swaps, buybacks and other devices with developing nations in return for concrete efforts to protect tropical forests. Since Congress enacted this important legislation, the Clinton administration successfully concluded an agreement to reduce debt owed by the Government of Bangladesh to the United States in exchange for a new plan to protect 4 million acres of mangrove forests in that country. These forests protect the world's only genetically secure population of Bengal tigers.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, there are 11 nations on 3 continents interested in negotiating new tropical forest conservation debt reduction agreements with the United States. It is critical that the Bush administration continue the active implementation of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. Tropical forests around the globe are rapidly disappearing. The latest figures indicate that 30 million acres of tropical forests are being lost every single year. This is an area larger than the State of Pennsylvania. Tropical forests harbor much of the world's biodiversity. They act as carbon sinks, absorbing massive quantities of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, thereby reducing greenhouse gases. The United States National Cancer Institute has identified over 3,000 plants that are active against cancer, 70 percent of which can be found in tropical forests.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. must continue to play a leadership role in protecting the world's tropical forests. By reauthorizing this act and providing reasonable funding for the next 3 fiscal years, I am confident that we can help save tens of thousands of acres of tropical forests around the globe. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2131.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the principal sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for yielding me this time, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his statement and for his strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation. It is bipartisan, it is bicameral, and it is reauthorizing a program which can work well to address serious problems.

Mr. Speaker, we introduced this bill with 33 other colleagues in order to continue what is a very innovative conservation program which helps protect the world's most valuable tropical forests through these debt-for-nature mechanisms.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member (Mr. LANTOS) gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and other members of the Committee on International Relations, including the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), for their expedited consideration of the legislation and unanimous approval of it on June 20.

I also want to thank them for the improvements they made to the legislation. The three amendments that were accepted in committee, I think, perfect the legislation and make it work better, given the evolving nature of some of the debt-for-nature relationships we might have.

Four years ago I introduced this original bill with our former colleagues Lee Hamilton and John Kasich. It was approved by the House and passed by the Senate under unanimous consent, and was signed into law by President Clinton. The legislation was developed with the support and input of a lot of people, including some of the major respected international environmental organizations such as the Nature Conservancy, the World Wildlife Fund and Conservation International. Their support and ongoing commitment to this program and their involvement in this program as a potential third party has been and will continue to be very valuable to its success.

Mr. Speaker, I also note that our freshman colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), was instrumental in developing the original Tropical Forest Conservation Act when he was a senior member of the Committee on International Relations staff. I am delighted that he is an original cosponsor of this legislation before us today.

The United States has a significant national interest in protecting these forests around the world. As has been said by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), these forests provide a wide range of benefits. We know they harbor between 50 and 90 percent of the terrestrial biodiversity on Earth. We know that they act as carbon sinks, absorbing massive quantities of carbon dioxide from the environment, and we know that carbon dioxide taken out of the atmosphere helps reduce the effect of greenhouse gases. They also help regulate rainfall on which agriculture and coastal resources depend, and they are important to regional and global climate.

Furthermore, these tropical forests are the breeding ground for new medicines. We are told that fully a quarter of the prescription drugs currently used in the United States come from tropical forests. We are also told that of the more than 3,000 plants the National Cancer Institute has identified as being active against cancer, 70 percent are found in these tropical forests.

Regrettably, these forests are rapidly disappearing. The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) talked about that, and stated an area the size of Pennsylvania is being destroyed every year. We believe that half the tropical forests are already gone.

The heavy debt burden of these countries that have these forests is a contributing factor to the disappearance of these forests. Why? Because these countries must resort to exploitation of their natural resources, timber, minerals, and precious metals, to generate revenue to service burdensome external debt.

At the same time, poor governments tend to have very few resources to set aside and protect their tropical forests. This act addresses these economic pressures by authorizing the President to

allow eligible countries to engage in debt swaps, buybacks or restructuring in exchange for protecting threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis over time.

The legislation is based on the previous Bush administration's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative that allowed the President to structure certain debt in exchange for conservation efforts, but only in Latin America.

This legislation and its predecessor expands on the countries eligible, the requirements, and the legislation expands it beyond Latin America to protect tropical forests that are threatened worldwide. The bill provides for very innovative ways to leverage scarce resources available for international conservation.

Under two of the three options made available under this bill, third-party debt swaps where third parties can come in, such as the Nature Conservancy or Conservation International, and also debt buybacks, in those two cases, there is no cost at all to the United States Government.

□ 1515

Under the third option provided for under this legislation, the United States and an eligible country can agree to restructure the debt. Our Government in this case does provide a subsidy to cover the difference between the so-called net present value of the debt and the net present value of whatever the new debt is. Now, net present value is a fancy term, but it refers to what an investment bank, say, on Wall Street might use as they look at the debt to determine what it is really worth, what its actual value is.

Our Government provides this subsidy because we get something in return for it. We get something in return in the sense that the amount of debt forgiven is often lower than the amount that is placed in these tropical forest funds. Therefore, we get leverage. In fact, taxpayers will usually get at least $2 in conservation funds back into the fund in local currency for every $1 of Federal funds that would be spent.

Part of this leverage comes from the fact that the host country is required to use local currency in a tropical forest fund. Second, these tropical forest funds have integrity, are broadly supported within the host country; and, therefore, conservation organizations are interested in placing their own private money in these funds. We believe this is producing additional private sector leverage of government conservation dollars, and we believe the potential for that is great.

The final point I would just like to make about the restructuring option is that I believe if we are going to reduce or eliminate debts that are owed by poorer countries to the United States, it only makes sense that we get something in return for it. In this case we do, in fact, get something in return through this initiative. It is a win-win-win, for us, for the poorer country, and for the environment.

Last year, as mentioned earlier, the United States did conclude a tropical forest debt reduction agreement with Bangladesh, which is a less developed country that is heavily burdened by foreign debt. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), who is with us this afternoon, has been quite focused on Bangladesh. In fact, I can remember at the first hearing we had on this subject 3 or 4 years ago, he raised the fact that Bangladesh was a country that ought to be included within the requirements because they could use this initiative in order to reduce some of their debt and save some of their endangered tropical forests. In fact, that has happened. It allows in Bangladesh the protection of over 4 million acres of endangered mangrove forests, and it protects the world's only genetically secure population of Bengal tigers.

At present, we believe there are at least 11 nations on three continents interested in negotiating these kinds of Tropical Forest Act debt reduction agreements. In fact, we have reason to believe that Belize, El Salvador, and Thailand are ready to move on such agreements this year. Furthermore, as many Members know, President Bush has expressed his strong support for this program.

I would also like to briefly address the authorization for funds included in this legislation. First, I want to make the point this authorization is actually less than the authorization over the last 3 years. In fact, looking out over the 3-year period, it is roughly $100 million less than was provided in the previous and original authorization.

Second, I would say this authorization is consistent with what the Bush administration has said is their commitment to providing adequate funding for this initiative. In other words, it fits within the budget so long as we are making progress toward restructuring agreements around the world, and, again, I think there is adequate evidence that we have lots of countries lined up and interested, and we will be able to move forward aggressively from this point on.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my thanks and appreciation, also, to some key staff members who got us here today: Adolfo Franco, Frank Record, Peter Yeo, David Abramowitz, Keith O'Neil, and Carol Doherty of the Committee on International Relations majority and minority staffs for their expertise and all their diligent work on this legislation. I would also like to thank Tim Miller and Maile Gradison of my office for their dedication to this initiative, and Jeff Burnam with Senator LUGAR and Jim Green with Senator BIDEN for helping to develop the companion bill on the Senate side, which is identical to the legislation introduced in the House and almost identical to the legislation that we have on the floor this afternoon.

Again, this is a good program, worthy of reauthorization. It holds great promise. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to enthusiastically support the passage today of H.R. 2131.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend for his eloquent statement, and I want to identify myself with it.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), one of the nationally recognized leaders in this field.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2131, which reauthorizes the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

I want to commend the author of the legislation, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), and the chairman and ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their leadership in moving consideration of this important measure which facilitates debt reduction in Third World countries by supporting their efforts for conservation of fragile tropical forests.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act basically allow less-developed nations that owe loans to the United States to restructure their debt repayment, funneling savings into a tropical rain forest protection fund which provides for the conservation and maintenance of native forest resources in each participating country.

According to the World Wildlife Fund, Mr. Speaker, in recent years up to 42 million acres of tropical forests have been devastated annually throughout the world. Indeed, approximately one-half of the planet's tropical forests no longer exist. In the Asia-Pacific region alone, it is estimated that 88 percent of original forest lands have now been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, these careless actions have a dramatic negative impact on the environment that is global in nature. The destruction of tropical forest lands on this scale destroys the Earth's ability to recycle carbon dioxide, significantly contributing to greenhouse gases and climate warming.

Perhaps more importantly, we sacrifice and lose the rich and unique biodiversity of these tropical forest ecosystems which, incidentally, contain over half of the world's plant and animal species.

Mr. Speaker, tropical forest plants have been used for centuries by indigenous native peoples to treat illnesses and disease. Most of the Earth's 265,000 flowering plants are located in tropical regions, and less than 1 percent of these plants have been scientifically tested for effectiveness against disease.

I am appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) had alluded earlier about a win-win situation for the reauthorization of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, over the years, as a classic example, it has been my privilege to know one of the world's leading ethnobotanists, Dr. Nafanua Paul Cox, for the tremendous work that he has done in saving rain forests and tropical forests in the South Pacific region.

I say this personally, because of his efforts over the years, he has sent hundreds of herbal plant medicines that were used by my people for centuries and now the latest discovery by the National Institutes of Health, a certain drug that has come out of this research conducted by Dr. Cox is a substance called protrastin that may have very positive effects in curing HIV. I am talking about AIDS. That is all because of the preservation of these plants.

Mr. Speaker, we must preserve these tropical resources that may hold the key to curing cancer, even AIDS and other deadly diseases afflicting humanity. If rare tropical plants are not protected, their genetic codes and potential benefits will be lost forever to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation. I thank my good friend from Ohio for his management of this legislation and especially the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), one of the distinguished members of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation. It has been very well explained by many of my colleagues, including the distinguished primary sponsor of this legislation and the original act, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN). So I will not have to go over the details, that is for sure; but I do want to mention and reemphasize one thing the gentleman from Ohio said and, that is, that the program builds upon former President George Bush's innovative Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and is another creative example of how our country can address developing-country debt while helping to protect the environment.

The act gives the President the authority to reduce certain forms of development assistance and food aid debt owed to the United States in exchange for the deposit by eligible developing countries of local currencies in a tropical forest fund to preserve, restore and maintain tropical forests. These funds are used by qualified nongovernmental organizations working to preserve the world's most endangered tropical forests.

A board of directors in the United States comprised of U.S. public and private officials oversees this program and annually reports to Congress on progress made to implement the program.

The gentleman from Ohio was gracious in mentioning at the time the House International Relations Committee proceeded to mark up the original act. Frankly, I was interested in Bangladesh because when it has come to debt forgiveness or debt reduction in the past, by a strange set of circumstances, Bangladesh has fallen through the cracks and they needed some assistance. I wanted to make sure that they were not neglected. It turns out they are the first beneficiary of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act.

Before I offered my amendment to assure eligibility for Bangladesh I had to look to see if it had a tropical forest to be saved in that country of such huge population density with all of its drought and flooding problems. They do. As mentioned in terms of square miles, I will put it in square kilometers, 14,000 square kilometers of tropical forest areas in the Chittagong Hill Tracts and in the Sunderbans. As mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, this is one of the few remaining refuges for the Bengal tiger. Currently, the Bangladeshi board of directors, which will disburse the trust funds, is reviewing how similar boards operate in establishing its procedures for implementing the agreement.

There are only 11 countries considering it right now on three different continents, but I have no doubt the number will expand dramatically when interested people and their governments understand the benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to very specifically commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the sponsor of this legislation and the original act; and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their leadership and support for conservation efforts in the developing world and for their work to reauthorize this program. Of course, the expedited treatment of this legislation by our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), is also to be commended; and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges all of our colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, as it provides direct benefits to both developing and developed countries.

□ 1530

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), also a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2131.

Mr. Speaker, let me just note that the argument that we must try to preserve our tropical rain forests because the tropical rain forests have a possible treasure house of biodiversity for this generation and future generations I think is a very valid argument.

I have lived in jungles in my life. I understand the many thousands, if not tens of thousands, of variety of not only animal and insect and plant life but all kinds of life that is surrounding one in the jungle. And, yes, in future generations we may find tremendous assets that are right in front of our face but we do not recognize it now.

The idea of trading debt with some of these countries and getting for that debt a commitment to try to preserve these rain forests, I think, is a very good idea. Let us just remember that in many cases these countries would not be repaying that debt anyway. So this is a win-win proposal.

Let me just say, however, that believing in this bill and believing in the biodiversity of the jungles does not mean that one has to believe that the jungles in some way contribute to helping the global warming situation. I have heard that several times in the arguments here on the floor.

Let me just say that global warming, if one takes it by the people who advocate that, I believe global warming is a bunch of global baloney myself, but even if one does believe in global warming as precisely presented by those people who are trying to convince the rest of us that it is true, one would not want to preserve the rain forests. In fact, consistent with the global warming theory what one would want to do is to clear-cut all of the rain forests and bulldoze them because the rain forests are one of the major contributors on this planet of CO_2 and methane, which are the global-warming gases.

Termites eating in the jungles produce more of what they call greenhouse gases than does the internal combustion engine. By the way, I do not believe in global warming so I would never advocate bulldozing the jungles, but if one believes in it that is what they want to do and they, of course, want to also get rid of old growth trees. The older the growth of the trees, the more one wants to cut it down and replant young trees. The essence of global warming is saying that one wants young, vibrant trees and plants to take in carbon dioxide and give out oxygen.

Let me just say, our jungles and our old growth trees do just the opposite. They give out more CO_2 than they are taking in oxygen. So let us support this effort to try to save the jungles and save those forests and rain forests around the world and let us take advantage of this very commonsensical approach of debt restructuring. Let us not get trapped into using arguments that just do not hold water and are not scientifically viable. There has been enough nonsense on global warming and other areas.

Let us just say that the rain forests are valuable and let us save them.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the number of facts that are out there dealing with carbon dioxide, methane, and a number of other greenhouse gases show that in the last 50 years the dramatic increase in those gases are evidence that human activity is causing the climate to warm.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say that means one would clear-cut all of the jungles to get rid of the CO_2 buildup if that was true.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2131. I would like to particularly thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for his strong leadership on this issue. He is one of our environmental leaders here in the Congress, and I salute him.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for bringing this legislation to the floor and thank Tim Miller from the staff of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for his work.

Under President Bush's 1990 Enterprise for the Americas Initiative Act, the United States sponsored many debt-for-nature swap programs. The Tropical Forest Conservation Act, based on this idea, was first introduced by the gentleman from Ohio in 1997 with bipartisan support and was signed into law in 1998.

As a congressional staffer, I had the honor to work on that legislation and help him achieve that goal. I am pleased to support this bill which continues in that tradition.

Bangladesh is the first country which benefited from this program. Because Bangladesh has been able to restructure its debt, it was able to create a national forest fund of almost $9 million, which went to protecting the Mangrove Swap area, home to over 500 wild tigers. Currently, there are 11 nations on three continents interested in considering debt forgiveness under this program, including places like Belize and El Salvador.

I think the United States has an important national interest in supporting the protection of the world's natural resources, including tropical forests. Tropical forests are home to half of all known plants and animals. We are losing an area equal to a football field a minute, and this must stop.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) is our leader on this issue and built on the work of the previous Bush and Clinton administrations. Later this year, the Congress will consider legislation building on this model to protect coral reefs. Coral reefs are home to most aquatic plants and animals. Many reefs are disappearing, and most of them are in developing countries.

I salute the leaders on this issue, commend the gentleman for this legislation, and urge the House adoption of this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act Reauthorization. This bill extends the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998, which passed in this body and was signed into law by President Clinton. Today's legislation allows the U.S. Agency for International Development to relieve some of the foreign debt owed to the United States. In return, participating nations agree to establish trust funds to protect local tropical rainforests and other environmentally sensitive areas. This bill authorizes $225 million to be spent over the next three fiscal years to pay for this important conservation program and for the cost of debt forgiveness.

This innovative tool, the so-called ''debt for nature swap'', helps countries with undeveloped natural resources reduce their foreign debts by buying it back and agreeing to spend a portion of the proceeds on conservation projects. This is especially vital because tropical forests contain half of the world's known species of plants and animals. They contain a diversity of organic materials that could lead to the development of life-saving new medicines and tropical forests help slow global climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide. Increasingly, however, these fragile forests are succumbing to logging, roadbuilding and development. Since 1950, half of the world's tropical forests have disappeared and they are disappearing at a rate of 30 million acres each year. The countries that carry the heaviest debt contribute significantly to this loss because they extract valuable natural resources in order to generate needed revenue.

A recent report in the Journal of Science highlights the problems affecting Brazil's tropical forests. The report states that the rapid growth of Brazil's population is leading to the equally rapid expansion of railroads, pipelines and highways into the delicate Amazon forest areas. The devastation of the Brazilian rainforest will take place in only 20 years because of a $40 billion project to encourage development.

In tropical countries throughout the world, the deterioration of the rainforest will have dramatic and devastating effects on wildlife habitat, genetic diversity, the quality of watersheds and the global climate. The United States, because of our role as an economic leader, should promote creative solutions such as the one contained in this bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for reminding us of tragedy of the rapidly disappearing tropical forests, and the importance of protecting the world's most diverse ecosystems.

Tropical forests contain approximately half of the world's species of plants and animals. Unfortunately, over half of the tropical forests on Earth have disappeared, and, with more than 30 million acres which are lost each year, the destruction of these volatile ecosystems continues.

The majority of those forests are located in developing nations that are plagued by poverty and extensive debt burdens. The Tropical Forests Conservation Act offers up to $325 million in debt relief to developing nations in exchange for the sustained protection of threatened tropical forests. These conditions also include the creation of a favorable climate for private sector investment, cooperation on narcotics measures, on state-sponsored terrorism, and a democratically elected government.

This bill enjoys wide bipartisan support, support from the administration, and from various environmental groups. I urge support for this bill, and, once again, commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for introducing legislation to extend this important environmental program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2131, 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 of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2360, CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2001, AND H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on campaign finance reform legislation. Let me say that I and Members of the Committee on Rules and our staff have been working very closely with the key authors of this very important legislation, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN). And we have the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), here, and we have been working with him on that.

I would like to say that the Committee on House Administration, as we all know, reported H.R. 2360, the Campaign Finance Reform Citizen Participation Act of 2001, as well as H.R. 2356, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001 on June 28; and the reports are expected to be filed later this afternoon.

While we have made no final decision on which version will actually end up

being the base text for further amendment, I would like to ask Members to draft their amendments to both bills, both the Shays-Meehan bill and the Ney legislation as they were introduced in the House.

Members must submit 55 copies of each amendment and one copy of a very brief explanation of each amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–313 no later than 8 p.m. today. So they have until this evening, Tuesday, June 10.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to run upstairs to see if there are any amendments that have been filed.

AUTHORIZING ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL TO BE USED FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS TO THE ORIGINAL 29 NAVAJO CODE TALKERS

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 174) 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 174

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on July 26, 2001, for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, during the Second World War, the United States Government called upon 29 Navajo men from the Navajo Nation to support the military effort by serving as Marine Corps radio operators. The actual number of enlistees later increased to over 350.

The Japanese had deciphered the military code developed by the United States for transmitting messages and the Navajo Marine Corps radio operators, who became known as the Navajo Code Talkers, developed a new code using their language to communicate military messages in the Pacific.

Throughout its extensive use, the code developed by these Native Americans proved unbreakable. The Navajos were people who had been discouraged from using their own language. Ultimately, the code they developed using the same language would be credited with saving the lives of many American soldiers and several successful United States military engagements during World War II. It is an extreme honor to bring this legislation to the floor today authorizing a ceremony to be held in the Capitol Rotunda presenting Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers. Their contribution to this Nation proved immeasurable.

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

Mr. NEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to congratulate the gentleman on his statement and say that we look anxiously towards that program which will be held later this month.

I, last week, had the opportunity to meet with some people at MGM, and the motion picture which is going to be coming out on the work of the Navajo Code Talkers should be fascinating. I have the trailer upstairs. I have not seen it yet, but I know from the early reports we have seen that it will be a wonderful presentation of the work of these courageous people and the role that that they played during the Second World War.

I would like to strongly support the effort that is being led by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and it looks to me as if the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is also working on this. I believe that it should be a great motion picture and a wonderful ceremony here, and I thank my friend for the leadership role he has played on this.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for his support on this important measure.

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their efforts in bringing House Concurrent Resolution 174 to the floor today.

I introduced H. Con. Res. 174 on June 26, 2001, to authorize 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. This legislation will bring us one step closer to making the special and long overdue ceremony a reality.

I would also like to thank the 14 Members on both sides of the aisle who joined as original cosponsors to this measure.

During the 106th Congress, Senator JEFF BINGAMAN introduced legislation to honor the Navajo Code Talkers who played a pivotal role in World War II. I introduced the companion measure so that both Chambers could support these original 29 heroic men with the Congressional Gold Medal. In addition, a Silver Medal will be presented to the other Navajo Code Talkers who later followed the original 29.

Thanks to Senator BINGAMAN's efforts, language was included in the last year omnibus bill to honor these men. This was an effort that I and many of my colleagues supported in the House. These Code Talkers will soon receive their long overdue recognition for their service and the honor they brought to our country and to their people. This is a historic moment for the Navajo Nation and for all World War II veterans.

The medals that the President will present to these 29 men on behalf of Congress will express our appreciation for their dedication and service as Navajo Code Talkers. Of the 29 original Navajo Code Talkers, 5 are still alive today. They are John Brown, Jr., of Navajo, New Mexico; Chester Nez of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Allen Dale June of West Valley City, Utah; Lloyd Oliver of Phoenix, Arizona; and Joe Palmer of Yuma, Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the Navajo Code Talkers took part in many assaults conducted by the U.S. Marines in the Pacific. In May 1942, the original 29 Navajo recruits attended Marine Boot Camp and worked to create the Navajo Code. The Navajo Code Talkers created messages by first translating Navajo words into English and then using the first letter of each English word to decipher their meaning. Because different Navajo words might be translated into different English words for the same letter, the code was especially difficult to decipher.

□ 1545

The use of Native American languages in coded military communications was not new to World War II. Choctaw Indians, for example, served as Code Talkers in World War I. The idea of using Navajo as code in World War II came from a veteran of World War I, Phillip Johnston. Johnston knew of the military's search for a code that would withstand all attempts to decipher it. He was also the son of a missionary, raised on the Navajo Indian Reservation, spoke fluent Navajo, and believed that the Navajo language was the answer to the military requirement for an indecipherable code, given that it was an unwritten language of extreme complexity.

The Navajo Code Talkers served in all six Marine divisions, Marine Raider battalions and Marine parachute units. They transmitted messages by telephone and radio in a code derived from their Native language, a code, I may add, that was never broken by the Japanese. The Navajo code remained so valuable that the Department of Defense kept the code secret for 23 years

after World War II. Therefore, the Code Talkers never received the recognition they deserved.

The ceremony on July 26 will at long last pay full tribute to the brave Americans who used their Native language to help bring an end to World War II in the Pacific. I would also like to mention that a separate ceremony is being planned for later this fall in Arizona or New Mexico to present a silver medal to each man who later qualified as a Navajo Code Talker.

In closing, let me say that the Navajo language imparts a sense of feeling, history and tradition to all the Code Talkers who served valiantly in World War II. To the five Code Talkers who are with us today, to their families, and to those who are with us in spirit, I say a few words in Navajo, which I will translate.

Dine bizaad chooz' iidgo silaoltsooi niha nidaazbaa

Aadoo ak'ah dadeesdlii.

Nitsaago baa aheeh daniidzin.

Ahehee.

Which in English translates to, ''Let me express my deep gratitude to the Navajo Code Talkers who provided and helped to develop an ingenious code based on your language, and became the communications link to and from the front lines of the Allies in the Pacific War.'' Through the Navajo Code Talkers' bravery, their sacrifice, and the unbreakability of the code, the United States military was able to communicate with one another.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I urge my colleagues to come together and support this resolution, support our Navajo veterans and every veteran who sacrificed their very lives for the liberties and freedoms we enjoy today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the cochair of the Native American Caucus, who has also been a staunch leader on Native American issues in this body for many years.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 174, the resolution sponsored by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), that authorizes the use of the Capitol Rotunda on July 26, 2001, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers.

I am honored to have been an original cosponsor of H.R. 4527, the legislation sponsored by my good friend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) that authorizes the President of the United States to award the gold medal on behalf of the Congress to each of the original Navajo Code Talkers.

I also want to acknowledge the work of Senator JEFF BINGAMAN for his efforts in getting the Senate version of the bill included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 2001.

Mr. Speaker, awarding these medals to the brave Navajo men that served this country at a time of war by using the Navajo language to develop a unique and unbreakable code to communicate military messages in the Pacific is long overdue.

The United States Marine Corps recruited and enlisted 29 Navajo men to serve as Marine Corps radio operators. These men are referred to today as the Navajo Code Talkers. The number of Code Talkers would later increase to over 350. So successful was the code that the Code Talkers were sworn to secrecy, an oath they honored until 1968, when the Department of Defense declassified the code.

Mr. Speaker, the heroic efforts of these men saved the lives of many, including probably my own brother Kenneth Robert Kildee, and hastened the end of World War II in the Pacific theater.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this resolution so that Congress, through the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal, can finally express the gratitude of an entire Nation to these brave men for the contributions they made during a time of war and the valor with which they served their country.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to thank the original sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), for his leadership and for bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also be remiss if I did not express my gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, for his support, and also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, for his support in bringing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as a former student of Brigham Young University, it was my privilege to know many students who are Americans of Navajo descent. If I could, I would like to say a fond hello in Navajo, Yateeh.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored as an original cosponsor to speak today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 174 to authorize the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol to be used later this month for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers, a ceremony that is certainly long, long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of using an Indian language as a code was first tried during World War I by the Canadians. The Canadians used Choctaw Indians in their effort, but the experiment was not successful. The failure of this effort is attributed to the Indians knowing very little English and there being no equivalent terminology for the military terms.

The next effort to use an Indian language for a code during wartime was made by the Americans in World War II. The origin of this effort is credited to Phillip Johnston, who was the son of missionaries who did a lot of work among the Navajo Indians. Mr. Johnston brought their idea to the U.S. Marines in California. Because of the bad experience during World War I, still our government was very reluctant to be receptive to this kind of an idea.

Eventually the supporters of the Code Talkers prevailed, at least enough to conduct a test. Two Navajos were sent into one room, and two were put in a second room without visual contact. A message was given to the Navajos in the first room, and they were instructed to translate the message and send it to the other room. The three-line message was encoded, transmitted and decoded in 20 seconds. Encoding and decoding the same message by machine took 30 minutes, and the viability of using the Navajo for military encryption became readily apparent.

Nevertheless, there was still some resistance to using American Indians to transmit military messages. An authorization was given to recruit only 30 Navajos for a pilot program. Recruiting potential Code Talkers and getting them through military training was not easy. Most Navajo did not speak English, and they were all coming from a very different culture.

Parts of their training, such as long runs in the hot sun or surviving in the desert with one canteen of water, came quite naturally to them. Other parts of the training, such as certain aspects of military discipline and the maintenance and repair of radio transmitters and receivers, were somewhat alien to them.

In constructing a code, the Navajo had to take several things into consideration. The code would have to be memorized. It would then be used in periods of conflict when tensions were running high and transmissions could be difficult to hear clearly because of static, close-by rifle fire and explosions.

With those constraints in mind, the Navajo used four basic rules in developing this code: 1. Each code word must have some logical connection to the actual word; 2. Each code word should be unusually descriptive or creative; 3. Each code word should be short; and, 4. No code word should be easily confused with another.

While developing the code, the Navajo were placed in battle simulations, and transmissions were monitored by military code breakers and Navajos who did not know the code. No one broke the code during these tests.

Mr. Speaker, the first 30 Code Talkers were sent into battle, and the pilot program was a success. Eventually 350 Code Talkers were employed in battle, including the battles of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Saipan, Iwo Jima and Okinawa. At Iwo Jima alone, the Navajo

Code Talkers passed over 800 error-free messages in a 48-hour period.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that thousands of lives of our soldiers, sailors and marines were saved due to the outstanding job our Navajo Code Talkers made as part of our war effort during World War II, especially in places I had previously mentioned.

About 4 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to travel with the late Senator John Chafee from Rhode Island to represent the Congress at a special ceremony whereby our government had authorized construction of a parliamentary building for the Solomon Islands Government as a gift from the people of the United States to commemorate one of the most fierce battles that took place in the South Pacific, the battle of Guadalcanal, where thousands of Marines lost their lives, and the late Senator John Chafee was among the few 19-year-old Marines who fought in that terrible battle. It was a moving experience for both Senator CHAFEE and I to visit the remnants of that terrible conflict. The Navajo Code Talkers were a critical part of our success in winning the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that 29 of the original Code Talkers will be recognized later this month for their work. Because of the secrecy placed on the program, the valor the Navajo displayed during World War II was not recognized for decades. Their code was finally declassified in 1968, and it was only declassified then because electronic equipment had been developed that would be sufficient to meet military needs. The Navajo Code Talkers were also used in Korea in the 1950s, and even in Vietnam in the 1960s.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. UDALL, for his leadership in bringing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in support of this resolution and in support of the valiant men who served their country in World War II. Those men, known today as the Navajo Code Talkers, played a key role in our Nation's victory in that great war.

Mr. Speaker, it was the cryptic language of the Navajo that was essential in the U.S. Marine takeover of vital areas like Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Peleliu and Iwo Jima. Well-known to the Code Talkers are the words of Major Howard Connor, who said, ''Without the Navajos, the Marines would never have taken Iwo Jima.''

Today, we open up our Nation's Capitol to the few surviving Navajo Code Talkers. Later this month, the President will give them an honor long overdue. Mr. Speaker, only 5 of the original 29 Code Talkers are alive today. I am proud to say that one of those, Mr. Allan Dale June, lives in my home State of Utah. Mr. June, like so many others during World War II, sacrificed years of his life for the love of his country.

I would ask that all Members of this body join me today in thanking these men for their service. These medals, which can never fully compensate these men for their sacrifice, will at least ensure that their heroic deeds will never again be forgotten.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just once again thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for his dedication to this issue, and also the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) for his tremendous support of a very important issue.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 174, authorizing a ceremony in the Rotunda of the Capitol to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers.

At the start of World War II, operations in the Pacific were compromised because the Japanese were breaking U.S. radio codes. Philip Johnson, the son of a missionary to the Navajos and one of the few non-Navajos, who spoke their language fluently, suggested using Navajo for secure communications.

In the 1940s, Navajo was an unwritten language and is extremely complex. It answered the military requirement for an indecipherable code. Its syntax and tonal qualities make it unintelligible to anyone without extensive exposure and training. It has no alphabet or symbols, and is spoken only on the Navajo lands of the American Southwest.

In 1942, Navajo men were recruited by the Marines to be radio operators, called Navajo Code Talkers. Most of them were barely out of high school and from the reservation just north of Gallup, New Mexico. The Navajo Reservation is about the size of the state of West Virginia and is located in my state of New Mexico and extends into Arizona.

The Navajo radiomen served from 1942 to 1945, and often the code talkers were in the forefront of the bloody battles of the Pacific. The Japanese never broke the Navajo code or captured a Navajo Code Talker. The code talkers are credited with saving thousands of American lives.

The Navajo Code Talker's work remained classified until 1968 because the Pentagon was unsure whether the Navajo Language might be needed again.

The Navajo Code talkers played an important role in winning the war in the Pacific. They deserve our thanks and support.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Con. Res. 174 today to authorize the use of the rotunda to honor and celebrate the heroic work of the Navajo Code Talkers. I thank my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. TOM UDALL, for sponsoring this resolution.

During World War II, about 400 Navajo tribe members served as code talkers for the United States Marines. They transmitted messages by telephone and radio in their native language—a code that the Japanese never broke. Navajo is an unwritten language of extreme complexity and one estimate indicated that fewer than 30 non-Navajos could understand the language at the outbreak of World War II. Navajos demonstrated that they could encode, transmit and decode a three-line message in English in just 20 seconds. Machines of the time required 30 minutes to do the same job.

This resolution does great justice by recognizing the contributions of these great people to our nation's collective security and history.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in May 1942 twenty-nine Navajos entered boot camp and later went to Camp Pendleton to develop a code that used the Navajo language as its basis. They worked at finding new words or meaning for military terms, which had no actual Navajo translation as well as an alphabetical way of spelling out other words. So began the career of the Navajo Code Talkers who were the secret weapon of the Marine Corps against Japan. Their unbreakable code would play a vital part in the United States ability to win World War II.

The man credited for the idea of a code based on Navajo language goes to Philip Johnston, an engineer in Los Angeles. His father had been a Protestant missionary; therefore, as a child he moved to a Navajo reservation where he grew up and learned the culture and the language. Knowing that the Navajo language had been orally handed down through the centuries was Johnston's main argument for this code. He argued that it was a system that would not have to be changed on a regular basis, and because it had never been written down it could not result in falling into the hands of the enemy.

Ironically, Navajos were subjected to alienation in their own homeland and discouraged from speaking their language yet they still came willingly forward and used their language to defend their country and help develop the most successful military code of the time.

The code was such a success that the Department of Defense kept the Code secret for 23 years after World War II. It was finally declassified in 1968. The Code Talkers had been sworn to secrecy, an oath they kept and honored. Imagine these unsung heroes returned home with no special recognition for what they had accomplished and sadly over the years some have died never receiving the honor and accolades that they so deserved.

The time has come for us to recognize the Navajo Code Talkers with a Congressional Gold Medal—the most distinguished honor a civilian can receive. It is for that reason I support House Concurrent Resolution 174, authorizing use of the rotunda to present Congressional Gold Medals to the original 29 Navajo Code Talkers. This honor has been a long time in coming.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 174.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 174.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 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. ISAKSON) at 6 p.m.

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:

House Concurrent Resolution 170, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 168, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 174, 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.

ENCOURAGING CORPORATIONS TO CONTRIBUTE TO FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 170.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 170, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 17, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
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
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—17

Baird
Conyers
DeGette
Dingell
Frank
Hinchey
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Lofgren
McDermott
McKinney
Obey
Olver
Rivers
Schakowsky
Stark

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Allen
Snyder
Tierney

NOT VOTING—22

Cannon
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Coyne
Engel
Evans
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kennedy (MN)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (CA)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Paul
Riley
Scarborough
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Waters
Watts (OK)
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1826

Messrs. DINGELL, JACKSON of Illinois, and CONYERS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GIBBONS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. TIERNEY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for voting on each

additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF VICTIMS OF TORTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 168.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspended the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 168, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
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
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
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
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
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
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Cannon
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cox
Coyne
Engel
Gekas
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Lewis (CA)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Paul
Riley
Scarborough
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Waters
Watts (OK)
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1835

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent 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:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 212, H. Con. Res. 168, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 212, I am not recorded. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL TO BE USED FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDALS TO THE ORIGINAL 29 NAVAJO CODE TALKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 174.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 174, 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 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
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
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel

Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
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
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Cannon
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Coyne
Engel
Gutierrez
Hulshof
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kennedy (MN)
Lantos
Lewis (CA)
Lucas (OK)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Paul
Riley
Scarborough
Shimkus
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Waters
Watts (OK)
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1843

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). 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.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to be taking up the agricultural appropriation bill; and I would like to for a couple of minutes discuss, number one, the seriousness of the agricultural problem; but, secondly, an amendment that I have tomorrow that deals with how we distribute some of this Federal money to farmers.

There are a lot of us that would hope that these extra funds go to help support the traditional family farmers in this country. However, our farm programs since we started them back in 1934 have tended to favor the large farmer. And so what has happened over the years is the small farmer has been forced out because of the advantages of Federal farm policy to the middle-sized and larger farmer; and the middle-sized farmer, figuring that they might survive, have bought out the small farmer and become bigger.

Specifically, we have legislation that says the price support for farmers in this country through the Federal Government should be limited to $75,000. If a farmer wants to include their spouse or usually their wife for a separate producer payment, then they have to jump through all kinds of hoops to borrow money in the spouse's name and then document that it was invested in the farm operation, then the farm operation can pay it back. It is a disadvantage.

My amendment tomorrow does essentially three things: it says automatically the wife is included as a producer without jumping through these bureaucratic hoops, eligible for an additional $75,000 payment limitation. The average size of a farm in this country now, Mr. Speaker, is about 448 acres. But some farms, some huge, giant corporation-type farms are up to 80,000 acres and 100,000 acres; and there is no payment limitation on those farms. So as you can guess, millions of dollars go out to those huge farming operations.

My amendment tomorrow says, let us stick to our guns of the historic $75,000 limitation but automatically include spouses. That would move it up to $150,000. And let us make sure that there is no loophole such as forfeiting a nonrecourse loan or such as certificates that can be issued by the Federal Government in lieu of forfeiture of that particular loan, because those certificates, the alternative of those forfeitures of that loan, has resulted in approximately $400 million extra payment going to those giant farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my colleagues look at this amendment, that they consider the policy of how we want to spend this extra money, that they face the decision of what should farm programs try to do in this country; and I would suggest humbly that part of what we should be trying to do is help the small family farmer. The large farmer already has a competitive advantage, simply because of the size of their operation. We expand that advantage as we pay them on the bushels produced on each acre or the tons produced. Whether it is rice or corn or soybeans or cotton, we help that large farmer.

I feel it is important that we look at this policy, and I would request that my colleagues look at my amendment that will reaffirm the historical provision of limiting those payments to $75,000 rather than the $150,000 per producer that was passed out on a suspension vote late in June when the House went through that particular legislation without the opportunity for any amendments.

ELECTRICITY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, the electricity crisis continues 1 year later in San Diego, in California and the West. Scores of businesses in my hometown of San Diego have gone out of business. People on fixed incomes are suffering because they have to make choices between buying food and prescription drugs and air conditioning. This should not be happening in America.

Now, we have called for price controls, we have called for a refund of the overcharges, and people from my State on the other side of the aisle have said, Let the free market work. Price controls don't work. I say to my colleagues, there is no free market. The system is completely out of whack. There is an energy cartel which dominates our lives in California.

I want to give you a specific example, Mr. Speaker, of how the market in California is being manipulated by this energy cartel and what we in San Diego hope to do about it.

There is a 700 megawatt power plant in my district. We call it the South Bay Power Plant. It is operated by the Duke Energy Corporation. It looks like in the last year, Mr. Speaker, Duke Energy has made close to $800 million off

that plant while 65 percent of the businesses in our area face bankruptcy. They paid for the operation of that plant in 3 months for what they thought would take 5 years or more to pay off.

Now recently, five former employees of Duke Energy, five former employees of the South Bay Energy Plant, testified under oath, testified with 100 years of experience in that plant, Mr. Speaker, and what they said should be taken very seriously by anybody studying this crisis. They said that the generators were turned up and down not because of the need of the people of San Diego or of California but because of the price at a given moment that the market was bringing. In fact, a 250 megawatt generator was turned off at a time when we had blackouts in San Diego, at a time when people were sent home from their jobs and not getting paychecks, at a time when there were near-fatalities at a traffic intersection because the lights were off, at a time when elevators had people stuck in them. Yet the biggest generator in our county was turned off.

These employees further said that they were told to throw away spare parts so maintenance would take a lot longer, supply could be withheld and the prices increased. They talked about how the trading floor where the prices were set for electricity was in direct contact with the generating floor; and so the generators were ramped up and down, as I said, not by the need of California or of San Diego, but by the price that could be gotten. So Duke Energy has stolen $800 million from the citizens of San Diego and of California. They have charged up to $4,000 a megawatt hour for something that cost $30 only a year ago. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the free enterprise system at work; that is stealing from people who could not afford the cost.

Now, to add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, that theft took place from a power plant which the citizens of San Diego own. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we own that plant through the San Diego Unified Port District, a public agency; and that public agency, at very, very good terms for the lessee, leased the plant to this Duke Energy Corporation to operate, as the lease says, in the public interest. Well, that lease has not been operated in the public interest. That lease has allowed Duke Energy Corporation to steal hundreds of millions of dollars from the people of San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, since the public owns the South Bay Power Plant, I call upon the San Diego Unified Port District to take back that plant and to operate the lease in the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN MEMORY OF SANDY POLICE CHIEF SAM DAWSON

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come before the House today to memorialize the death of Police Chief Sam Dawson of Sandy, Utah. Chief Dawson, who served faithfully for 7 years as the head of the police department of Utah's fourth largest city, passed away July 2, 2001, doing what he loved best, riding his Harley-Davidson motorcycle.

Chief Dawson lived up to the sign he had on his desk that said, ''Lead, follow, or get out of the way.'' Chief Dawson was a leader for 30 years in Utah law enforcement. He started as a Salt Lake County sheriff's deputy in 1971. He became the chief police investigator for the Salt Lake county attorney's office after that and became the head of Sandy City's police department in 1994.

Chief Dawson was an outspoken leader in his field. In the year 2000 he spearheaded a project to produce and distribute a video called ''Your Kid May Have a Secret,'' which describes the growing problem of methamphetamine use in Utah communities. Keeping true to his style, Chief Dawson sent a copy to every county sheriff and every city police chief, asking them to freely distribute the video throughout the State.

Chief Dawson was also a leader among his peers. He led an effort to increase the size of the Sandy Police Department while at the same time increasing officer pay. He succeeded at both, increasing his department by 30 officers during his tenure and significantly increasing the wages of those who worked for him.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I end with the words of Lieutenant Kevin Thacker of the Sandy Police Department. He said, ''Sam Dawson will be greatly missed by all who knew him. He will always be remembered for his leadership abilities and dedication to the community. His death leaves a void in the police department.''

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to join me in heartfelt appreciation for the service this great man provided my community. I would also like to ask the House to join me in extending our deepest condolences to the wife of Chief Dawson, Bridgett Dawson, and her three children, Sam Jr., Chris, and Angela.

POSTAL BOARD OF GOVERNORS DECISION REGARDING 6-DAY MAIL DELIVERY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier today Mr. Robert Rider, chairman of the Postal Board of Governors, released a statement indicating that 6-day mail delivery would continue without any further study. The Postal Board of Governors had commissioned a study on April 3 to study cost savings associated with reducing delivery service to 5 days.

In response to the idea of cutting mail delivery to 5 days, I, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), introduced H. Res. 154, a bill to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

□ 1900

The bill we introduced enjoys wide bipartisan support and has more than 55 cosponsors. This bill is the companion to Senate Resolution 71 introduced by Senator HARKIN. I applaud the Postal Board of Governors' decision today to continue 6-day mail delivery. This decision means that businesses, advertisers, and others who want to reach citizens on Saturday will be able to do so.

In addition, citizens who receive paychecks, Social Security, food coupons, and other important mail will not see an interruption in their basic service. Also, it means that postal workers and letter carriers will win because cutting mail delivery to 5 days could have led to mail piling up, delivery delays, and other problems.

I commend the leadership and efforts of Moe Biller, and the American Postal Workers Union; Vincent Sombrotto; George Gould and the Letter Carriers; Kevin Richardson and the Printers; Jerry Cerasale and the Direct Marketing Association; and all of those who worked to preserve 6-day mail delivery.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is an important entity in all of our communities. As chair of the Postal Caucus, I look forward to the continued focus on the U.S. Postal Service and assuring its viability not only today but into the future.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that the agriculture appropriations bill is going to be on the floor tomorrow, let me just take a moment and remind us that the sugar subsidy program is keeping prices extraordinarily high and is driving candy makers and food processors out of my community and out of many other communities throughout the country because they end up paying an enormously high price for sugar, which is the main ingredient used in their product. As a matter of fact, Brach's Candy Company, located in the heart of the community where I live, just announced that they are going to move their plant to Argentina. Fifteen hundred jobs, 1,500 people, will be out of work. So as we look at agriculture appropriations and rewrite our agricultural policy, let us be reminded that the sugar subsidies are bad for my community, bad for the City of Chicago, bad for the food processors and candy makers and bad for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). 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.)

PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES CAN SERVE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OR ANY FIELD OF ENDEAVOR WITH JUST MINOR CHANGES

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, I was up here speaking as the proud sponsor of a resolution honoring Erik Weihenmayer, a young man who inspires not only people with disabilities but all of us struggling to overcome our own obstacles and challenges. As the first blind person to summit Mount Everest, he illustrates the immense power of the human spirit. However, while it is important to pay homage to such remarkable people, I believe it is equally important that we honor those who make such special achievements possible.

Tonight I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT); the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY); and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration; the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY); the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Small Business and all their dedicated staff, as well as those who manage the floor activity on a daily basis. They have all provided tremendous support to me as a freshman Member of the United States Congress.

My experience illustrates the compassionate understanding one can receive from his colleagues and employers once they are aware of his or her needs. I have been overwhelmed by just how considerate and flexible my colleagues have been in ensuring that I can work effectively in Congress.

When I dreamed of running for this office, I was not sure how accessible the congressional buildings would be, but from the moment I was elected in November of last year, the hard-working engineers, architects, design managers, and my fellow Members of Congress made it clear that they would do whatever was necessary to make my office, the committees on which I serve, and the House floor accessible. One of the products of this generous response to my needs, in fact, is the lectern and microphone that I am using right now. It took months to design and build this remarkable podium which can be easily raised and lowered and is truly a work of art.

I gratefully recognize all the time and resources that were dedicated to making this lectern, to installing additional voting machines on the floor, and placing ramps in my committee rooms and providing accessible office space. What everyone involved in this process may not realize, however, is that beyond enabling me to better serve my constituents, they have also opened the doors for people with disabilities to serve in this Chamber in the future.

As I have said many times before, I may be the first quadriplegic elected to the United States Congress but most certainly I will not be the last. The invaluable message that has been delivered in making this Chamber accessible is that any one of the nearly 53 million people with disabilities in this country can become a Member of the United States Congress or can serve in any other field of endeavor with just minor changes.

Mr. Speaker, people with disabilities are an integral but underutilized part of our workforce. With minor accommodations they can become an even more important part of our society and be involved in strengthening America's communities, businesses, and government. That is why I am so thankful to President Bush, who has highlighted the need to make workplaces, housing, education, technology, and our society in general, more accessible to all Americans. The President's new Freedom Initiative is an important proposal which calls for funding of a broad range of programs that together can help create countless new opportunities for many Americans who continually face unnecessary obstacles because of their disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am eager to work with President Bush to make this new Freedom Initiative a reality. To this end, I recently sent a letter co-signed by 23 of my colleagues to the House appropriators seeking their support in providing funds for the President's proposals. This is an issue on which we can all come together regardless of party background and help open doors for millions of people who are eager to conquer new challenges.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I extend my heartfelt thanks to the dozens of people who have made my tenure in Congress possible. Ensuring that some day every workplace in America will be able to respond to the special needs of employees in the same way is one of my top priorities in Congress. When that happens, we will all benefit from the remarkable talents and contributions of the millions of Americans with disabilities who are eager to pursue their dreams just as I have.

TRIBUTE TO BIRDIE KYLE

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in the rush to greatness upon which many of us embark in this city, in the heat of the TV camera lights, in the chaos of clashing interests, it is important that we pause and take stock of those who brought us here, keep us here, and help make us. So this evening I thank and I pay respect to my long-time legislative director Birdie Kyle who passed away over our recent work period.

Birdie once wrote, ''I am a native West Virginian born in Fayette County at MacDunn but raised up on Cabin Creek in the coalfields. I was born in a one-room abandoned boxcar. When I was little, my older sister tormented me when she felt like it by calling me ''Old Boxcar Bill.' I do not remember which made me the madder, being reminded that I was born in a boxcar or being called Bill when I was a girl. Probably both.''

That was Birdie Kyle writing for West Virginia's Goldenseal Magazine in 1980.

Well, Boxcar Bill traveled far from her humble beginnings, but she never lost sight of the hills of home or the people there.

Birdie Kyle, a true coal miner's daughter, a native West Virginian in every sense, served West Virginia and our Nation in the Congress for more than 3 decades. Birdie served with me since 1989, and I appreciate deeply her loyalty and dedication. Before that, she spent most of her career with the late Senator Jennings Randolph.

Her mainstay of work for the Senator and for me was education. For Birdie, education was not a part of one's life. It was life itself. Teachers captivated her. Students compelled her.

Books were with her always, from her earliest moments to her latest nights. If books were her backbone, words were her blood. She was the mother of wordsmiths and, boy, could she make me sound good.

Birdie's letters, more often than not, prompted replies, and I got more kudos from her letters than anything.

Her list of legislative responsibilities in my office over the years reads like a record of the republic itself: Education to health care, the Postal Service to the Middle East. As one person who called to express their sympathy said, ''She knew everything and everybody.''

How true. She could converse on every subject, but that was not her most unique attribute. She did not care if one was king or commoner. She was going to sway you to her belief before you left the building, and most of the time she did.

Will there ever be another Birdie Kyle? No. Can one person fill her shoes? No.

Birdie was, in addition, the poet laureate of the office. Each Christmas and on my birthday she composed wonderful verses that not only made me feel special but it was so wonderful I started believing it.

She gave me my voice on many issues, issues of life and death, on wealth and poverty, on education and ignorance, health care and child care.

Her deep compassion infected us all. In a city where a lot of people can

make a buck off an issue, Birdie poured her heart and soul into those issues and sought nothing in return.

Her family, her mother, her sisters, her children, and grandson all meant everything to Birdie. In fact, I think she would have liked to adopt me because sometimes she thought I needed a mom in town, and she was probably right.

Each time that she came in to see me in my office to offer her advice and wisdom, she would tap lightly on my door. No one else ever did that. I knew that I was either in trouble for a vote I had cast on the floor that day contrary to her suggestions, or I was in store for a witty argument on an upcoming vote in this body.

There will be many days and many nights ahead when I will miss that tapping at my door, but I will have many years of memories, many years of good counsel and many years of friendship upon which to reflect and rely.

Washington is a city of monuments hewn of stone and sewn with mortar. We can admire these great people and we should, but Washington is also the city that spreads forth the ray of hope for our Nation and our world. Birdie Kyle spent her life igniting that hope.

I was honored to know and work with Birdie. Without her, I would not have been as good a representative nor as good a person as I am. Many of us in this body can say that about our staff.

About right now, somebody up there in heaven is getting a morning briefing from Birdie, and I am sure it is not a pretty sight with all that needs to be righted in the world. We all know that heaven is in good hands with Birdie Kyle up there at the helm.

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

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

□ 1915

SALVATION ARMY DISCRIMINATING AGAINST GAYS AND LESBIANS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening because of a shocking story that appeared on the front page of the Washington Post this morning about a secret deal between, of all people, of all organizations, the Salvation Army, to support charitable choice in exchange for the issuance of a White House regulation, OMB Circular No. A–102, that would deny assistance to States or localities that require religious charities to adhere to their nondiscrimination laws as they apply to gay men and women. Now, of course, these nondiscrimination laws have to do with the activities of these religious charities that do not relate to their religions.

A political deal should be beneath the dignity of the Salvation Army, given its long Christian heritage, not to mention the President of the United States. It is a deal to discriminate under the table.

According to the lead document, this cannot be done in the legislative process very easily, so they had to do it by regulation. Charitable choice already contains a fatal flaw, because, as put forward by the administration, it would allow a religious organization to discriminate using government money by requiring people it hires to do a government task to be of their religion. That is a direct violation of Title VI and of the Constitution of the United States.

I am a former Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I strongly support an exemption in the law that I administered, Title VII, which allows a religious denomination an exemption to the antidiscrimination law in hiring people of their own religion with their own money. But we cannot give the Baptists and the Lutherans and the Catholics and the Jews our money and say you can discriminate when you perform services in our name. That is already a problem with the bill.

But in order to make it perfectly clear, in case that does not survive, that at least people who are gay and lesbian should not be discriminated against, this would be done by regulation.

Mr. Speaker, why the Salvation Army would engage in this deal is really perplexing. The Salvation Army already gets $300 million in funds from the Federal Government to do their wonderful work. They get it because they abide by government regulations that say when you use government money, you cannot proselytize, you cannot engage in religion, because this is America, and this is what we have stood for, for everybody. So they already get money, just like Catholic charities and just like Lutheran charities and just like Jewish charities all get money, and they have accepted it, and I hope they will continue to get it on the basis that everybody else who does the government's work accepts it, and that is as long as we are doing the government's work, then your money is the public money, and we cannot discriminate against anybody when giving those services.

This body has already a long history of discriminating against gays and lesbians in the District of Columbia, because whenever there is anything in our law that allows equal protection for people of a different sexual orientation, then somebody hops up here and tries, and often succeeds, in overturning the law. Now we are trying to do to do what you do to the District of Columbia to hundreds of localities and States in the United States.

I hope everybody understands what it feels like to intrude in the affairs of local jurisdictions in a federalist society, a society where we say, look, different strokes for different folks. Some of us behave one way with respect to our laws, others another way. Some people have chosen to protect gay men and lesbians against discrimination, and I say God bless them. In the 21st century we should not be discriminating against any Americans based on a characteristic that has nothing to do with performance. Sexual orientation has nothing to do with performance, and the last people, the last organizations who should be engaged in such discrimination are organizations that go by the name ''Christian,'' and the Salvation Army should be ashamed of itself that it has been caught red-handed on the front page of the Washington Post in the column where you put war and peace. Thank God that they were exposed.

NATURAL RESOURCES

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, I am a little surprised by the previous speaker and her unrelenting attack against the Salvation Army. She apparently got the merits for this attack from one newspaper article. I have heard the gentlewoman previously speak from here. I think she is well-educated. She comes generally with numerous sources when she speaks. That is why I am very surprised that she takes one newspaper article and launches an attack against the Salvation Army, which I would like to say to the gentlewoman has helped millions and millions of people throughout the history of this country. I think such an attack is unfounded, and I think you should hear the other side of the story.

I would advise the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia to immediately go to a TV, turn on CNN on the half-hour, or some other broadcast, and she will find that the other side of the story has come out. In fact, I just spent some time, I was not looking for the story, I was grabbing a snack and watching the other side of the story being played out, and once the gentlewoman sees that, she will moderate the comments against the Salvation Army.

I do not disagree with her point, I want to make this clear to the gentlewoman. I do not think any kind of secret deal should be made. But I do not think the Salvation Army went out and made a secret deal to discriminate against people, contrary to the laws of the United States. And I think that in all fairness to the Salvation Army, as well as the President of the United States, that both sides of the story should be read, both sides of the story

should be analyzed, and then the concluding remarks that the gentlewoman has could then be made on the House floor.

Now, that is not the purpose of my comments this evening. My real focus this evening is on natural resources. But before we go to natural resources, I want to spend a couple of moments also on the comments of another speaker.

Unfortunately, as my colleagues know, we have one speaker at a time. We only have one speaker at a time that gets the opportunity up here. So I have heard some of these, and I heard another attack regarding the energy situation in the State of California. So I want to reiterate a couple of points that I think are important for the energy situation that we have in California.

Remember that the energy crisis that exists in California does not exist in 50 States. In fact, in 49 of the 50 States, they are not having the kind of problems that California is having. In other words, the problems in California are as a result of a combination of a number of different factors that have come into play, not the least of which is that the State of California has refused to help itself, has refused to help itself, by allowing power plants to be built over the last 10 years, by allowing natural gas transmission lines to go into their State, by allowing electrical transmission lines to go into their State.

California has paid a very dear price. Of all 50 States out there, of all 50 States, California has been the lead State opposing any kind of energy transmission in their State, opposing power plants. They are the ones where the old saying, ''Not in my backyard,'' it is out of that State that that came.

So I do not think a speaker, I do not think one should stand up here and make California look like some poor innocent victim in the Western United States who somehow is picked out of 50 States and is the only State in the kind of crisis they are in, and then have one stand up here and accuse the power companies of theft. I do not know whether there has been theft or not, but let me tell you, the problem is much broader than a power company like Duke Energy.

The problem that you have got out there is you have to face a couple realities. Number one, conservation is absolutely critical, and it is going to be a critical component about how California, and, frankly, the rest of the Nation, can avoid getting into the same spot that California got into by adopting some pretty simple methods of conservation.

Conservation does not mean you have to suffer in your life-style. There are a lot of very simple things that you can do in your life-style that do not give you a negative impact, that do not serve as an inconvenience for you. Just think of them: Shut the lights off when you leave the room; make sure your fan is turning in a clockwise fashion in the summer; make sure you change your oil when the owner's manual tells you to change the oil on your car, instead of being marketed into changing your oil every 3,000 miles by the quick-lubes. There are a lot of things we can consider. Conservation is very critical for California.

The second thing that is very critical for California is you have got to get over that habit, I guess you would say, or almost an idealism that you have locked into, and that is ''not in my backyard.'' In other words, let the other 49 States build the power plants, let the other 49 States worry about electrical transmission lines, let the other 49 States worry about natural gas exploration and oil exploration, et cetera, et cetera. You cannot do that, California. California, you are going to have to help yourself. You are going to have to help pull yourself up by the bootstraps.

Now, let me say, I am a fan of California. I like the State of California, and California is a State. We have 50 States. We are unified like brothers and sisters. We should not abandon California. I do not think we should stand up here and bash California.

But we need to be frank with each other. California, quit pointing the finger at everybody else. California, quit saying it is everybody else's fault. You know what you need to do is help pull yourself up by your own bootstraps. And we should help, too. I do not think California should be left to die on the vine out there, so to speak.

California, after all, if it were a country, it would be the seventh most powerful country in the world. It is huge in economics for this country, and every State of the Union is dependent upon good economic health in the State of California. But I think it is grossly unfair for any of my colleagues to stand up here and make it sound like it is everybody's fault but California's, and that everybody ought to pitch in but California, and that California has been abused here and California has been abused there.

There are a lot of good minds in California, and a lot of those people will say, you know, we have to have conservation, number one; and, number two, we have got to have power plants.

The fact is we need electricity in our everyday lives. We need oil. We need gas. We need it in a balanced fashion. And, to California's credit, although in many cases they may have gone overboard, in many cases California has been the leading State in demanding that the energy production be clean production, in demanding that we have higher efficiencies, and, to California's credit, just here in the last month or 2 months, California is responding to conservation. My understanding is their conservation has resulted in about a 10 percent decrease in the demand for energy that that State is having.

So, the only reason I am making my comments, which are a little off the subject of which I wanted to talk about this evening, water, although when we talk about water, we are going to talk about energy and the renewable energy of water and its resource, my purpose in commenting is I just think somebody has to stand up here when some of my colleagues take this microphone and talk about ''poor old California'' and how it is everybody else's fault.

You know, California, what you try to do, I will tell you what got California in this mess. They had a new theory of deregulation, and they went out to the customers in California and said, we will keep your price the same, no matter what happens out here in the market. We will buy on the spot market, and, regardless of what happens, the average will always allow us, even though it goes up and down, the average line in there will always allow you to be sold power at the same price. Something for nothing. That is exactly what they promised, something for nothing.

For a little while it worked. Forty-nine other States did not adopt that policy. Forty-nine other States did not think they could get something for nothing. Forty-nine other States allowed power production to be built in their State. Forty-nine other States allowed electrical transmission lines. Forty-nine other States allowed natural gas transmission lines. But California thought they discovered something new, and that is by denial, by guaranteeing flat rates, and by shoving the obligations on the other 49 States, they thought they could sail through this, and they have not been able to.

Now, what is happening out there, I think that the Governor finally, I notice a couple of weeks ago he went over and cut the ribbon for a new power generation facility. Finally they are going to allow some generation to be built in that State. Finally this ''not in my own backyard'' is going to be adjusted, not eliminated, because I do not think it should be put in every backyard, but it is going to be adjusted, and California is going to get back on its feet.

I do not think California is in for the kind of crisis that some people on this floor think it is going to be in for. It has been a good lesson not just for the State of California, but a good lesson for all 50 States, that, look, we need to plan for our future. We have an obligation to have some kind of vision into the future, to talk about what the energy needs are not only of today's generation, but what we can do for energy for tomorrow's generation, and that means serious discussions on alternative energy, although, as you know right now, do not be led down the path that alternative energy today is the answer.

If you took all the alternative energy in the world, all of the alternative energy in the world, and devoted every bit of it to the United States, it only supplies 3 percent of our needs.

□ 1930

So do not exaggerate what alternative energy can do for us today. But we should focus on what alternative energy can do for us tomorrow. All 50 States should do this. What happened in California was a warning shot to the entire Nation, and that is, we need to have an energy policy. That is exactly what has been missing here in the last few years. During the Clinton administration we had zero energy policy.

I am very interested, by the way, to read the newspapers. I cannot find a newspaper, and maybe there is one out there, maybe the Wall Street Journal, but I cannot find much coverage or any kind of criticism of the Clinton administration for not having an energy policy for the last 8 years. But we can pick up any newspaper on a daily basis and see criticism against the current administration because they are trying to develop an energy policy.

We need to put all of these things on the table. We need to discuss and debate and analyze exactly what it is that we have put on that table. We need to add things or take things off. But in the end we need a product that is called an energy policy that will allow us and instill upon us a vision for the future of this country, that will allow us to avoid the very kind of crisis that California got into, that will allow us less dependency on foreign oil.

But we will not get that without some type of policy, and we will not come to that policy without some kind of debate. But instead, they are criticizing the debate; instead they are criticizing the administration in trying to put an energy policy together to put some ideas on the table and let us have discussions on this floor. Do not continually, colleagues, come to this floor and criticize. Everybody is to blame for California. Do not come to this floor, colleagues, and try and let all of us believe that the answer to this, the sole answer to this, is alternative energy or more conservation. All of those factors have to come together for the answer that we need.

As much as you want to deny it, the fact is we are going to have to have more electrical generations. I think we are going to be responsive to that. In fact, in the rest of the Nation, in the other 49 States we are going to have a number of States that will have an electrical glut in about a year. Part of the problem is we do not have the electrical transmission lines to move that electricity. But my point is this, and that is that it is unfair for my good colleague from the State of California to speak at this microphone and act as if California's problems belong to the energy companies in the other 49 States. This was a problem that was brought upon themselves. It is a problem that all of us should help them get out of, but they have got to lead. They have got to have a little self-help. They have got to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. And for the rest of us, colleagues, we have to sit down and work with the administration and come up with an energy policy that gives us vision for the future.

Let me move from that subject to another subject. A subject that is near and dear to my heart. It is going to be a boring subject to my colleagues. I know that many of you will probably find yourself snoring or not find this of particular interest, because it is about water.

Water is one of the most wonderful things of our life. It is one of the more wonderful creations of God, if one believes in God, which I do. It is something that obviously we all know sustains life. It sustains a number of different factors in life.

Water is pretty boring. Why? Because we have been blessed in most cases with plenty of water. As long as water runs out of the faucet, as long as the toilet flushes, as long as there is drinking water out of the sink it is not such a big issue. It is when it stops that all of the sudden it becomes a big issue.

Just the same as energy, I think we need to have a vision for water in the future. Frankly, we have had from the generations and generations of people that have preceded us, we have seen vision for water. We have seen different types of utilizations of water and different planning for water for future generations. But in order for us to continue that kind of vision, we need to understand what water is about and what it has that is so valuable to our everyday lives.

So I thought I would start out and visit just a little about the importance of our water.

Let me say, first of all, in the State capital, my district is obviously in Colorado, my district is the highest district in the Nation, so I am at the highest elevation in the Nation. Up in my district, it snows year-round up on top of those mountain peaks. It is cold up there. It gets high. That is where a lot of this Nation's water comes from, are off the mountain peaks in my congressional district. So I think I know a little about water.

In our State capitol of the State of Colorado, if any of my colleagues ever have an opportunity to go visit, go take a look at it. It is a beautiful building to start off with, but it has a number of different murals throughout the capitol building. Do you know what you see in every mural in the State capitol building in Colorado? Somewhere in that mural, you will see water, because water is the lifeblood in the West. Water is the lifeblood everywhere; but in the West, we are in a unique part of this Nation. There is a distinct difference between the eastern United States and the western United States.

Mr. Speaker, one-half of the Nation is blessed with a lot of water. In fact, in the eastern United States, you see lawsuits or disagreements about: hey, put that water on my neighbor's land. I do not want that water. In the West, the suits are just the opposite. In the West, there are range wars fought, not only over sheep and cattle, but over water. They say water out there in the West does run like blood, and it is fought over with blood, and that it is as valuable as blood. That is the importance of water in the West; and there is a distinction, as I said.

But in the State capitol there in Colorado, there is this language: ''Here is a land where life is written in Water. The West is where the Water was and is Father and Son of old Mother and Daughter following Rivers up immensities of Range and Desert, thirsting the Sundown ever crossing a hill to climb a hill still Drier, naming tonight a City by some River a different Name from last night's camping Fire. Look to the Green within the Mountain cup; Look to the Prairie parched for Water lack; Look to the Sun that pulls the Oceans up; Look to the Cloud that gives the oceans back. Look to your Heart and may your Wisdom grow to power of Lightning and to peace of Snow.'' That is Thomas Hornsby Ferril.

That is a saying in our capitol. That is why water is so critical.

Let us look over a few statistics that are important. First of all, the interesting thing that I found about water, if we look at all of the water in the world, all of the water in the world, 97 percent of the water is the salt water; 97 percent. So only 3 percent of the water we have in the world is drinking-type of water, is nonsalt water, is clear water. And of the remaining 3 percent, if we took 75 percent of that 3 percent, that is all tied up in the ice caps up in the polar ice caps. So when we take a look at the amount of water worldwide, without the technological advances that perhaps the future will bring us for salinity and desalinization, we find that there is not really a large amount of water that we can use out of that big pot of water out there.

When we take a look at our country, we can see that stream flow in the United States; and as I said earlier, there is a difference between the eastern United States and the western United States, but 73 percent of the stream flow in the United States is in the eastern United States. It is not in the western United States. So we have 73 percent in the East, and then in the Pacific Northwest we have another 12 percent, and then the rest of the West, which makes up over half of the Nation. Remember, the West is vast in quantity of land. If we take the West, minus the Pacific Northwest, which consists of more than half of the Nation, we have 14 percent of the Nation's water. So in other words, more than half of the Nation has 14 percent of the water to provide life. That is pretty amazing.

So we should understand that it is important that our water does not come on a consistent basis and it does not come in the same amount of quantity every year, year after year. In fact, day after day, the quantity of water that we have varies in the West,

and it is not at all consistent. Some years we have great snowfall; but it gets too warm in the spring too early, and it runs off before we can use it. Some winters we do not get great snowfall, so we have drought. In much of the West right now we are facing drought conditions.

The critical issue to remember about the West when we talk about water is that in the West, we have to store our water. We are going to talk about the mighty Colorado River. The State of Colorado is called the ''Mother State of Rivers,'' and we will go into that. It has four major rivers that come out of Colorado. In fact, the Colorado River out of the State of Colorado provides drinking water for 25 million people, 25 million people. So my good friends in Phoenix or Las Vegas or Tucson, you are totally dependent upon the Colorado River. In Los Angeles, you are almost totally dependent on the Colorado River.

The thing to keep in mind is that in the West, since we do not have consistent rainfall, we have very low rainfall. In fact, in the State of Colorado, we get about 16 inches a year, 16 inches a year. In some of the communities here, they get 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18 inches in a heavy rain storm in a day, and that is pretty remarkable. So in the West, we have to be able to store our water, because when we do have a lot of water, we do have a lot of water during one period of time generally, and that is called spring runoff. When the high snows come into the mountains in the wintertime and it accumulates and accumulates and accumulates, and then in the springtime, when the flowers start to pop up, everything starts to green, the snow starts to melt, and very rapidly, and for about 30 to 90 days, for about 30 to 90 days, really probably 30 to 60 days, we have all the water we need in the West. It is called the spring runoff. We have all the water we need. But the problem is, for the balance of the year, we do not. That is in part one of the reasons we need to store our water in the West, why we need to have dams in the West.

Now, in the East there are some radical environmental organizations, Earth First and some of the groups like that. Frankly, the national Sierra Club, which has never supported a water storage project in the history of that organization, they would like to make people in the East believe that in the West, a dam is an abuse of the environment, that these dams are nothing but atrocious toys for construction companies. We are totally dependent in the West.

Mr. Speaker, any family or friends that we have in the West, they are totally dependent on our capability to store water. By the way, you know when the first dam was that we could find on the Colorado River? One thousand years ago. One thousand years ago the Anasazi Indians down at Mesa Verde, Mesa Table, Verde Green, the Green Table, down in Mesa Verde we found proof that the Anasazi Indians were the first ones to come up with a dam; and they had reservoirs and they had canals, and then the Indian tribe, the Anasazis went extinct. We think the reason they went extinct was because they did not have enough runoff to store the water. So after hundreds of years, a period of time, the Anasazi goes out, we think the reason they became extinct was because of the lack of water.

So those are some very interesting things. Let us look very quickly here, I covered here pretty much, so I think this is the critical point here: there is only 14 percent of the total stream flow to be shared by 14 States which make up over half of the Nation's land use.

Now, let us talk, just for a moment, because I think this next chart I want to show really was stunning to me. I found it fascinating. I had no idea how much water is required in our everyday life. I am not talking about showers or using the restroom or drinking water. I am talking about water for agriculture.

□ 1945

This is about water for agriculture. I watched with some interest the fact that out in the West the Federal Government has shut down farmers because they need to protect the sucker fish. I do not know enough about the dispute to argue on either side of that, but it has been on the national news the last few days. Watch and see how critical that issue becomes. It is critical for life out there in the West.

Look at this chart. See if the Members are as interested in this as I am. Direct use of the water. This is water we would use every day. The average person uses two gallons to drink and cook in, two gallons of water.

Imagine, at the grocery store, we all have an idea what a gallon of milk jug looks like. Two of those are necessary just for the drinking and cooking. For flushing the toilet for one's own personal use, we need about five to seven of those gallons of water.

We have the grocery cart. We have two gallons for drinking and cooking. Now we have to put six, between five and seven, so say six more gallons for the use of the toilet. If we do wash that day we will have to put 20 more gallons into the shopping cart.

Now it is time for a second shopping cart. If we use the dishwasher that day, we will need 25 more gallons into that shopping cart. Then, if we take a shower because we sweated so much from putting all of that water into the shopping carts, it is another nine gallons.

Now take a look at what growing food takes, because growing food is what uses the most water. But what is the most beautiful aspect of water? What is the key ingredient of water? It is a renewable resource. One person's waste is another person's water.

I remember years ago in Colorado when they came out and said that what we need to do, they demand that we go and lay concrete in all the ditches; line the ditches, because that water seeping into the ground is a huge waste of water.

Do Members know what happens when we line a ditch and stop the seepage of the water within that ditch? We may be drying up a spring of somebody 3 miles away. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the technology today to look underneath the Earth and see where every little vein of water goes and how it connects.

The generations that will follow us will find it fascinating, because they will have the technological apparatus to take a look and say, gosh, this ditch provides for this spring, which is 10 miles away, and this aquifer, which has been under the ground for thousands of years, it provides a stream to this aquifer which connects over here and pops up in a spring somewhere. Those are the kinds of things that this future generation will be able to see that we cannot see today.

But what we do know today is that water is, number one, renewable. It is not like gasoline, where we use a gallon of gasoline and it is gone forever. It is not like natural gas, where we turn on the heater and bring the natural gas through. It is gone forever. It is not like nuclear with uranium, it is gone. Water is renewable, and that is why it is so important.

Take a look. Most of the use of water is in agriculture. Now, it is interesting to me. In fact, I had the privilege, really the privilege, of being up in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. I happen to think I have the prettiest district in the Nation. I have resorts, Aspen, Durango, I have all the Rockies, almost all the mountains in Colorado, but Jackson Hole comes pretty close.

I was up in Jackson Hole. It was just beautiful, gorgeous. Of course, there is the national park, Yellowstone, the Teton National Park. I would love to discuss, and I intend to one of these nights soon, talk about the national parks and how important the national parks are for our Nation, and how many millions of people enjoy our national parks every year.

But what was interesting is that we were looking out at Jackson Lake, which is north of Jackson Hole. As we were looking out there, they have a dam on Jackson Lake. That is what created the lake was the dam. I was listening. Somebody said, ''Well, the unfortunate thing about this dam is that the Idaho farmers, the Idaho farmers get the top 36 feet. They get the first 36 feet of storage. It is let out into the Snake River and it goes to the farmers in Idaho. That is really bad.''

I thought, bad? This person is probably going to eat a potato for lunch. This person was probably going to eat lots of agricultural products during her day that were provided by water. Agriculture is not a bad thing, but we have to make the connection. We could not have a lot of agriculture in the West if we did not have the water storage to provide for it.

In fact, what we would do is have very, very little agriculture in the West, very little way to sustain life in the West. The same thing with the Anasazi 1,000 years ago. When they ran out of the capability to have water for storage, the storage would not hold enough for them, they became extinct. That is why water is so important. That is why, when we look at a dam, we should look at what all it provides.

Take a look at agriculture. This is amazing. One loaf of bread, I will bet Members did not know this, one loaf of bread, from the time we cultivate the soil to raise the wheat and to be able to process the wheat, to be able to turn it into a loaf of bread, we will have gone through 150 gallons of water, 150 gallons of water. That is what is necessary to have the final product of one loaf of bread.

One egg, this is almost unbelievable, 120 gallons for one egg. We have to raise the chicken, give the chicken water, the chicken has to have the water on a regular basis, the egg has to be cleaned and processed, there is water within the egg, et cetera, et cetera. It is 120 gallons.

To produce one quart of milk, we have to have 223 gallons of water; for one quart of milk, one quart, 223 gallons; for a pound of tomatoes, 125 gallons; a pound of oranges, 47 gallons; a pound of potatoes, 23 gallons.

So here is what happens, just so we have a comparison here. If we put 50 glasses of water, 50 of these glasses of water out, of these, how were they used? Forty-four glasses of that would be used for agriculture, for our food products, 44 of those 50 glasses. Three glasses would be used by industry, two glasses would be used by cities, and half a glass would be used in the country for rural areas. Water is critical. Mr. Speaker, this gives us somewhat of an idea of just how important it is for all of us in our everyday life.

Let me focus us back, Mr. Speaker, to the State of Colorado, because Colorado is a very unique State. As I said, it is the highest point in the Nation. It is also the only State in the Nation out of 50 States whereupon all of its water runs out. It has no incoming water for its use that comes into the State of Colorado. It all goes out. This gives an idea of the quantity of water that goes out of Colorado, the average annual outflow of major rivers through 1985.

Now, this chart is old, so these numbers are off a little, but they are not off by a lot. They are still pretty close. These are acre feet. An acre foot is how much water it would take to put one foot of water on an acre of land for 1 year, 4,540,000 acre feet right out of the Colorado River.

Up here off the Yampa River in the green, 1,576,000. Every point that we see here, here is the South Platte that goes into Nebraska, almost 400,000 acre feet of water. Down here on the Arkansas River, 133,000 acre feet. Over here on the Animas River, 700,000 acre feet. Here, of course, is the mighty Colorado.

This chart right here, Mr. Speaker, gives us an idea of the State of Colorado, which is a critical State for the West. Of all of the States in the West, I cannot think of any State that is more important for the water supply of the West. Remember, this is not just water for agriculture but it is water for hydropower, hydroelectric, whether Lake Mead or Lake Powell, Glen Canyon or the Hoover Dam, water for recreation, et cetera. Here Colorado is the key State because of its high elevation, because of its snowfall, which provides the flow of water.

Colorado is really divided here into four major water basins: the Missouri; here we have the South Platte River; the Arkansas, we have the Arkansas River that goes through here. We also have down in here the Rio Grande, the Rio Grande River, which goes down near Alamosa, Colorado. Here on the Western side of the State we have the mighty Colorado River.

Remember that, regarding the rivers in the West, as well as in the East, in the old days we used to have to live close to the rivers, but as man has evolved with technology, we can live further and further away from the rivers. So while the Colorado River, of which 70 percent of the water within that river basin is provided by the State of Colorado, and by the way, the Colorado River is one of the longest rivers in the Nation, but because of the technology, that water is moved.

For example, in Colorado it is moved from the western part of the State, my district, which has 80 percent of the water resources. There is a good quantity of water that is moved from our part of the State to the eastern part of the State, which has 80 percent of the population.

It is the same thing in Arizona. We have the Central Arizona Water Project, where we move water away from the basin into the cities, like Phoenix and Tucson or Los Angeles. We have the water project down in Los Angeles. So we move water from these basins. We have to have the capability to divert.

This real quickly just gives us an idea. I mentioned that the Colorado River is one of the longest rivers in the Nation. This gives us an idea.

Now, out here we have the Gulf of California, but in actuality most of the water that is left, when it enters Mexico near Baja, it is used by the country of Mexico.

It is interesting that when the Colorado River was first divided up, they figured there were about 15 million acre feet of water a year that came down the Colorado River, 15 million acre feet. So they divided it, and in about 1922 they had what they called the Colorado River Compact. That is a very important compact for the West, and probably of all the water compacts in the West, that is the most critical. It divided what we called the Upper Basin States and the Lower Basin States. The Upper Basin got 7½ million acre feet, and the Lower Basin got 7½ million acre feet of water every year.

But unfortunately, when those calculations were made, they were made when we had a very unusual year. We had the highest flow in any number of years. They were recorded at the highest record of flow. So in fact, we really do not produce 15 million acre feet of water on an average year out of the Colorado, which means that a lot of the Colorado River water is overappropriated.

Now, on top of the 15 million acre feet, here is an interesting story for us. In World War II, the United States was concerned, as was the country of Mexico, that the Japanese would try and invade the United States through the country of Mexico. So the Mexican authorities and the United States, the American authorities, got together. Mexico wanted the defense of their country. The Americans did not want the Japanese in Mexico, so the Americans agreed to supply reinforcements or troops to the country of Mexico to defend Mexico if the Japanese invaded.

The Mexican government, being the better negotiator of the two, said that we should want to keep the Japanese out of their country, and it is nice of us to protect them, but we ought to give them something for it, like 1½ million acre feet of the Colorado River.

So that is exactly what happened. In 1944, the United States government agreed to give the country of Mexico 1.5 million acre feet, 750,00 from the Lower Basin States, 750,0000 from the Upper Basin States, of the surplus waters. Of course, there is a dispute over ''surplus,'' which is going on between the Upper Basin States and Lower Basin States.

They are getting too technical right now, my comments, but suffice it to say that the Colorado River Compact is really the point I want to make here. That is what has taken one of the longest rivers of the Nation and has divided it between the States that benefit from it. The Colorado River supplies drinking water for about 25 million people.

One of the first people to explore, and we have all heard this name before, was John Wesley Powell. He explored. This, of course, had been discovered before by the Spanish, by the Anasazis, et cetera, et cetera, but John Wesley Powell and his party mapped and explored the Colorado River.

They used wooden boats, and Mr. Speaker, I am sure some of my colleagues have rafted in Colorado. We think we have some of the best rafting, if not the best rafting, in the Nation. It is pretty scary. Imagine before those rivers were controlled by dams, before we had flood control, imagine the kind of rafts back then. They were big wooden barges, as we would see them today. That is what he went down on.

Think of the disease and unknown territory. In fact, some of them probably still believed the Earth was flat. It was a pretty challenging thing. You died at a young age if you wanted to go

out and explore the West. But John Powell and his parties did exactly that. In 1869 he described the roil and boil of the rivers that pass through the treacherous passages, like the Grand Canyon, and the hard labor of the boat crews just to keep it going.

But John Wesley Powell mapped the Colorado River, and talked in his journal, in his diaries, and explained much of what he saw in the Colorado River. The result of the Colorado River, by the way, is what has provided absolute beauty, the Grand Canyon and the canyons in Utah.

Mr. Speaker, if Members have never been out to the West, go to Colorado first, and of course spend money in the Third District, but go little further West and go into Utah and see those gorgeous canyons. Go into Arizona and see exactly what this mighty river has carved over all of these hundreds and thousands of years.

Here is a good example. The Colorado River carved many of the gorges and canyons in the Colorado plateau. Dead Horse Point State Park in eastern Utah preserves the natural state of Meander Canyon, aptly named for the fantastic twists and turns the river etched into the soft sedimentary rock of the plateau.

When Members stand from this position, where my pointer is, and they look out, these are huge canyon walls. We can see where the river is from the green that goes through, that cuts through all of this. This was all cut by the Colorado River.

□ 2000

It is a fabulous study, our history of this Nation and what it has provided for us. But it is also critical for the life-style of the people out there.

Now, my colleagues will find that there is focused attention on the West. Remember that almost all of the Nation's public lands are in the Western United States. They are not in the Eastern United States. Let me very quickly kind of give a brief history on how that occurred.

When we first settled our country, most of our population was on the eastern seaboard, and this country, this United States of America, wanted to grow. But back then, to grow, you had to buy land. And if you bought the land, the title did not mean much. If you had a deed, you had a deed that said, hey, you own the State of Colorado or you own out there in the West this chunk of land, these millions of acres, but it did not mean much. The only way that you could obtain your land after you bought it was to get out there with a six-shooter on your side and possess the land. That is where the saying came from, the old saying that ''possession is nine-tenth's of the law.''

That is exactly what happened that created public lands in the West and almost no public lands in the East. Why? Because our leaders in Washington, D.C. knew we needed to settle the frontier. We had gotten the Louisiana Purchase, we had gotten a number of other lands, and we needed to somehow give incentive to the population in the east to go west. ''Go west, young man, go west,'' as the saying went. So they decided to have land grants. They decided to have the Homestead Act, where if a person went out to Kentucky, and that was west to them, Kentucky was west, or go out to Missouri and Kansas and even to eastern Colorado, 160 acres back then could provide for a family. So they gave this land to the citizens of the United States who would go out and occupy the land, or possess the land on behalf of the United States of America. And after so many years, 5 or 6 years of working that land, you would own the land.

Well, the problem was when they got to the Colorado Rockies, guess what happened? One hundred sixty acres did not even feed a cow. So they came back to Washington and said people are going west but when they hit the mountains they are going around trying to figure a way to get to the ocean side, the Pacific Ocean, but they are not staying in the mountains. How do we get them there? Somebody said maybe we should give them an equivalent amount of land. We give 160 acres in Kansas or even in eastern Colorado, let us give them what it would take, the equivalent amount of land, let us say 3,000 acres in the mountains. Somebody else said, no, no, we cannot politically do that. There is no way we could give out 3,000 acres to a particular individual and survive politically.

So somebody came up with the idea, well, let us just go ahead in the west and let us let the government go ahead and hold the title in our name, the government's name, and let the people use the land. Let us have a concept called multiple use, ''a land of many uses.'' Let us have the West be a land of many uses. That is how we can get around that. We can get people to settle there. We will say, look, you do not get to put the land in your name, but you get to use it for yourself.

Now, in recent times, that has been misinterpreted in many cases by some of the more extreme environmental radicals in the country, who say, look, the land in the West was intended to be set aside for all future generations. While we are comfortable here in the East, they should set that land, those public lands in the West, aside. And they are doing the same kind of thing for the water.

Clearly, we have to have a balance. And thank goodness we had somebody like Theodore Roosevelt, who took a look at Yellowstone and with awe and a great deal of thought and, frankly, a great deal of brilliance put that into a national park. We have wonderful national parks on those public lands. We are pretty proud of those public lands. My district has huge amounts of public lands. But we have to be able to utilize those public lands, and it is the same thing with our rivers.

We have to have dams in the West. My point in speaking tonight is not to just have my colleagues walk out of here with some book knowledge on the topic of water, but to understand the difference between the Western United States and the Eastern United States when it comes to water and the necessity of water resources and the necessity to store water and the necessity to use hydropower.

By the way, in all of our discussions, especially of the last few months, when we have had debates and so on about the energy crisis, remember the cleanest energy producer out there is water. We do not need fuel to put water into a hydroelectric facility. All we do is take the energy of the water as it drops, turn a turbine, and we create electricity and then we can move the electricity.

My real focus here this evening in front of my colleagues, especially those from the East, is to ask you to remember that life is different in the West. Sure, we are all American citizens and we are not saying we are being picked upon but we are saying there is a difference. There is a difference between night and day. A part of it is caused by the fact that most of the public lands are in the West. They are not here in the East. It is very easy, colleagues, to put regulations on us in the West, on public lands, because those in the East feel no pain. The East does not have any public lands. Well, there are the Appalachians, and a chunk down there in the Everglades, but, in essence, when we talk about public lands in the East, we are talking about the local courthouse or the property around the courthouse.

When we talk about lands in the West, we are talking about 98 percent of some of our States, like Alaska. In my State alone, in my district alone, now get ahold of this, in my district I have over 22 million acres of public lands. And there is water on there. And that water is absolutely essential, one, for diversion, and, two, for the protection of the environment that we have. But my focus here this evening is that I hope, as my colleagues leave and that as I conclude my remarks, that everyone understands how important water is in the West; that we are arid out there in the West.

We have over half of the Nation's land in the Western United States, over half of it, and we have 14 percent of the water. That means that I think my colleagues have to approach us with a little more open mind. When we talk about water storage projects in the West, when we are trying to stop a bill, for example, backed by the national Sierra Club, that we understand their number one goal is to take down Lake Powell. Now, Lake Powell and Lake Meade, those dams provide 80 percent of the water storage for the West, yet the national Sierra Club wants to take out almost half, almost half of our water storage in the West because they do not like dams.

That is their number one goal. I am not making this up. It is in their publications. Their president's number one

goal is to tear down Lake Powell, the second largest recreational, just behind Lake Mead for recreation, the second largest recreational facility in the West, despite the hydropower that it produces, the amount of water it stores for us out there. So, colleagues, when the national Sierra Club comes and talks to you and wants you to sign on to taking down Lake Powell, please, please understand that life in the West, when it comes to water, when it comes to public lands is different than back here. Listen to our side of the story before you sign on to any of these bills that take fairly dramatic steps not in your area of the Nation but in our area of the Nation.

Before you sign on as a sponsor or cosponsor, take a look at the impact it creates on us. Take a look at what it does to your colleagues; take a look at the history of the Nation. I have 25 charts here that I can walk through depicting life in the West since the Anasazi Indians and since the Spanish explorers. We can walk through the time of John Wesley Powell and about how the West has managed those resources. And with all due respect, I would venture to say that many of us in this room, many of my colleagues in the room, especially those from the East, have no idea of the kind of lifestyle that is required in the West, and the natural resources and our use of the natural resources and our conservation of the natural resources.

So, please, colleagues, do not let some of these organizations convince you that all of a sudden you are an expert in western water law. Do not let these experts or groups like the national Sierra Club convince you that you should become an expert and cosponsor a bill to take down Lake Powell, which is exactly what they want to do, or to stop the Animus La Plata water project, which was promised to the Native Americans 30 or 40 years ago. Those issues are critical for us out there. This is a Nation where the Eastern United States should understand the problems of the West and understand that the water situation here is different than our water situation back there in the West.

My whole point here tonight is to tell my colleagues that in the West, as they say, our life is written in water and water is so, so critical. It has all come together. It all comes together when we begin to understand the geographical conditions, the historical conditions, the political conditions. Then we begin to say, you know, there is another side to this story that is important for all of us to understand.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up this portion of my comments about water by just simply reiterating one point, and that is that there is a difference between the Eastern United States and the Western United States when it comes to natural resources. There is a difference between the Eastern United States and the Western United States when it comes to public lands. There are very few public lands in the Eastern United States. There are vast quantities of public lands in the West.

The concept of multiple use, a land of many uses, that is how I grew up. When you would enter the government lands, which we are completely surrounded in my district, I have over 100 communities, I have a district larger than the State of Florida, and every community except one is completely surrounded by public lands, and when we enter the national forest and so on, if any of my colleagues have ever been out to the national parks or public lands, it says something like, ''you are now entering the White River National Forest.'' And there used to be a sign under that that said, ''a land of many uses.'' A land of many uses.

Now we are seeing groups like the national Sierra Club or Earth First or more radical environmental groups coming out and saying they want to take that sign, ''the land of many uses,'' they want to take it off and put on a sign that says ''no trespassing.'' And it is the same thing with our water. The quickest way to drive people out of the West is to cut off their water. And it is not complicated. In the Eastern United States it would be very complicated to shut off the water. You have a lot of it. It rains all the time. In the West, all we have to do is take down a couple of dams.

Go ahead, let the national Sierra Club take down Lake Powell. You take down Lake Powell, and you will shut off a large portion of the west. You would take away life, the human population, and, by the way, a great deal of vegetation and animal population out there because we have been able to utilize that water and store that water so we can use it beyond the spring runoff. So keep in mind in the west life is written in water.

Let me use my final concluding remarks on a topic that is obviously totally unrelated, but I want to go back to my remarks at the beginning of this and that is on this energy thing. By the way, I heard some comments earlier today that we have no free market in the energy, that we need to have the government run the energy business in this country. Nothing would be worse than inviting the government into our front doors to begin running our energy companies for us. Nothing would be worse than allowing the government to intercede in the private marketplace.

Now, I am not speaking about stopping antitrust, where intercession is necessary. According to Adam Smith, and he is right, a monopoly is a dangerous tool to management. But to intercede and to actually become almost socialistic like, where we would have the government supply the power and the gasoline, and we would have the government guarantee it will all come at a reasonable price, we should not buy into this concept that the government is going to be able to give us something for nothing.

Take a look, for example, at the government's intercession in lots of other different programs. In almost every case, when the government takes over or begins to think that it can do better than the private marketplace, we end up with lots of regulation, we end up with subsidies, and we never get something for nothing. This energy is a problem that we all have to work through.

The way we work through it is we put several components together. One of those critical components is conservation. Now, not every citizen can go out and find natural gas, not every citizen is going to be able to build a transmission line out there, and not every citizen can build a generation plant, but one thing that every citizen in our Nation can do is to help conserve. And if we want to keep the government out of our lives, we only need to help conserve energy. Because the more energy that we waste, the more energy shortages we then have, the more temptation there is to have the government come in as a quick fix, as some kind of waving of the magic wand that the government is going to be able to deliver to us any kind of product at a cheaper price. The private marketplace does pretty good if we can all help.

So to conclude this portion of my remarks, let me say that I think it is incumbent upon every citizen in this country, and I speak through my colleagues, that we have to go out into our districts and encourage our constituents. Because if there is one thing that every citizen in this country can do to help alleviate the energy crisis, that exists primarily in California but is a warning shot to the rest of the Nation, it is to conserve.

□ 2015

And we can all do it by simply shutting off our lights, changing our car oil when the owner's manual says it instead of when the lube market tells you to do it. I am optimistic about future energy of this country. Slowly but surely we are building an energy policy, and conservation is going to be an important part of it. You cannot conserve your way out of the situation that we are in.

Alternative energy is an important part, but do not overplay it. As I said earlier, if you took all of the alternative energy in the world and delivered it all to the United States, it would only supply 3 percent. Certainly this young generation behind us, their brilliant minds will be able to make that much, much larger because they will find ways to take energy out of water.

The first and most immediate thing we can do is come up with an energy policy as a government. We can urge our constituents to conserve. But the worst thing we can do is propose that the government put on price controls, that they take over industries, that

they seize power plants and the government becomes your local electric utility. It would be the most inefficient operation in the history of our government. Do not let them do it. You cannot get something for nothing out of this government. If it is the government running it, you usually pay a higher price than if you as a community can have the private sector with checks and balances. I have spoken primarily about energy, about water.

Mr. Speaker, one last shot on water and then I am done. That is keep in mind in the East and West of this Nation, there are differences in water and differences in public lands. I would urge all of my colleagues in the East and all of their constituents in the East to please take the time before signing on a petition to take on Lake Powell or kick people off public lands, take a look at both sides of the story. If you take a look historically, politically, environmentally at both sides of the story, I think you will have a better understanding of what I have said tonight and a much deeper appreciation for our message from the West.

HIV/AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes we act on perceptions rather than reality, and when we discuss HIV and AIDS, indeed that has been one based on perception. Oftentimes we have felt, those of us who live in the rural South, have felt that AIDS was an issue of the North. Those of us who lived in small towns felt it was an issue of the big cities. Heterosexual persons thought this was only an issue for gays or that it was indeed white male gays. What we are finding is that those perceptions were ill-founded, and that the disease has affected all phases of the United States, particularly the South.

HIV/AIDS is becoming more prevalent in rural areas and in the South. AIDS cases in rural areas represent only about 5 percent of all reported HIV cases in 1995. Only 5 percent. However, the pattern of HIV infection suggests that the epidemic is spreading in rural areas throughout the United States. HIV in the rural South is growing at one of the fastest rates in the Nation. The Southeast as a whole has the highest number of those infected. The southern region of the United States accounts for the largest proportion; that is, 34 percent, 34 percent of 641,886 AIDS cases. The latest figures we have is for 1997, and 54 percent of the 56,689 cases are among persons residing in rural areas.

However, according to a Boston Globe article, which I include for the RECORD, according to this article it references that in six Southern States, including my State, North Carolina, and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi as well as Louisiana, 70 percent of those with HIV are African American, and 25 percent are women, according to a Duke University study.

But more importantly, here is what it says. Both of these figures are higher than the national average, but few are saying anything about it, keeping the disease nearly invisible as it spreads. It is a deadly, silent disease. It is the silence that worries many of the AIDS activists who are fearful that as the silence continues, the government will not know that they have a problem.

The text of the article is as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 1, 2001]

IN THE SOUTH, DEADLY SILENCE

SHAME AND FEAR CONTRIBUTE TO RAPID SPREAD OF HIV IN RURAL AREAS

(By John Donnelly)

SCOTLAND NECK, NC.—In the short, grim history of AIDS, this rural town surrounded by cotton and tobacco fields would probably go unnoticed. The virus hasn't killed people here in great numbers, as it has in Africa, nor has it devastated a whole sector of the population, as it did to gay men in the cities of America in the 1980s.

But as observers reflect on the two decades since the first public mention of a disease that was later named Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, the overarching reality is that the virus has stealthily managed to infect roughly 60 million people all over the world, including here on Roanoke Street, inside the four-room house of the Davis family, in the person of one Jeff Davis.

And that remains, largely, a secret here.

''I keep it pretty quiet,'' said Davis, 26, his skinny 6-food-3 frame sprawled out over a worn-out sofa as his mother hovered nearby. ''I'm not sure people would like being around people like me. If they find out I'm HIV-positive and their reaction was bad, I don't think I could take it.'' HIV in the rural South is growing at one of the fastest rates in the nation. The Southeast, as a whole, has the highest numbers of those infected. In six Southern states—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana—70 percent of those with HIV are African-American and 25 percent are women, a Duke University study found. Both figures are higher than national averages.

But few say anything, keeping the disease nearly invisible as it spreads. It is this silence that worries many AIDS activists, who are fearful that as the US government grapples with the out-of-control pandemic in parts of sub-Saharan Africa, it will neglect the increasingly costly programs to treat infected citizens at home. In at least a dozen states, there are waiting lists of people infected with HIV who want to get the drugs.

At home, the Bush administration's initial position has been to put a lid on treatment funds. It has proposed no increase next year for the $1.8 billion Ryan White Care Act, which pays for AIDS cocktails for Americans not covered by Medicaid or other insurance programs. Abroad, the administration has put $200 million in additional HIV money into a newly created Global AIDS and Health Fund, a sum belittled by many advocates as a trivial response to a problem that Secretary of State Colin L. Powell calls a war without equal. ''It's our responsibility as a world leader to fight AIDS at home and around the world,'' said Ernest C. Hopkins, director of federal affairs for the San Francisco AIDS Foundation. ''Furthermore, the crime of someone in rural North Carolina not getting treatment is far more egregious than the reality of that happening in sub-Saharan Africa, where countries spend a few dollars per capita on health care. This is an incredibly resourced nation, and yet there are people here who are basically being written off.''

In the past 20 years, AIDS has killed 438,795 people in America, 23 million worldwide. In the United States, an estimated 1 million people are now infected with HIV or have full-blown AIDS, but only about a third of them are receiving treatment. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that another third of a million have been diagnosed but either aren't medically eligible for treatment or can't pay for it, while the remaining third don't know they are infected or refuse to be tested.

AIDS has remained largely an urban epidemic in America, but infection rates have been rising rapidly in rural areas. Interstate highways act like spigots that flush the disease deep into the back country. Sex workers set up shop along the highways. And from rural Southern towns, as elsewhere, people like Davis travel to neon-bedecked bars or strip joints located near interstate highway ramps, pay for sex, and bring the virus back home. Some, like Duke public health specialist Kathryn Whetten-Goldstein, ''see echoes of Africa in HIV in the South,'' because of the barriers to care as well as the way the virus is increasingly transmitted through heterosexual contact. In the rural South, about 45 percent of women with HIV were infected by having sex with infected men, compared with 15 percent nationally; in Africa, as much as 80 percent of the transmission is heterosexual.

''When you think about the epidemics being similar,'' said CDC epidemiologist Amy Lansky, ''in the rural areas, particularly in the South, there is a lot more transmission occurring through heterosexual contact than you see as a nation as a whole.''

It is an outrage, in Whetten-Goldstein's thinking, because heterosexual transmission carries far less of a stigma than homosexual transmission. And yet, few talk about it, which she believes is rooted in racism.

''If the rates of heterosexual transmission were as high in middle-class white women and men as they are among African-American men and women, policymakers and power holders would be terrified and acting quickly,'' she said.

But Whetten-Goldstein believes the similarities between the rural South and Africa go deeper than the mode of transmission.

''There's a great stigma here attached to the disease, a sense of fatalism that it doesn't matter what they do and the great distances people have to travel to see a doctor,'' she said.

In both Africa and the rural South, a lack of education about how the virus is spread has allowed it to flourish. In North Carolina, for instance, state law forbids schools to teach that condoms can help prevent the spread of AIDS; teachers can only talk about abstinence.

And like many places in Africa, the stigma of living with HIV/AIDS is reinforced by attitudes of some fundamentalist Christians. Here, many fervently believe that God is punishing those with AIDS for their sins.

One woman in rural North Carolina who would be identified only as Sylvia said she travels 180 miles to see an AIDS doctor three times a month, even though there is an AIDS specialist 40 miles away. ''If you go to the local doctor, everyone knows you have HIV,'' said Sylvia, a local PTA president and a Cub Scout den mother.

''It's a modern-day leprosy here,'' said Dr. Mario G. Fiorilli, the only AIDS doctor in Halifax County in northeastern North Carolina. The great differences between the

United States and Africa, of course, are that antiretroviral AIDS drugs are widely available here. But availability of drugs does not always guarantee access, and flat-funding of the Ryan White Care Act would mean that many newly infected Americans will be denied drugs, advocates say.

In interviews with several dozen AIDS caseworkers and patients in rural areas of North Carolina, many said that potentially thousands of people refuse to get tested for HIV, while others fail to adhere to the daily regimen of pills for a variety of reasons, including painful side effects. ''I have friends—and I don't agree with them—who are sleeping around with it,'' said a man who asked to be identified only as J-Ray, a now-celibate drag queen who adheres to the strict drug regimen. ''They're just spreading it. That's what's going on here. You have people who are either too scared to get tested, or find they have it and basically don't care at all. They're just angry.''

Like many interviewed, J-Ray did tell family members he had the disease. ''My mother hugged me,'' he said. ''My father looked at me, and said, 'Do you have life insurance?''

Beamon Vann's family reacted by kicking him out of the house. For 14 months, with no independent source of income, he lived in a leaky aluminum box 6 feet high and 8 feet wide behind his family's three-bedroom house, allowed in only twice a week for showers. His mother handed him meals out the back door. She gave him a metal bucket for a toilet.

''It was because of her ignorance, her faith, her feeling that the disease was God's punishment,'' said Vann, 41, in his new three-room home, staring at a game of solitaire, three aces showing.

Vann, who is gay, began to weep. ''The first words out of my mother's mouth were, 'I told you God would get you one day for what you've been doing.''' Vann's caseworker is Terry Mardis, who is retired from the Army after 26 years in the special forces. He carried out secret missions in Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Panama. It's natural for him to use war metaphors in describing his work with AIDS patients.

''Are we making a dent? No,'' said Mardis, 53, who works for the Tri County Community Health Center in Newton Grove. ''I doubt it very seriously. People are afraid to get tested.''

On the road one day recently, in between visits to clients dozens of miles apart. Mardis said poverty often interferes with treatment. ''I have one woman whose daughter takes money from her. She has Social Security, which pays her bills and her phone, barely. Then family members run up $600, $700 in phone bills,'' Mardis said.

''We're concerned about her'' staying on her medication, he added. ''You're fighting a war here—on several fronts,'' Mardis said. ''You have families working against you. You've got communities working against you. I go and ask some businesses for donations to help those with AIDS, and they look at you like you're strange. Their idea of a crisis is the Red Cross helping you if you're burned out, not if you have AIDS.''

In Halifax County, HIV case manager Kathy W. Knight has worked hard to get African-American ministers to fight the stigma of the disease. ''People won't change their attitudes until it comes from the pulpit. If it doesn't come from the pulpit, it ain't the truth. If ministers think they can get it from eating at McDonald's, which is what one told us, then we're still going to have trouble here.''

Few say a kind word. One who won't is Bishop Moses Williams Jr., pastor of the Love of God Church of Christ. ''These diseases come upon people because they are not obeying the work of God,'' he said waiting in line at a Roanoke Rapids pharmacy checkout.

Jeff Davis, who believes he contracted HIV one night when he had sex with a stripper in Roanoke Rapids, just off interstate 95, is responding well to his combination of antiretroviral drugs. His weight rebounded to 164 pounds, from 142, but he is wary because his health has gone upon and down before. ''There was a time when Jeff was falling away to nothing,'' said his father, Perry Lee Davis, 68. ''I felt like then just as I did when he was a small child. We all love him. How would I feel as a father if I turned my back on him because he has HIV? I would be less than a father.''

Jeff Davis, sitting on his father's bed, listened to him. ''I read my Bible every day,'' he said softly. ''I'm back in church. It's made me better. I think everyone in there knows about me. But no one says anything.''

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be offering an amendment to make sure that sufficient food goes to those persons in Africa who are suffering from the AIDS pandemic and their children and families who are taking care of them.

But if we do not recognize here in the United States, and particularly in the South, that we have this disease, it is unlikely we will get additional funds. In fact, when we look at the budget, the Ryan White Care Act, which pays for AIDS cocktails, is maintained about where it was.

The Globe article further says that in the rural South, about 45 percent of women with HIV/AIDS are infected by having sex with infected men, again breaking one of the perceptions we have that heterosexual persons will not be subject to it. But, indeed, the infection rate is 15 percent above what it is nationally. The spread of AIDS in Africa is being spread through heterosexual transmission of the disease rather than homosexual. In fact, women and children are the ones who are most infected.

Again, one doctor in this area, and they are referencing North Carolina and referencing Halifax County, which is in my district, this doctor says, Dr. Fiorilli, the only AIDS doctor in Halifax County, ''This is like a modern day leprosy, no one wants to claim or talk about it.''

Mr. Speaker, the big difference between the United States and Africa are that the medications we have are more available here, but availability of drugs does not guarantee access because there are people failing to take the test to find out whether they are eligible, and then there are people who are failing to follow their prescription.

In interviews many said that potentially thousands of people refuse to get tested for HIV, and one person states she travels 180 miles to get treated twice a month when she could travel 40 miles and be treated, but everyone knows her in her area. This person is president of the PTA and very active as a leader, and so the culture of the area does not allow her to seek out medical care, and in some instances not even to tell their own family members. We have a problem in the Southeast and in those six States.

The number of new AIDS cases in the United States began to decline in the mid-1990s, but actually the rate went up in the South. While everybody else was kind of dealing with the problem and acknowledging that we had a problem, actually it went up. Particularly we find this happening in the South among black women as well as with children. It is true there are still more males than females, but the growth rate for women is extremely high in that area.

Mr. Speaker, from 1981 to 1999, 26,522 black women developed AIDS in 11 States of the former Confederacy. In Mississippi and in North Carolina, statistics show that more black women than white men have contracted HIV.

By region of the United States, AIDS incidence increased in all regions from 1994, with the most dramatic increases in the South. In 1996, however, AIDS incidence dropped in the Midwest, dropped in the West and the Northeast, and just began to level off a little bit in the South.

Now, again back to North Carolina, the HIV epidemic continues in North Carolina. Rates of infection continue to grow among adolescents and among women, with heterosexual contact as their primary mode of transmission. The minority population is disproportionately affected by the AIDS epidemic in all risk groups. The geographic distribution of cases for HIV/AIDS and bacterial STDs indicate the high correlation of STDs, which is sexually transmitted disease, and as a predictor of the risk of AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, this chart shows that persons living with HIV and AIDS, and this was as of the end of last year, the percentage by gender, 68.4 percent are male; 31.6 percent are females. And then when you begin to look at the ethnicity of it, 72.4 percent are African American or blacks; 23.9 percent are white non-Hispanic; 1.9 percent are Hispanic, and the Hispanic population is growing in our State, so that increase is in some way related to the growth. You see the proportion, that indeed it is growing.

Of the 20,525 individuals reported through December 2000, 10,329 have been reported with AIDS, including 8,189 adult adolescent males, 2,013 adult adolescent females, and 127 children.

According to figures from last year, North Carolina ranked 23rd among 50 States, including the District of Columbia, in terms of the number of AIDS cases. Most North Carolina HIV disease reports highlight the male population, African Americans 72 percent, falling within the age group between 30 and 39. Thirty and thirty-nine are our most active, productive citizens. This is the time when people are forming families and building careers. This is the time when people ought to be the most productive in their community; but at this time we are finding within

the age group 30 to 39, 72 percent are African Americans.

□ 2030

In the First Congressional District as well as in eastern North Carolina, including the third district, African Americans accounted for as much as 87 percent of HIV/AIDS cases that were reported in this year alone, the new cases that were reported.

The House of Representatives and the General Assembly of North Carolina recently passed under the leadership of Representative Wright a resolution declaring HIV/AIDS as a public health crisis, that we need to acknowledge that and get our community involved, get our faith-based community involved and our education system involved, because without the public recognition, we are not going to deal with that.

While only 1 percent of AIDS cases are found among teenagers aged 13 through 19, an additional 18 percent are found among those who are in their early 20s, who may have acquired the infection while they were teens because many of them had the infection, but we are now just discovering it while they are in their early 20s. Likewise, we are finding infection of teenagers is increasing. Additionally, some 26 percent are found among those who are now in their 20s, assuming they might have been infected some years earlier.

As of December 31, 68 percent or 13,943 of all HIV disease reports in North Carolina were among those who were from 20 to 39, regardless of race. From 20 to 39. That is an astounding, large number of people. Let me repeat that: 13,943 were reported last year. Of those reported, 68 percent of those reported were between the ages of 20 and 39.

Now, earlier I had said that there was a correlation between STD, sexually transmitted disease, as a predictor of HIV.

I want to show you another chart as well. This is alarming because syphilis and gonorrhea and other transmitted disease, we thought those had been eliminated. In fact, I have a map that I do not have with me; but if you look at this map, it is almost completely eliminated, other than in the South and in one or two places in the Midwest. Completely eliminated. In fact, there is no reason why sexually transmitted disease should be growing. There indeed is a bacterium treatment for it, but it is growing in the South; and it is growing in my State in alarming numbers.

Although it cannot be said that the STDs cause HIV/AIDS, it can be said there is a correlation between them. Indeed, you can begin to see the large number of them growing in North Carolina. But also you see a high percentage of them being related to African Americans. Gonorrhea percentage, almost a relationship between what you see in gonorrhea and syphilis as the HIV chart. There is no reason for this. This is unexplainable why this is happening. One is a disease by a behavior pattern that we can correct, but also there is no public outcry in understanding this. One, we assign to the fact, well, this is their own doing and, therefore, we shouldn't be concerned.

There is a glaring racial disparity in North Carolina cases. Seventy-one percent of them are among African Americans. The infectious syphilis rate is almost 12 times greater for African Americans, 11 times greater for Native Americans, and eight times greater for Hispanics than the rate for non-Hispanic whites.

In 1998, half of all syphilis cases were confined to 1 percent, 1 percent now, of all the counties in the United States. These cases of syphilis were found in 28 counties, primarily located in the South, and three independent cities: Baltimore, St. Louis, and the District of Columbia. North Carolina had five nationally significant high syphilis morbidity counties: Guilford, not in my district, but certainly a large county in my State; Forsyth, again not in my district, but a large county in my State; Mecklenburg, which is our largest city; Wake County, which is our capital; and Robeson County, growing at significant rates higher than all of the other southern States.

The National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors, something called NASTAD, did a report. I have that report. This report is entitled ''HIV Services in Rural Areas.'' They studied New Mexico and South Carolina experiences.

Mr. Speaker, I include this study for the RECORD.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL AIDS DIRECTORS, NASTAD MONOGRAPH, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HIV SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS

Introduction

AIDS cases in rural areas (less than 50,000 persons) represented approximately five percent of all reported AIDS cases in 1995. Patterns of HIV infection suggest that the epidemic is spreading in rural regions of the United States. Estimating the prevalence of HIV infection, based on AIDS cases, is complicated by the tendency of rural residents to go to urban areas for diagnosis and treatment, if possible. Research findings indicated that the majority of HIV infections in rural areas tend to occur in young adults (15–29 years), primarily females. Rates of heterosexual transmission are more prevalent than homosexual transmission and appear to be compounded by the presence of other sexually transmitted diseases and the use of crack/cocaine. Geographic areas with populations of 50,000 or fewer residents are considered rural. In 1997, over 54 million Americans lived in rural areas, composing 20 percent of the U.S. population (see Appendix A).

The HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB) has set, as part of its policy agenda, an objective to document the experience of vulnerable populations and the changing nature of the epidemic. One population that has been historically under served is rural residents. In response, the National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD) developed this monograph on HIV Services in Rural Areas, as part of a cooperative agreement with the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

HIV Services in Rural Areas describes approaches that states are using to address the health care and social service needs of rural residents living with HIV/AIDS. NASTAD selected two states, New Mexico and South Carolina, to highlight in this monograph because they are located in regions of the United States that are considered rural. Additionally, these two states were selected because their populations include a disproportionately high number of rural communities of color—African, Hispanic, and Native Americans—who are very high risk populations for new HIV infections—living in areas with limited resources to address their health care needs (see Appendix B).

NASTAD conducted interviews with the state AIDS directors and program staff and local providers in both New Mexico and South Carolina in fall 1999. Based upon these interviews, NASTAD identified barriers to access to HIV health care and key program components that support and link HIV health services in rural areas.

Barriers to Providing HIV Services in Rural Areas

Long Distance Travel—Almost every service provider interviewed for this monograph identified transportation as a barrier to overcome in the provision of services for persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas. Providers acknowledged that travel options exist: 1) commercial transportation services; 2) volunteer drivers; 3) staff home visits, or 4) mileage reimbursement for the use of a personal vehicle. However, in cases of acute illness, the lack of an adequate transportation plan may make a critical difference.

Inadequate Supply of Health Care Providers with HIV/AIDS Expertise—Providers express frustration about the lack of physicians with expertise in HIV treatment, despite the wide availability of training and consultation opportunities. They also reported that it is difficult to monitor the quality of care that persons living with HIV/AIDS receive from local health care providers and that these providers, in turn, may not be highly motivated to monitor care due to small client caseloads. In the absence of local medical expertise, a social service provider, such as a case manager, may become the local ''HIV expert.'' In cases in which the provider has little or not medical training, serving as the local expert is a difficult and isolated job because clients living with HIV and their families rely on this individual for a breadth of information that she or he may or may not be able to provide.

Linking HIV Counseling and Testing with Care—Many of the providers reported having either formal or informal relationships with local counseling and testing sites. Despite these linkages, providers also reported that a large number of person living with HIV/AIDS, as high as 50% for some, are referred to services either from hospitals or emergency rooms. While many of these clients are receiving their diagnosis for the first time, others are aware of their HIV status but have not sought services. Some providers report relying heavily on ''word-of-mouth'' to reach clients but acknowledged that stronger ties between testing sites and other organizations that may be in a position to refer clients need to be developed.

The Lack of Available Medical Facilities—Since the early 1980's, the number of rural hospitals and medical facilities has dwindled primarily due to financial cutbacks. Many facilities have closed or have been consolidated with other organizations or agencies, or the number of services has been drastically reduced due to managed care penetration, or the disappearance of an adequate

supply of specialist, or the need to acquire new and expensive technology. Such trends have exacerbated the limited supply of comprehensive health care services needed by rural residents living with HIV/AIDS.

Limited Availability of Social Services—Rural areas, especially poor ones, may have few agencies to provide social or support services. The lack of available services restricts opportunities for agency and/or organization collaboration and prevents the formation of service networks. Linkages to community-based social service agencies have become more critical as HIV has become a chronic condition and clients' needs have become more diverse.

The Stigma Attached to HIV/AIDS—The stigma attached to HIV/AIDS may result in community-wide denial that HIV is a problem that needs to be addressed. Medical providers may resist treating persons living with HIV/AIDS. In contrast, clients may be reluctant to seek services in rural areas ''where being socially ostracized.

In addition, there may be a sense of mistrust of medical and related health care providers by individual clients and/or the community at large, especially if such service providers are unknown to the client or from outside the local community.

Client Adherence to Treatment—With improved HIV/AIDS care and treatment, treatment adherence may become a more important concern. Promoting adherence to antiretroviral treatment regimens can be difficult when clients are isolated and face-to-face contact between case managers, physicians, treatment educators and persons living with HIV/AIDS is limited. It also is difficult to assure client adherence to treatment on a regular schedule if the ability to refill prescriptions is problematic, or if the client has issues of stigma to overcome.

Substance Abuse—Several providers noted that the provision of long-term substance abuse services is a significant service delivery barrier in rural areas. Distance and limited client contact compound the challenge. Substance abuse treatment services may not be readily available outside of urban areas. There may be a sense of denial, both in the community and on the part of the clients who are using drugs and alcohol, because substance abuse is not identified openly as a problem in rural areas, resulting in little effort to secure treatment services.

Addressing the Special Needs of Communities of Color in Rural Areas—Communities of color, including Africans, Hispanic, Native, and Asian Americans, are at high risk for HIV infection. Rural communities of color, like other rural residents, experience the same barriers—stigma, poverty, and the absence of accessible care vulnerability of these communities to HIV is further compromised by additional factors: discrimination, distrust of the medical establishment and the health care system, diverse nationalities, language differences, severe poverty and unemployment, and social-cultural differences and isolation.

State Components that Link HIV Services in Rural Areas

The providers interviewed for this monograph have developed and described various strategies for providing HIV services to clients living in rural areas based on client needs and available resources. State strategies include:

Addressing Clients' Needs Beyond HIV—Service providers who address the entire range of client needs are more likely to maintain clients in care. Poverty, substance abuse, mental illness and other problems that are often associated with urban life also affect people living in rural areas. For example, the Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services (PALSS), in Columbia, SC, operates the Women's Resource Center. Approximately 25 percent of PALSS clients live in rural areas. The center provides a range of services that address the needs, both HIV-related and those not related to HIV, of their female clients. PALSS offers parenting classes, breast and cervical cancer screening, nutrition classes, exercise classes, social activities such as crafts and sewing classes, and a library with resources specific to women and HIV, creating a link between service provider and client.

Client-Centered Approach—It is not always practical to develop services targeting a specific population in a rural area. The caseload is often small and resources are extremely limited. These circumstances necessitate that staff be culturally sensitive and focus on the clients as individuals, since the client population, though small, may be very diverse. For example, one of New Mexico AIDS Services' (NMAS) case managers is Native American and works with the organization's Native American clients in Albuquerque. The case manager also understands the cultural importance of using Native American healing methods and administers NMAS's complementary medicine program.

Flexibility—Service providers stressed the importance of designing and administering programs that are flexible enough to accommodate the unique needs of individuals living with HIV/AIDS. Many agencies allow clients to designate where they will meet with their case managers, whether at their home, a local health department or library, or even for lunch at a local restaurant. Such arrangements require additional driving on the part of case managers and allows the client to identify a ''safe site'' in his or her community where individual confidentiality can be maintained. Limited clinic hours present another challenge for providers. If a person living with HIV/AIDS cannot schedule an appointment during regular clinic hours and needs to see a physician in between weekly clinics, several service providers reported that the physicians will frequently allow office visits, even though they are contracted to do so.

Working with Available Resources—It is important to identify and to link collaborative partners in rural networks, even with limited resources. For example, the Edisto Health Department in central South Carolina works with the Cooperative Church Ministries of Orangeburg (CCMO), a coalition of churches in the area that have combined their resources to offer some services such as a small food and clothing bank to persons living with HIV/AIDS, CCMO also administers the Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS (HOPWA) funds for the health department.

Fostering Informal Relationships—Service providers in rural areas stressed the importance of informal relationships that repeatedly prove to be invaluable in identifying resources and developing service networks. These relationships may develop unexpectedly. The ACCESS Network in Hilton Head, SC works closely with ''Volunteers in Medicine,'' a medical clinic staffed by retired health care professionals, who moved next door to ACCESS several years ago. Some ACCESS clients now receive services at the clinic. Case managers work closely with the clinic's staff to coordinate clients' care. They also provide clinic staff with information on HIV/AIDS treatment developments.

Providers reported fostering informal relationships between their own physicians and infectious disease (ID) specialists outside their service area who are available for phone consultation. Providers also cited the importance of working with local media to raise awareness about HIV/AIDS and the agency's services by running public service announcements (PSAs) or providing coverage of agency activities and events.

Conclusion

Both New Mexico and South Carolina have implemented strategies that seem to be working well for their respective residents who are living with HIV/AIDS. Both states also have found it necessary to remain flexible in implementing these strategies to meet the needs of specific group of residents who have unique challenges from one geographic area to another within each state. The selection of these two states in no way suggests that other states are not conducting exemplary work to assure positive outcomes for their respective residents. The selection of these states simply presents an opportunity to share information about HIV services in rural areas with other jurisdictions and stimulate national discussion among states on how best to meet the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS.

HIV SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS: THE NEW MEXICO AND SOUTH CAROLINA EXPERIENCES

INTRODUCTION

AIDS cases in rural areas represent approximately five percent of the all AIDS cases in the United States. Long distances between residents and accessible health care services, social isolation as a result of social sigma related to HIV/AIDS, lack of adequate, if any, health insurance coverage, insufficient medical facilities, few medical specialists, and limited support services like transportation and child care challenge the efforts of rural communities (see Appendix A) to serve residents living with HIV/AIDS.

State health departments, in collaboration with local health agencies and organizations, are focusing on preventing new infections in rural areas, getting persons living with HIV into care (see Appendix B), and improving access to HIV health care services in rural areas. State health departments offer experienced insight, methodological research and analysis, and documented evidence of the success or failure of specific program strategies that collectively are designed to improve the quality of life for persons living with HIV/AIDS. State health departments also have the expertise to provide technical assistance and support for capacity building to local health care agencies and organizations that serve persons living with HIV/AIDS and to develop linkages between HIV/AIDS health care and related services in urban as well as rural areas.

HIV Services in Rural Areas is a monograph developed by the National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD), under a cooperative agreement with the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. NASTAD conducted interviews with state AIDS directors and local service providers receiving Ryan White CARE Act funds in fall 1999. This monograph highlights activities in New Mexico and South Carolina, two states that have developed strategies to address the primary care and support service needs of people living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas. These two states were selected because they are located in regions of the United States that are sparsely populated and are characterized as rural with remote populations. Additionally, these two states were selected because their populations include a disproportionately high number of rural communities of color—African, Hispanic, and Native Americans—who are at high risk for new HIV infections.

NEW MEXICO

Total Population: 1,737,000.

Area: 121,593 sq. miles.

Population Density: 14 persons per sq. mile.

HIV/AIDS Cases (cumulative reported through June 1999) (HIV reporting was initiated in January 1998).

People living with HIV/AIDS (reported): 1,334.

AIDS cases reported in 1999: 125 (annual rate per 100,000 population: 7.2).

HIV cases reported in July 1998-June 1999: 318.

Cases of AIDS reported (Cumulative through June 1999): 1,866.

Ryan White CARE Act Title II Base Grant Award, FY 1999: $1,125,079.

ADAP, FY 1999: $1,351,076.

Total Title II Funds, FY 1999: $2,476,155.

Over 75 percent of the cases of HIV/AIDS reported in New Mexico are attributed to male to male sexual contact (MSM). Women compose only eight percent of reported cases of HIV/AIDS. Fifty-six percent of persons reported with HIV/AIDS are white, 35 percent are Hispanic, five percent are Native American, and four percent are African American. Over two-thirds of HIV/AIDS cases are reported in Bernalillo and Santa Fe Counties, where the cities of Albuquerque and Santa Fe are located. The number of cases reported in New Mexico's other 31 counties range from zero to 124.

In July 1997 the HIV/AIDS/STD Bureau of the New Mexico Department of Health (DOH) created the HIV/AIDS Medical Alliance of New Mexico (HMA). The HMA is a capitated system that provides medical care, case management, home care, support services including counseling, housing and nutritional assistance, and work re-entry programs through partnerships among regionally-based organizations.

Under the HMA system, the state is divided into four districts: Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Las Cruces, and Roswell. Each of the four HMAs is a self-contained, multidisciplinary provider or an association of providers, designed to provide cost-effective continuum of care including a prevention focus. Racial/ethnic distributions for HIV/AIDS caseloads in each of the four HMA districts is reported in Appendix D.

The HMA model resulted from a field review commissioned by DOH in November 1996. The review was conducted to identify and clarify shifts in the case and treatment of persons living with HIV/AIDS, such as the introduction of antiretroviral combination therapy and the impact of deeper penetration of managed care health care into both the urban and rural areas of the state. These shifts necessitated an examination of the statewide HIV/AIDS service system and consideration of new models of case management and service delivery.

The field review involved an inventory of existing services within each of the four districts. The review included: (1) an examination of each contract managed by the state HIV/AIDS/STD Bureau; (2) the identification of services provided through other agencies such as the Veterans Administration and the Indian Health Agency; and (3) a review of the HIV Coordinating Council's services guide. Epidemiological data was used to assess the density of client access to the available services.

In addition to the review, task forces were organized in each district. These task forces were composed of representatives from community-based organizations, clinical systems, regional DOH agencies, advocacy groups, and home care and prevention agencies. The insights from these groups on access to services, competence of service providers, completeness of service continuums, and gaps in services were invaluable to the process.

The findings of the review process identified needs in rural areas of the state. The final report states:

Access to adequate services diminishes the further away from Santa Fe or Albuquerque one lives. Taos, Los Alamos, Roswell, Las Cruces, and Farmington provide pockets of services that meet the immediate needs of many persons living with HIV/AIDS. The rural regions from the four corners of the state are underserved and force persons living with HIV/AIDS to relocate, to drive long distances, or to cross state lines to pursue adequate services. Many in the task forces reported that while there were physicians available to see persons living with HIV/AIDS, their knowledge about the disease was insufficient and resulted in misdiagnoses of opportunistic infections and inappropriate treatments. Physician HIV/AIDS competency is a serious issue in rural areas (Finney, 1999).

HMAs Respond to Local Needs

FUNDING FISCAL YEAR 1999

District	State funds	CARE Act funds	Total
District 1	$730,000	$115,000	$845,000
University Hosp.*	$270,000	$115,000	$385,900
District 2	$509,000	$115,000	$624,000
District 3	$170,000	$115,000	$285,000
District 4	$95,500	$115,000	$210,500

(* University Hospital has a separate contract to provide primary care in District 1.)

The HMA system allows HIV case management to be specialized within an agency and specific to the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS. Before the HMAs, the state subcontracted with approximately 100 providers. Most of the providers did not specialize in HIV services and there was great variation in the case management services provided. The formation of the HMAs resulted in statewide availability of comprehensive case management and support services for persons living with HIV/AIDS.

Consolidation has been an important part of the HMAs. With the establishment of the HMAs, person living with HIV/AIDs enroll in and receive services from only one organization. Referral to services is facilitated because there is only one access point in each district and HMAs have publicized their services throughout their service area. Clients receive all necessary services from one provider, not various providers scattered throughout the region. Accessing services from several providers greatly increased the possibility of breaches in confidentiality, a major concern for persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas.

Service providers for each district were selected through a state request for proposal (RFP) process. The state review process identified services considered necessary for an integrated continuum of care for persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families. Findings from the state review process were used to develop the HMA model. Applicants are required to provide the identified services either directly or through contracts with other organizations. Providers have contracts for three years.

Key Factors in the Development of HMAs

According to Donald Torres, Section Head of the New Mexico's DOH, HIV/AIDS Bureau, the HMA model works well for low incidence, rural states where the number of service providers is relatively small. Under these conditions, the service delivery network is compact enough that adjustments can be easily made across the program.

At the time of model was being considered there were only a few HIV-specific providers in the state. DOH contracted with various organizations throughout the state to provide case management services but the contracts were not large enough to jeopardize the agencies' viability if funding was discontinued. Therefore, most service providers did not resist the formation of the HMAs because it would not negatively impact the well-being of individual organizations.

Clients also were generally in favor of some change to the existing system. The development of the HMAs paralleled the move toward Medicaid managed care in the state which created an environment where people expected change in the health care delivery system. As with any major change, the move toward HMAs created some concerns. The HMAs were caught up in the partisan political debate on managed care. Additionally, there were concerns that the HMAs would not be sensitive to the needs of people of color and that they might divert funds from HIM prevention programs.

*Two Years Later * * **

Since their establishment, HMAs have become identified as the source of HIV care in New Mexico. Of the approximately 1,300 persons living with HIV/AIDS, 1,100 persons living with HIV/AIDS access case management services throughout the HMAs.

In New Mexico, anyone who tests positive for HIV is eligible for case management services. To be eligible for services through the HMA a person must: 1) have a documented diagnosis of HIV disease from a qualified licensed medical provider; 2) be a resident of the service area (district); and 3) have a documented income at or below 300% of the federal poverty level (FPL). Members may elect to enroll in a HMA other than the one providing service where they reside but HMAs do not recruit members from outside their service area.

Since their initiation, the HMAs have been integrated with other HIV services in the state. The DOH operates a health insurance continuation program. The program pays up to $400 per month for the premiums of a participating client's existing health insurance. The program also reimburses the patient's share (co-pays) for HIV medications under the New Mexico Medication Assistance Program (ADAP). The state will purchase health insurance for eligible clients through NMCHIP, the state's health insurance risk pool. This reduces the amount of money spent by the HMAs for health care services.

The University of New Mexico's Health Science Center (University Hospital), a Ryan White CARE Act (RWCA) Title III grantee, administers the ''Partners in Care Program.'' Medical services are provided at the hospital in Albuquerque and the grantee also recruits physicians across the state to provide services to persons living with HIV/AIDS. To be eligible for the program, physicians must treat a certain number of persons living with HIV/AIDS. University Hospital physicians are available for consultation and the hospital also operates a hotline that physicians may call with treatment-related questions. HMA clients, especially in three of the four districts, often access medical services through the Title III program.

Successful Cost Containment

The New Mexico DOH reports significant cost savings as a result of implementing the HMA model. The cost of providing HIV-related care and support services, including medications, to New Mexico's caseload of persons living with HIV/AIDS climbed from $5.2 million in 1995 to $8.2 million in 1996, a 37 percent increase. The increase was primarily due to the expense of antiretroviral combination therapy. Overall costs of care jumped significantly between 1995 and 1996, rose slightly in 1997, then in 1998 fell to the 1996 level. It is estimated that if the HMA system had not been implemented, the cost of HIV care in New Mexico would have increased between five percent and 20 percent

in 1998. HMA implementation saved the state between $400,000 and $1.7 million. These cost savings resulted even as the number of people being served increased. The net number of clients served increased by an average of six percent each year.

In the coming year, DOH plans to more thoroughly integrate the Title III grant with the HMA program. Even though training is available for physicians in outlying areas, the HMAs report that care is still problematic and that some physicians lack the required expertise to provide quality HIV care. By integrating the Title III funds into the HMA system, HMAs will be able to select physicians in their districts who are motivated to treat persons living with HIV/AIDS and to develop their HIV-related expertise.

Additionally, these physicians are more likely to work with case managers and persons living with HIV/AIDS in the development of overall care plans.

The state's early intervention nurses also play a key role in linking persons living with HIV/AIDS with services. Five nurses are employed by the state. In post-test counseling, persons living with HIV/AIDS are linked with early intervention nurses who conduct an initial assessment, refer clients to the appropriate HMA, and follow-up clients who do not access care. The nurses also conduct partner notification services.

As of the end of 1999, DOH plans to expand the HMA system. A fifth, statewide HMA will be added that will serve Native American persons living with HIV/AIDS. It will be based in Albuquerque. The state also plans to contract with an agency to provide benefits advocacy services. The new contractor will help persons living with HIV/AIDS obtain benefits and also address emerging needs such as education and re-employment. Additionally, the contractor will provide advocacy services, including mediating grievances with HMAs. The contract will be awarded through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Addressing Needs in Rural Areas

Each of the HMAs has developed a unique service delivery system based on available resources in the district and local challenges. All four districts serve clients who reside in rural areas. Albuquerque (District 1), Las Cruces (District 3) and Santa Fe (District 2) contain urban areas, where most clients reside, surrounded by rural areas. Roswell (District 4) is predominantly rural.

The New Mexico DOH has established different capitation rates for the HMAs based on the greater per client expense of serving clients in rural areas. The larger HMAs, Albuquerque and Santa Fe, are able to achieve some ''economies of scale'' because they serve a larger number of clients. Additionally, they have access to more resources, including more fundraising opportunities. In rural areas, the distance that clients and staff are required to travel also can escalate costs for mileage reimbursement and staff driving time. To facilitate access for clients in rural areas, all the HMAs reimburse clients for travel expenses (mileage) and all the HMAs have toll-free telephone numbers.

Quality Assurance Activities

DOH has adopted a variety of measures to assure the quality of services delivered by the HMAs. Contracts with the HMAs stipulate the number of clients to be served (a range is specified), the number of contacts with each client per reporting period, travel reimbursement, emergency procedures, and confidentiality and grievance procedures. HMAs are required to maintain records on member enrollment status, provision of covered services, and relevant medical information on individual members. DOH also is administering a client satisfaction survey to assess whether the HMAs are meeting clients' needs and to determine client satisfaction with the HMA service delivery system.

The New Mexico DOH initiated a process to identify statewide HIV/AIDS ''best practices'' guidelines to be used to direct the cost-effective design and delivery of HIV/AIDS services throughout the state. The guidelines are intended: (1) to support the management and, where appropriate, the elevation of the quality of HIV/AIDS care throughout the state, (2) to improve access to quality care in both urban and rural areas, (3) to provide a measuring device against which HIV/AIDS care system services might be objectively evaluated, and (4) to provide the HMAs with a product with which they might competitively position their services.

The state guidelines present an integrated ''care team'' process based on collaboration between primary care physicians, case managers, and the client in the development of an individualized care strategy to delay or reverse disease progression. The guidelines identify core services (clinical, prevention, practical support, educational support and mental health) and procedures for enrollment, assessment, chronic management, acute events and palliative care. To develop the guidelines, DOH held a retreat attended by the executive directors of two HMAs (one urban and one rural), two physicians, three case managers, three persons living with HIV, four early intervention nurses, and representatives of the DOH. Guidelines also have been developed to address case management in rural areas.

Challenges

Accessing Services Based at the Main Office—The HMA has developed alternative approaches for clients living in rural areas because it is not possible to provide all the services that are available at the main office and in the field office in Farmington. For example, clients in rural areas requested that the food bank services be made more accessible. Many were driving long distances (and getting reimbursed for the mileage) for a relatively small amount of food. Now, the HMA purchases gift certificates from the major supermarkets in the rural areas of the district and sends them to clients twice a month. Any client living more than 50 miles from the main office is eligible for the food voucher program.

Obtaining Client Feedback—Providing opportunities for clients to give feedback on their needs and the services they receive can be difficult in rural areas. To facilitate the process, the District 4 HMA holds their Community Advisory Committee meetings at six different sites throughout the service area. The meetings are open to all clients. Local physicians who treat clients also are invited. At the meetings, clients can raise concerns about services or other personal issues. To encourage attendance, dinner is served and incentives, such as grocery store vouchers, are provided. Twice a year, the HMA surveys clients about their needs. Based on the findings of the survey, the HMA will tailor information provided at the meetings to client needs and depending on the topics, the agency's nurse, therapist or other appropriate staff will attend. Treatment issues are always a popular topic at the meetings.

Lack of Medical Providers with HIV Expertise—According to many of the HIV service providers interviewed, local doctors do not take advantage of the availability of training opportunities to increase their knowledge of HIV treatment. In District 4, two physicians treat the majority of the clients. Approximately 12 other physicians see one or two clients. With a large number of physicians providing services and the informal nature of the relationship between the HMA and these physicians, it is difficult to monitor the quality of care clients receive.

The move to consolidate the Title III services with the HMA system will allow the HMAs to focus on a limited number of physicians in the region and build their expertise. Additionally, HMAs that do not have on-site medical services will be able to move toward a care team model with physicians, case managers and persons living with HIV/AIDS working together to develop a treatment strategy. Consolidation will improve the monitoring of clients' medical care.

For more information about the activities of each of the four districts in the New Mexico HMA system, please refer to Appendix D.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Total Population: 3,836,000.

Area: 31,113 sq. miles.

Population Density: 123 persons per sq. mile.

HIV/AIDS Cases (cumulative reported through June 1999) (HIV reporting was initiated in February 1986).

People living with HIV/AIDS (reported): 10,108.

AIDS cases reported in 1999: 984 (annual rate per 100,000 population: 25.7).

HIV cases reported in 1999: 877.

Cases of AIDS reported (Cumulative): 8,352.

Ryan White CARE Act Title II Base Grant, FY 1999: $4,968,208.

ADAP, FY 1999: $5,966,180.

Total Title II Funds, FY 1999: $10,934,388.

The HIV Epidemic in South Carolina—In rural areas of the southeastern United States, the HIV epidemic is increasingly concentrated in the heterosexual population and associated with high rates of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), especially syphilis, alcohol abuse and crack cocaine use. In South Carolina, 71 percent of HIV/AIDS cases reported in 1998 were among men, 29 percent among women. African Americans made up 75 percent of reported HIV/AIDS cases. Twenty-seven percent of HIV/AIDS cases are attributed to male sexual contact (MSM), including MSM and injection drug use, 27 percent are attributed to heterosexual contact and nine percent to injection drug use (36 percent have no reported risk). One third (33 percent) of the people reported with HIV/AIDS in 1998 reside in rural areas.

Characteristics of Newly-Diagnosed People with HIV/AIDS: Urban vs. Rural—From January 1991—December 1998, the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) conducted the Supplement to HIV/AIDS Surveillance (SHAS) Project (supported by CDC). The project initially included Charleston County and the Edisto Health District (a three county area). A third county, Richland, was added in 1993. The project staff conducted interviews with newly reported/diagnosed people with HIV/AIDS, 18 years of age or older, who were residents in the study area. During the course of the project, 1,146 eligible persons were interviewed. Of these, 78 percent were from urban communities and 22 percent were from rural communities.

The Rural SHAS Project was implemented in Edisto Health District between January 1995 and December 1996. Seventy interviews were completed as part of this study. The majority of respondents were male (72 percent) and African American (77 percent). Approximately 47 percent of the Rural SHAS participants had never lived outside of the county. The findings of the study include:

At the time of diagnosis, 28 percent of rural participants had AIDS, as compared to 34 percent in the urban counties;

Sixty-one percent of rural participants had 12 years of education or less, as compared to 69 percent in the urban counties;

Sixty-nine percent of rural participants were unemployed at the time of diagnosis, as

compared to 57 percent in the urban counties; and

Sixty-nine percent of rural participants had household incomes of $10,000 a year or less, as compared to 39 percent in the urban counties.

The study also revealed that participants in rural areas were more likely to have used crack cocaine than those in urban areas (33 percent rural, 28 percent urban) but were less likely to have injected drugs (14 percent rural, 16 percent urban). Rural participants were more likely to have not used condoms with their steady sexual partner (48 percent rural, 38 percent urban) and were less likely to have received money or drugs for sex (12 percent rural, 18 percent urban).

The State Consortia—South Carolina relies primarily on eleven Title II-funded regional consortia to provide primary care and support services to persons living with HIV/AIDS. CARE Act-funded services also are provided by two Title III grantees and one Title IV grantee. The DHEC administers the Title IV grant on a statewide basis that provides mostly tertiary and specialty care and assures that primary care is easily accessible for infants, children, youth, and women infected and affected by HIV. The two Title III grantees that focus on outpatient early intervention and primary care services are based in Columbia, the state's capital, and in Ridgeland, in the southern section of the state. The Ridgeland Title III provider was first funded in fiscal year 1998, so it is still a relatively new component to the service network in this area (note: two new Title III grantees were funded in 1999—Greenville Community Health Center in Greenville and Low Country Health Care Systems in Fairfax. The addition of these two primary care providers brings additional federal resources to two rural consortia).

The state opted for the consortia system due to a lack of support service and medical providers, especially in rural areas. The statewide plan developed in 1990 identified primary medical care as the greatest need in the state. The formation of consortia was seen as a way to stimulate the development of local service networks.

Initially, the state funded consortia in four areas. By 1994, statewide coverage was achieved through the formation of seven more consortia. The consortia basically mirror the geographic boundaries of the state's public health districts to each consortia region also includes a local health department.

The consortia, which vary in size from three to six counties, are charged with assessing needs and resources in their region and developing and maintaining a service delivery network. Each consortium has developed a unique system of care based on existing needs and available resources in the service area. The following variables influenced the development service networks in the consortia:

Existence of AIDS service organizations (ASOs) prior to the formation of the consortium.

Ability of the lead organization to identify and recruit other providers into the services network,

Availability of primary care providers in the service area and their willingness to work with persons living with HIV/AIDS,

Availability of training opportunities and information sources on HIV treatment for primary care providers, and

Access to specialty providers.

Several providers stressed the role personality plays in developing service networks in rural areas. Many relationships between service providers are informal and are forged between staff members in various agencies. Service delivery systems must be flexible enough to allow staff to take advantage of these informal linkages that can provide access to necessary expertise or resources.

Currently, 39 percent of the state's Title II funds (including ADAP) go to the consortia. Funds received by each consortium are based on the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS in the region, with some variance in the formula due to demonstrated need. Consortia are funded through a request for proposal (RFP) process and awarded funds on a five-year cycle. While the process is designed to be competitive, only a single applicant has applied for each region. Service and reporting requirements are outlined in the RFP and any necessary changes can be made in the annual contracts. DHEC meets quarterly with consortia contacts.

The consortia developed into one of three basic structures:

Lead agency and subcontractors,

Single lead agency providing both primary care and support services, and

Single lead agency providing case management with informal linkages to primary care.

The structure that evolved depended greatly on the resources available in the communities. For example, the Midlands AIDS Consortium, based in Columbia, SC serves both urban and rural areas. The consortium focused on establishing linkages through a system of subcontracts because there already were agencies providing HIV-related services. In other consortia regions, a single agency was identified and funded to provide HIV-related services that may or may not already have been available in the region.

Quality Assurance—The Ryan White CARE Act Peer Review Committee oversees the activities of Title II consortia in the state. It is made up of eleven members, one for each consortium, and DHEC representatives. When the committee was formed in 1996, each consortium completed a self assessment. The committee established a mission statement based on the findings of this process. For the last two years the committee was developing standards and guidelines that consortia can use as tools to assess services.

The committee has developed guidelines for case management services and is also developing outcome measures for primary care. To develop the guidelines for case management services, the committee surveyed all case managers in the state and held a series of meetings for additional input. Based on the findings of this process, the committee has developed standards for intake, assessment, and discharge.

State Efforts to Link HIV Services in Rural Areas—While the state relies primarily on the consortia to meet needs in their own regions, the state does conduct activities that assist in the provision of services in rural areas. The state has consolidated the ADAP program in a centralized pharmacy operated by DHEC which allows the state to administer the program in a cost-effective manner while rapidly dispensing medications. Medications are mailed to clients at their homes. Initially, medications were distributed through local health department pharmacies but increases in the number of persons living with HIV/AIDS soon exceeded the capacity of the regional pharmacies to carry out the necessary services.

A major advantage of the centralized pharmacy approach is that it allows DHEC to assess adherence to U.S. Public Health Service treatment guidelines through monitoring prescriptions for persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas. DHEC pharmacists review prescriptions for any deviation from the standard protocol. If an irregularity is identified, the physician is contacted to find out why the medications were prescribed and to discuss treatment decisions before the prescription is filled. This provides a training opportunity for physicians in rural areas who may not have treated a large number of persons living with HIV/AIDS and may lack expertise in HIV treatment.

Local providers frequently report the shortage of physicians with expertise in HIV treatment. The state employs a Title II-funded medical consultant who is available to consult with physicians. All physicians treating HIV are encouraged to develop an informal relationship with the medical consultant. For the Title III providers, the state plans to move toward a primary provider model, in which persons living with HIV/AIDS access medical services through a physician in their community who has access to specialty providers who can be contacted for either consultation or referral.

Challenges

Serving a Large Region—Initially, most of the services provided by the CARETEAM, the lead agency of the Waccamaw Care Consortium and based in Myrtle Beach, were concentrated in Horry County, near Myrtle Beach, and all staff members resided in this area. To meet with clients in the two southern counties required staff to make a round trip from the agency's office in the northern part of the service area. To alleviate some of this travel, case managers who reside in the outlying counties were hired. On days when case managers see clients in the southern part of the service area, these case managers do not go into the office to reduce driving time. Staff also may see clients at either the beginning or the end of the day, before or after they have been to the office.

Within a large service area, outlying areas may have access to fewer services and feel less connected to a service provider. In addition to improving services for clients, hiring staff from that area help to facilitate linkages with the community. CARETEAM found that as they increased their presence in the two southern counties, it was much easier to work within these communities in terms of raising awareness of HIV and of CARETEAM services.

According to Jeff Kimbro, Executive Director of CARETEAM, ''We have worked hard to make sure that Georgetown and Williamsburg Counties feel they have a stake in the organization and know that we are here to serve them. Even though these counties will never have the same level of resources as Horry County, as we've expanded our efforts in the area we have seen the community gradually become more involved in the response to the epidemic.''

Knowledge Level of Primary Care Providers—Because it does not have physicians on staff or have contracts with medical providers, the ACCESS Network has had to work hard to assure that physicians in the service areas have access to information on the treatment of HIV. Located in Hilton head and Hampton, ACCESS Network is the lead agency for the Low Country Care Consortium. According to Jerry Binns, President of ACCESS Network, physicians have become much more knowledgeable about HIV in the past few years but it is still necessary to provide educational opportunities.

ACCESS Network has used a variety of approaches. They regularly provide written materials on treatment developments to local practitioners. They also hold informal meetings between ACCESS Network staff and local practitioners, organize educational presentations by experts (sometimes done with support from pharmaceutical companies), and foster relationships between local practitioners and HIV experts in the state who are available for phone consultation. While knowledge level is important in terms of the quality of care, ACCESS Network acknowledged that the stigma attached to HIV

is still a barrier in terms of physicians' willingness to treat persons living with HIV/AIDS. Other deterrents include a fear of being perceived as an ''AIDS doctor,'' the perception that HIV/AIDS needs to be treated by a specialist, the potential financial costs of treating people with HIV (low reimbursement rates), scheduling time to attend training activities and the distance providers must travel for training. For more information about each of South Carolina's consortium, please refer to Appendix E.

CONCLUSION

State Efforts that Support HIV Services in Rural Areas

Local providers in both states identified several ways that the state HIV/AIDS Program (Title II grantees) can support the delivery of HIV services in rural areas in program components that are often difficult to resolve.

Assistance in Diversifying Funding Sources—Although sources of financial support can be limited in rural areas, service providers expressed concern about being overly dependent on the state and the Ryan White CARE Act for funding. Rarely do rural areas have access to a fundraising base or grant opportunities from foundations and corporate donors as do service providers in urban areas. Providers also acknowledged that many do not possess the organizational capacity to conduct fundraising activities or prepare grant proposals and/or contracts. Providers suggested that states provide technical assistance on fundraising, grant writing, and financial and organizational capacity building. States may have the resources to hire a fundraiser who can focus on identifying new sources of funding for HIV services for rural areas. States can assist in identifying funding sources in the private sector and pass information about such sources to providers at the local level.

Identification of Outcome Measures—States can play a role in initiating and maintaining a process to develop outcome measures for rural medical and support services. While conducting this type of program evaluation can mean additional work for providers, it helps them to focus on the effectiveness of their services, account for funds, and demonstrate that they are improving the health status of persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas in which they provide services.

Fostering Ryan White CARE Act Cross-Title Collaboration—Especially in rural areas, service providers can be separated by significant distances making the establishment of linkages more difficult. The absence of established links, especially in areas in which other CARE Act providers (Title III, IV, and SPNS) are present, but are not participating in the state's Title II-funded activities, can lead to duplication of and/or significant gaps in service delivery. States can play a role in facilitating cross-title collaboration within service areas to assure more coordinated service delivery.

Strengthening Prevention Efforts—Rural areas can be more conservative than urban areas and more resistant to HIV prevention efforts. The lack of prevention efforts can result in less public awareness which, in turn, may reinforce the perception that HIV is not a problem in rural areas. This lack of awareness on the part of the public, especially in rural areas, may lead to increased spread of HIV and delays in accessing services. Since states administer HIV prevention funds as well, they can provide leadership in recommending or mandating HIV prevention programs at the local level and providing technical assistance in implementing such programs. Additionally, states can move to strengthen linkages between HIV counseling and testing services and HIV-related primary care and support services to facilitate access to care.

State Responses to the Challenges of Serving Persons Living with HIV/AIDS—Both New Mexico and South Carolina have implemented strategies that seem to be working well for their respective residents who are living with HIV/AIDS. Both states also have found it necessary to remain flexible in implementing these strategies to meet the needs of specific groups of residents who have unique challenges from one geographic area to another within each state. The selection of these two states in no way suggests that other states are not conducting exemplary work to assure positive outcomes for their respective residents. The selection of these states simply presents an opportunity to share information with other jurisdictions and stimulate national discussion among states on how best to meet the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS in rural areas.

INTERVIEWS

NEW MEXICO

David Barrett, HMA Director, District 2, Southwest C.A.R.E. Center, Santa Fe, 505/986–1084.

Kathleen Kelly, HMA Director, District 1, New Mexico AIDS Services, Albuquerque, 505/266–0911.

Kari Maier, HMA Director, District 3, Camino De Vida Center for HIV Services, Las Cruces, 505/532–0202.

Jane Peranteau, HMA Director, District 4, Pecos Valley HIV/AIDS Resource Center, Roswell, 800/957–1995.

Donald Torres, Section Head, HIV/AIDS Program, Infectious Disease Bureau, Public Health Division, New Mexico Department of Health, 505/476–3629.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Department of Health and Environmental Control

Lynda Kettinger, Director, STD/HIV Branch, Division of Preventive and Personal Health, 803/898–0749.

JoAnn Lafontaine, RWCA Coordinator, STD/HIV Branch, Division of Preventive and Personal Health, 803/898–0752.

Low Country Care Consortium

Jerry Binns, President, ACCESS Network, 843/681–2437.

Ann Driessen, Case Manager, Beaufort-Jasper Comprehensive Health Services, Ridgeland, 843/987–7458.

Midlands Care Consortium

Pat Derajtys, Nurse Practitioner, Department of Internal Medicine, University of South Carolina School of Medicine, 803/540–1000.

Carmen Julius, Executive Director, Palmetto AIDS Life Support Services (PALSS), 803/779–7257.

Nancy Raley, Executive Director, Midlands Care Consortium, 803/540–1000.

Michelle Rojas, Title III Project Coordinator, Richland Community Health Care Association, 803/799–8407.

Pee Dee Care Consortium

Karen Beckford, Executive Director, Help for the Pee Dee, 843/667–9414.

Tri-County Interagency AIDS Coalition

Carl Humphries, Communicable Disease Supervisor, Edisto Health Department, 803/533–7229.

Waccamaw Care Consortium

Jeff Kimbro, Executive Director, CARETEAM, 843/236–9000.

REFERENCES

Berry, D., M. McKinney, M. McClain, and A. Valero-Figueira, 1995. Rural HIV Services Networks: Patterns of Care and Policy Issues. Rockville, MD; Health Resources and Services Administration/Bureau of Primary Health Care/Office of Science and Epidemiology.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998. HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report, 10 (2). Atlanta, GA: CDC.

Finny, M., Review and Recommendations Regarding HIV/AIDS Treatment Advances and Managed Care Field. Albuquerque, NM: HIV/AIDS Bureau, Department of Health, (5).

Goldsmith, F., D. Puskin, and D. Stiles, 1993. Improving the Operational Definition of ''Rural Areas'' for Federal Programs. Rockville, MD: Federal Office of Rural Health Policy.

McKinney, M., 1998. Southeastern Conference on Rural HIV/AIDS: Issues in Prevention and Treatment Conference Report. Kansas City, MO: National Rural Health Association.

APPENDIX A: FEDERAL DEFINITION OF A RURAL AREA

One of the challenges of addressing needs in rural areas from a policymaker's perspective is that the term ''rural'' is not easily defined. Of the various definitions, two of the most commonly used by federal programs were developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Bureau of the Census. Both of these definitions establish a quantitative measure to define rural.

The Bureau of the Census defines an urbanized area (UA) by population density. Each UA includes a central city and the surrounding densely settled territory that together have a population of 50,000 or more and a population density exceeding 1,000 people per square mile. A UA may cover parts of several counties. Additionally, places (cities, towns, villages, etc) with a population of 2,500 or more outside of a UA are considered to be an urban.

OMB designates Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) as one city with 50,000 or more inhabitants or an urbanized area (defined by the Bureau of Census) with at least 50,000 inhabitants and a total MSA population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). Each MSA must include the county in which the central city is located and additional contiguous counties that are economically and socially integrated with the central county. Any county that is not included in an MSA is considered to be non-metropolitan. Periodically, OMB reclassifies counties on the basis of Census data and population estimates.

It is generally agreed that in rural areas, unless additional encouragement or support is provided, easy geographical access to health and social services is lacking. However, the definitions start to get blurry when considering some metropolitan counties that are so large they contain small towns and rural areas. By one estimate, based on 1980 decennial census data, of the slightly over 32 million persons who live in large metropolitan counties, approximately two million lived in small towns and rural areas without easy geographical access to central areas (Goldsmith, 1993).

APPENDIX B: CHARACTERISTICS OF U.S. RURAL POPULATION

In 1997, over 54 million Americans lived in rural areas, making up 20 percent of the U.S. population. During much of the 1990s, the rural population grew faster than urban populations.

Race/Ethnicity—Eighty-three (83) percent of rural residents are white, as compared to 69 percent of urban residents. African Americans make up nine percent of the rural population and 14 percent of the urban population. Hispanics account for five percent of the rural population and 11 percent of the urban population.

Income Level—In 1996, real per capita income in rural areas was $18,527 as compared to $25,944 in urban areas. Sixteen percent of rural residents live in poverty as compared to 13 percent of urban residents. Poverty is especially high among rural minorities with 35 percent of African Americans, 33 percent of Hispanics, and 34 percent of Native Americans in rural areas living in poverty. In comparison, 27 percent of African Americans, 27 percent of Hispanics, and 29 percent of Native Americans living in urban areas live in poverty.

Unemployment—In 1997, unemployment in rural areas was 5.2 percent as compared to 4.9 percent in urban areas.

Health Insurance—In 1996, 46 percent of rural residents lacked private health insurance as compared to 38 percent of urban residents.

Access to Health Care Providers—Over 22 million rural Americans live in areas that are designated Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs).

Source: ''Facts about the Rural Population of the United States,'' Rural Information Center Health Service, August 1998.

APPENDIX C: CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITIES OF COLOR AT RISK FOR HIV/AIDS

Although African Americans account for approximately 13 percent of the U.S. population, they represent 36 of all AIDS cases and 45 percent of all new HIV infections. Similarly, Hispanic Americans constitute approximately 8 percent of the U.S. population, but account for 18 percent of all AIDS cases and 22 percent of new HIV infections. Risk for HIV infection may be compounded by diversity in nationalities and cultural practices, language and poverty.

Native Americans often live in geographically remote areas in the United States. Native Americans represent less than one percent of the total United States population and comprise at least 557 federally recognized tribes with each tribe having its own traditions, beliefs, and cultural practices. Approximately 1,800 cases of AIDS have been reported among Native Americans through 1997.

Asian Americans have come to the United States from more than forty countries and territories and speak more than one hundred languages and dialects. Generally, Asian Americans live in more urban areas, as opposed to remote rural locations. As HIV/AIDS infections increase throughout South and Southeast Asia, the likelihood of a rise in new infections among Asian Americans accelerates as families traverse back and forth between their home countries and the United States.

APPENDIX D: NEW MEXICO AIDS SERVICES; DESCRIPTIONS OF FOUR HMA DISTRICTS

District 1, Albuquerque (Counties served: Bernalillo, Cibola, McKinley, Sandoval, San Juan, Socorro, Torrance and Valencia).

Caseload—495 clients.

Client Characteristics:

Male: 90%, Female: 10%.

African American: 4%, Hispanic: 37%, Native American: 7%, White: 50%.

Clients with a third party payer: 36%.

Rural clients: 14% (any client residing outside of Bernalillo County).

Capitation Rate:

Case Management: $221 per client/month.

Primary Care: $109 per client/month.

The state contracts with two agencies, both based in Albuquerque, to provide services in the District 1 HMA. Since initiation of the HMA, New Mexico AIDS Services (NMAS) and the University of New Mexico, Health Science Center, Infectious Disease Clinic have worked closely to coordinate case management services and primary care, even though services are provided at separate sites. In 2000, both case management/support services and clinical care will be available at one location in Albuquerque. The HMA also has a field office in Farmington, New Mexico. One case manager is based in Farmington and clients in outlying areas can either access primary care in Albuquerque or from local physicians funded through the Title III program. If a client does chose to travel to Albuquerque, mileage is reimbursed.

The case manager in Farmington will make home visits or meet clients at a designated location. The Farmington case manager carries a caseload of approximately 40 clients, in comparison to the 48–55 clients served by case managers in Albuquerque because of the additional travel time required.

Regional community task force meetings are held four times a year for clients, families, and rural providers. Two of the meetings are held in Farmington and two are held in other regions of the HMA. The meetings allow an opportunity for clients to provide feedback on services. Dinner is provided at the meeting to encourage attendance.

District 2, Santa Fe—(Counties served: Colfax, Harding, Los Alamos, Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Santa Fe, Taos, and Union)

Caseload—285 are enrolled in the HMA—the maximum stipulated in the contract with the state (of a total of 317 clients).

Client Characteristics:

Male: 90%, Female: 10%.

African American: 2%, Hispanic: 39%, Native American: 4%, White: 54%.

Clients with a third party payer: 94% (43% are on CHIP).

Rural clients: 43% (any client residing outside of the City of Santa Fe).

Capitation Rate:

Under 300% FPL: $305/mo.

Over 300% FPL: $50/mo.

The District 2 HMA is administered by the Southwest C.A.R.E. Center (SCC), an AIDS service organization (ASO) based in Santa Fe. SCC's clinic is staffed with physicians, nurses, and case managers and provides one-stop shopping for clients. Centralized services have allowed SCC to adopt a care team model, in which the case manager, physician and client work closely to determine an appropriate course of treatment and support for the client.

Many clients in outlying counties prefer to go to Santa Fe, if at all possible, because of the quality of primary care services provided at the Santa Fe clinic. Mileage is reimbursed to all primary care and case management appointments. For those who prefer not to or cannot go to Santa Fe, case management services are available in Taos. The two case managers in Taos have about half the caseload of those in Santa Fe due to the travel required to meet with clients.

District 3, Las Cruces—(Counties served: Catron, Dona Ana, Grant, Hidalgo, Luna, Otero, and Sierra)

Caseload—90 clients.

Client Characteristics:

Male: 83%, Female: 16% (1% other).

African American: 3%, Hispanic: 52%, Native American: 2%, White: 43%.

Rural clients: 50% (any client residing outside of the City of Las Cruces).

Capitation Rate:

$387 per client/month.

Camino de Vida Center for HIV Services is based in Las Cruces, the second largest city in the state. The HMA employs two full-time case managers. A promotor, an additional staff member not funded through the HMA, works with case managers and focuses on trans-border services. The promotor sees clients who travel regularly between the United States and Mexico. Even though more than half of their caseload is Hispanic, neither of the HMA-funded case managers is bilingual. The agency would like to hire a part-time bilingual case manager. Currently, the client resource coordinator, who is bilingual, will travel to appointments with the case managers when it is necessary.

Case managers see most clients once per month, but the amount of contact depends on clients' need. Case managers make home visits but many clients from rural areas also travel to Las Cruces.

The agency's medical director sees clients at the Las Cruces clinic. Private physicians participating in the state's Title III program provide services outside of Las Cruces. Some clients see a physician in District 4 because it is closer to where they reside and some clients with private insurance go to El Paso for primary care since there is more access to infectious disease physicians there.

District 4, Roswell—(Counties served: Chaves, Curry, De Baca, Eddy, Guadalupe, Lea, Lincoln, Quay, and Roosevelt)

Caseload—82 clients.

Client Characteristics:cell 078

Male: 81%, Female: 19%.

African American: 10%, Hispanic: 36%, White: 54%.

Rural clients: 100%.

Capitation Rate:

$314 per client/month.

Pecos Valley HIV/AIDS Resource Center is an ASO that provides case management and support services and also conducts HIV prevention activities, including syringe exchange. The agency provides HIV counseling and testing, which serves as a direct link to services for newly diagnosed persons living with HIV/AIDS. However, approximately 50 percent of the HMA's clients first are diagnosed with HIV in the hospital or emergency room.

This HMA does not provide on-site medical services. The staff nurse handles most of the assessment and referral of clients. For example, clients will call the nurse to see if a certain condition is severe enough to warrant a trip to the emergency room or if it can be addressed at their next medical appointment. This approach is more cost effective than having a physician on staff. The HMA has a memoranda of agreement (MOAs) to provide services to their clients with two physicians in the area that are funded through the Title III program.

One case manager is on staff and the agency also contracts with another agency to provide case management services. This agency was providing case management services before the HMA was formed and some of the clients preferred to remain with their original case manager. Case managers get to know clients personally and address their needs on an individual basis because the caseload is small. Contact with the case manager is dependent on client need. Approximately 30–40 percent of clients meet with their case manager at least once every two months. About ten percent of clients come into the office for appointments. The case manager travels to the remaining 90 percent of clients. Travel time can be as long as 3.5 hours one way.

APPENDIX E: SOUTH CAROLINA'S LEAD PRIMARY CARE AND SUPPORT SERVICE AGENCIES

Tri-County Interagency AIDS Coalition—(Counties served: Bamberg, Calhoun, and Orangeburg)

Caseload—355 clients.

Client Characteristics:

Male: 61%, Female: 39%.

African American: 93%, White: 7%.

Uninsured: 70%.

Rural: 100%.

The Edisto Health Department, based in Orangeburg, is the lead agency of the Tri-

County Interagency AIDS Coalition. The health department estimates that there are between 500–700 persons living with HIV/AIDS in the service area and it plans to increase outreach efforts to bring more people into care.

The lead agency administers all the Title II funds received by the consortium. There are few service providers in the area and many support services, such as the local food and clothing banks, are provided on a very limited basis by the local churches. The churches have formed a coalition, called the Cooperative Church Ministries of Orangeburg (CCMO) and combined their resources for a more coordinated approach of helping the community. CCMO administers the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) funds for the consortium (writing the checks to the landlords).

The health department employs three nurses (two full-time and one part-time) as case managers. Due to the staffing at the health department, nurses were more readily available than social workers to fill the case manager positions. Case managers focus much of their time on treatment education and arranging access to prescriptions in addition to assuring that the other needs of clients are addressed.

Flexibility is an important element of the relationship between clients and their case manager. Case managers see clients during clinic visits and also maintain phone contact. Since many of the clients are isolated, home visits strengthen the provider/client relationship and the health department believes that face-to-face interaction is important in helping clients adhere to their treatment regimens. The case mangers can assess the client's environment and identify factors that may make adherence difficult. For example, a client may live with people who are not aware of his or her HIV status and feels that he or she cannot take medications without having his or her HIV status discovered.

The case managers also will meet with clients at other sites that the client may designate and will drive clients to appointments if they prefer to meet at the agency's office. The disease intervention specialist, who works for the same department that administers the HIV/AIDS program, will visit clients if they are in the area doing partner notification.

The health department provides both primary and specialty care. It contracts on an hourly basis (the most cost effective way for the health department to provide care) with four general practitioners and an Infectious Disease (ID) Physician (there is only a small number of IDs in the state and most are in Charleston and Columbia). The ID physician consults with the four other physicians.

The health department's clinic for clients is open every Thursday from 5–9 p.m. Each week it is staffed by three physicians, including the ID physician. The commitment of the physicians involved is a critical component. For example, some clients are resistant to attending the clinic, whether they fear loss of confidentiality or are just not emotionally prepared in their acceptance of their HIV status. The ID physician will see these clients in his office on a routine or emergency basis. One of the concerns about limited clinic hours is that clients may not have access to care when they need it. For example, if a client calls on Monday with a sore throat, they will have to wait until Thursday to see a physician. If the situation requires, the client is referred to the emergency room.

Once again, transportation can serve as a major barrier for clients attending the weekly clinic. The health department contracts with a transportation service. When they were considering the contract, it was discovered that if they paid by the mile they could only pay a contractor the health department's standard reimbursement rate. This was far too low for a professional provider. Instead, the health department pays the provider a flat fee per week (about $10,000 per year) to bring clients to the Thursday night clinic. The health department carefully monitors the contract to make sure it is cost effective.

Waccamaw Care Consortium, Myrtle Beach—(Counties served: Georgetown, Horry, and Williamsburg)

Caseload—350 active clients (will serve nearly 450 over the course of the year)

Client Characteristics:

Male: 60%, Female: 40%.

African American: 57%, Hispanic: 1%, White: 40%, Other: 1%.

Uninsured and underinsured: 80%.

Rural: 50%.

CARETEAM, based in Myrtle Beach, is the lead agency of the Waccamaw Care Consortium, which is composed of ten agencies. Horry County is primarily middle class and the other two counties are more rural and have fewer resources. The lead agency provides both medical care and support services. One of the challenges identified in service delivery in the region is that the service area is long and narrow, and the lead agency is located in the northern part of the region. It may take more than 1.5 hours, one way, to travel to the outlying areas because of the geographic configuration of the service area.

CARETEAM employs four case managers. Three have caseloads of about 90–100 clients. The Director of Case Management has a smaller caseload of about 40 clients because this caseload requires more intensive management. Case managers contact clients by phone at least once a month and meet with clients on a face-to-face basis at least once every three months (when applicable). Case managers will meet with clients at the office, clients' homes, or at a designated location.

The agency contracts with five physicians that have been recruited (either paid per month or per patient). Two of the doctors reside in the region. The other three are ID physicians that commute from Charleston. The clinics are operated all day Monday and half day on Tuesday and Wednesday. Limited clinic hours have not been a problem since clients can see a physician during off-hours if necessary. All clinics are held off-site at three physicians' offices located throughout the service area. A key component in the provision of primary care is the medical case manager, who is a medical technician. The medical case manager does all the administrative work, including scheduling appointments, lab work and prescriptions assistance (i.e. state, ADAP, pharmaceutical companies) for the phyisican to cut down on their work. The medical case manager is present at all the clinics.

Transportation is provided to medical visits by either volunteers or through contracts with individual drivers who are paid by the hour. CARETEAM has used taxis in the past but these proved to be too expensive. While some providers in rural areas have been reluctant to use volunteers to provide transportation, fearing clients will be resistant to riding with volunteers due to confidentiality concerns, this has not been the experience of CARETEAM. In the future, CARETEAM would like to acquire a van and hire a driver on a part-time basis to provide transportation to clients.

Pee Dee Care Consortium—(Counties served: Chesterfield, Darlington, Dillion, Florence, Marion and Marlboro)

Caseload—410 clients.

Client Characteristics:

Male: 65%, Female: 35%.

African American: 96%.

Uninsured: 96%.

Rural: 70%.

Hope for the Pee Dee, an ASO based in Florence, is the consortium's lead agency and the sole recipient of Title II funds. The agency provides case management services and onsite primary medical care. The agency's medical clinic is open three days a week and staffed by a general practitioner. The agency will contract with an ID physician in the near future who will be available for consultation.

The clinic employs three full-time case managers, each with a caseload of approximately one hundred twenty clients. Most of the clients (about 80 percent) come into the medical clinic at least once a month and meet with their case manager at the same time. Case managers contact clients by phone every six weeks. For the majority of clients, medical services are not the top priority. Instead, they are much more concerned with issues related to daily living such as access to benefits, housing, food, and job training.

In the consortium region, access to other community-based support services is limited. Lack of transportation can impact access but there are other challenges. For example, the local food bank recently experienced funding problems that could have jeopardized food services for persons living with HIV/AIDS. As the only agency of its kind in the region, if it had to close, even temporarily, it would have been difficult to arrange an alternative source of food for the agency's clients.

Most clients can find some way to get to the clinic, such as the Rural Transit System, but this travel can be time consuming and inconvenient. The agency will help arrange local transportation and will pay when necessary. The agency would like to either establish a mobile clinic or find physicians in the region who would donate office space in which the agency could hold off-site clinics.

Low Country Care Consortium, Hilton Head—(Counties served: Beaufort, Colleton, Hampton, and Jasper)

Caseload—190 clients.

Client Characteristics:

Male: 58%, Female: 42%.

African American: 65%, Asian/Pacific Islander: 1%, Hispanic: 5%, White: 29%.

Uninsured: 85%.

Rural: 100%.

ACCESS Network, located in Hilton Head and Hampton, is the lead agency for the Low Country Care Consortium, which serves a four-county area in the southeastern section of the state. The service area is about the size of Delaware and Rhode Island combined and has a population of about 200,000. The consortium considers the entire service area to be rural in nature.

ACCESS Network is an ASO providing a full range of support services. In the service area, primary care is provided by various clinics, including Beaufort/Jasper Comprehensive Health Services, a Title III-funded provider, and private physicians. The Title III provider was first funded in 1998 and operates five local clinics serving Beaufort, Hampton and Jasper Counties. This additional funding for primary case services allowed the consortium to expand support services with Title II funds that had been previously used for primary care.

ACCESS Network employs two case managers, each serving a specific geographic area. One serves approximately 110 clients, the other 65–85. The case managers focus on the assessment of client needs through face-to-face interaction. Most meetings with clients take place off-site, requiring significant

travel on the part of case managers. The agency utilizes support personnel to carry out the benefits management process and complete paper work in order to provide sufficient time for the case managers to meet with clients. Contact with case managers depends on the severity of the client's needs. Approximately 20 percent of the caseload requires intensive contact either daily or once a week. Other clients see their case manager every 6–9 months.

Case managers link clients with primary care providers in the service region. There are no formal linkages between ACCESS Network and these providers. Primary care is available from clinics operated by rural health services, private physicians and nonprofit health care providers. Since ACCESS is not formally linked to primary health care providers, case managers play an important role in assuring that clients access care. At intake, clients are asked if they already have a physician that they would like to continue to see and whether they have a source of payment. If the client does not have a physician, a referral is made based on geography and ability to pay. Low-income clients are treated in various local clinics that provide services on a free or sliding-scale basis to eligible clients.

Because the physicians in these clinics see more HIV-infected clients, they often have greater expertise in the treatment of HIV than other physicians in the community. Clients who are not eligible for these clinics (because of income level or they have private insurance) may end up seeing local physicians with less experience in treating HIV or having to drive to Savannah or Charleston to see an infectious disease specialist (anywhere from 50–110 miles one way). ACCESS provides some funds to primary care providers for services such as diagnostic tests, lab work or co-payments that are not covered by other payment sources. The primary care providers invoice ACCESS for these agreed upon services.

In the last eighteen months, ACCESS has been strengthening its ties with primary care providers and there has been greater coordination between physicians and case managers. Physicians and case managers consult about the clients' course of treatment and other factors impacting the client's overall wellbeing. Case managers also serve as a treatment advocate for the client.

As in many rural areas, informal linkages can be very important in obtaining a full range of medical and support services for clients. For example, situated next to ACCESS Network's Hilton Head office is ''Volunteers in Medicine,'' a clinic staffed by retired health professionals who provide free health care. While it was a coincidence that the clinic opened next door to ACCESS Network, it has resulted in a close collaboration between the two agencies and allows case managers to be much more involved in the care of clients receiving treatment at the ''Volunteers in Medicine'' clinic.

Mr. Speaker, what this report talks about, it kind of looks in depth at two rural States. They chose New Mexico because it had a high incidence of minorities and had a lot of rural cities with small towns in those areas and Hispanics and Indians were in New Mexico. They chose South Carolina again because of the smallness and the rural nature of the State and the high incidence of African Americans. What they found in both of those cases is that there were some challenges in both of those States.

In addition to all the things I talked about earlier, there is a lack of Federal dollars; there is a lack of public awareness, inadequate housing and unstable home environment. There is just a lack of community understanding, of family support, that they could not, in fact, have the kind of support that would enable people in the South to get it. Also there is a lack of transportation services in those areas, a lack of case management and services and a comprehensive program to respond to AIDS programs, a lack of services to assist people in understanding they need to stay on their drug treatment and have a management system, have a disciplined system where, indeed, they were under those areas, certainly a lack of mental counseling or religious counseling in these areas, and a lack of actually just an appreciation of the disease.

There are issues that indeed affect us in more ways than we would think. But my reason in bringing this, Mr. Speaker, is to have my colleagues to recognize that AIDS is an issue that is affecting the South and is going unnoticed. It is a silent disease killing people. We cannot work on those perceptions that we have had. We need to understand the fact. We really need to look and to see what we can do to curb and certainly the whole issue of sexually transmitted disease and it being a predictor for the likelihood of getting HIV, that ought to be addressed. Only 28 counties in more than 3,000 counties in the country really have any significant cases of sexually transmitted disease, and in North Carolina we certainly have it. There is a relationship. We can fight that. We can fight that only by education and awareness.

The final article I wanted to reference is indeed the impact it is having on women. Again, one of the misperceptions is that this is a disease of white gay men. That could not be further from the truth. As I have said, although men constitute more than female, but the rate at which the growth is going is happening much faster, as I said earlier, again this is North Carolina. And in North Carolina although 68 percent are male, roughly 32 percent are female, that rate is growing faster now for females than for males. And the rate is growing faster for African American females than it is for non-African American females. This article is from the New York Times. Again, Mr. Speaker, I include the article for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, July 3, 2001]

AIDS EPIDEMIC TAKES TOLL ON BLACK WOMEN

(By Kevin Sack)

GREENWOOD, MISS.—Here is the rural South, the image of AIDS today looks very much like Tyeste W. Roney.

Not a gay white man. Not a crack-addicted prostitute. But a 20-year-old black woman with a gold stud in her nose, an orange bandanna covering her braids, and her nickname, Easha, tattooed on one leg.

In the back of her mind at least, Ms. Roney had known for years that she could contract H.I.V. by having unprotected sex. Her mother had been telling her so since Ms. Roney was 13, when she lost her virginity. But either the lesson did not stick, or Ms. Roney did not have the power to negotiate safer sex with older lovers. She says that many of the men she can count as partners did not use condoms.

In February, after enduring 10 days of bleeding, Ms. Roney went to a health clinic. First a nurse surprised her by telling her that she had been pregnant and had miscarried. Then the nurse asked Ms. Roney if she knew she was carrying the virus that causes AIDS.

''I said, 'Get out of here, that can't be so,'' Ms. Roney recalled. ''I just broke down and cried. I thought I wasn't going to be here long. Maybe a month.''

It is a scene that has become all too familiar for poor black women here in the Mississippi Delta and across the rural south. Even as the AIDS epidemic has subsided elsewhere in the United States, it has taken firm root among women in places like Greenwood, where messages about prevention and protection are often overtaken by the daily struggle to get by.

Researchers say that in many ways the epidemic in the south more closely resembles the situation of the developing world than of the rest of the country. Joblessness, substance abuse, teenage pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, inadequate schools, minimal access to health care and entrenched poverty all conspire here to thwart the progress that has been made among other high-risk groups, particularly gay men.

While AIDS rates in the United States remain lower among women than men, women now account for a fourth of all newly diagnosed cases, double the percentage from 10 years ago. That growth has largely been driven by the disproportionate spread of the disease among heterosexual black women, particularly in the South.

For those who contract H.I.V. or AIDS in the rural South, life can become intensely isolated. Because of widespread misunderstandings about the ways H.I.V. is transmitted, the stigma facing those who are infected is often suffocating.

Many women are terrified to tell even their families, and they find their only comfort in the monthly meetings of a support group. One woman here, who lives with her son, is convinced that he would make her eat on paper plates and would keep her away from her grandchildren if he knew of her illness. Ms. Roney, who has informed only her family members, said she lost several neighborhood friends after they saw a health department van pull into her driveway to pick her up for a clinic visit.

Black women, who make up 7 percent of the nation's population, accounted for 16 percent of all new AIDS diagnoses in 1999, a percentage that has grown steadily since the syndrome was first identified 20 years ago. By comparison, black men made up 35 percent, white men 27 percent, Latino men 14 percent, and white and Latino women were each 4 percent.

While the number of new AIDS cases in the United States began to decline in the mid-1990's, the reversal started later for Southern black women, and the drop has been slower.

From 1981 to 1999, 26,522 black women developed AIDS in the 11 states of the former Confederacy. In Mississippi and North Carolina, statistics show that more black women than white men have contracted H.I.V. over the epidemic's course.

Unless a cure is found, the share of AIDS patients who are black and female is likely to rise. The trend is strikingly visible in Southern states with large black populations. Here in Mississippi, 28.5 percent of those reporting new H.I.V. infections in 2000 were black women, up from 13 percent in

1990. In Alabama, the number rose to 31 percent, from 13 percent. In North Carolina, it rose to 27 percent, from 18 percent.

''While the H.I.V. epidemic is also increasingly affecting men in the South and black men, the overall trends for women are distinct,'' concluded researchers with the Centers for Disease Conrol and Prevention in a paper published in March in The Journal of the American Medical Association. ''The H.I.V. epidemic in women initially centered on injection drug-using women in the urban Northeast, but now centers on women with heterosexual risk in the South.''

AN EXPLOSIVE INCREASE

In 1997, Dr. Hamza O. Brimah, a Nigerian-born physician who received training in AIDS care in London and New York, opened the Magnolia Medical clinic in a strip mall here in affiliation with the Greenwood Leflore Hospital. Dr. Brimah is the only AIDS specialist in a nine-county area. He started with fewer than 10 AIDS patients. Now he has 185. He assumes he is seeing only a fraction of those who are actually infected.

''In the beginning, I remembered everybody's name,'' Dr. Brimah said. ''Now I have a hard time. Who's this? Who's that? They're coming at me so fast.''

Sixty percent of Dr. Brimah's AIDS patients are women and 95 percent are black, in an area where 61 percent of the population is black. Almost all were infected through heterosexual transmission, and a majority, he estimates, came to him with a history of sexually transmitted disease.

Research has shown that people with sexually transmitted diseases like syphilis, gonorrhea and chlamydia have twice to five times the risk of contracting H.I.V., because the diseases cause ulcerations in protective mucous membranes. The South has consistently had the country's highest rates of sexually transmitted diseases. In 1999, for instance, 9 of the 10 states with the highest rates of gonorrhea and syphilis and 7 of the 10 with the highest rates of chlamydia were in the South, according to C.D.C. figures.

Dr. Brimah hears from his patients that H.I.V. is often the least of their worries. ''There are issues,'' he said, ''of looking after children, trying to get insurance, the lack of a father in the home, alcohol, drugs. They have so much going on.''

Because of that, he said, women rarely seek out H.I.V. testing for themselves or their partners. Many of his patients, like Ms. Roney, learn that they are positive only when they become pregnant.

The other thing Dr. Brimah hears repeatedly from his patients is that they understood before they were infected that H.I.V. could be transmitted hetrerosexually. Typically, they hold no misconceptions that H.I.V. victimizes only gay white men. And yet, like smokers, speeders and drug users, they place themselves knowingly at risk.

Dr. Brimah told of one patient who dutifully took annual H.I.V. tests for three years, who clearly understood the nature of the virus and who then tested positive in the fourth year. ''She was clued up, but she took the risk,'' he said. ''She really couldn't explain it.''

The women often struggle to explain their recklessness. They look down at the floor when asked to discuss their sexual behavior. Even those who have had many sexual partners will say they were choosy, that they had known their partners for years, sometimes for a lifetime and that they trusted them. Over and over, they say, they just did not think it could happen to them.

''I just wasn't thinking about no H.I.V., and I wasn't thinking about no AIDS and I wasn't thinking about no pregnancy,'' Ms. Roney said. ''I was just being hardheaded. I don't know any other way to break it down.''

Jean, a 44-year-old woman with AIDS who did not want her last name used, said she fell into a fast lifestyle after getting divorced in 1987. She said she might have had 30 to 35 partners over the last 10 years, and that they only occasionally used condoms.

''I guess I just blocked it out of my mind,'' she said. ''I thought I had a good heart so it wouldn't happen to me. I knew it could happen, I guess, but I was just being stupid.''

Health workers and researchers who hear these stories say that such high-stakes risk-taking may seem to make no sense, but that it must be viewed within the context of lives defined fatalism, faith and powerlessness. Often they say, there is little to break the tedium and despondency of life here, and certainly little that provides pleasure, other than sex.

''There's a sense that you don't control your life that much, and if God wants me to have H.I.V. I'll get it,'' said Kathryn Whetted-Goldstein, an assistant professor of public policy at Duke who has been studying AIDS in Southern states. ''All of their life experiences teach them that they have very little control over their future.''

Some girls start having sex at extremely young ages, almost always with older men, and find they have little ability to persuade their partners to use condoms.

''Most times I asked them to use one,'' ''said Ms. Roney, a ninth-grade dropout, ''but you know how guys are. They do their little sweet talk. 'It doesn't feel the same. Let's use one next time.' I just went along with it. I fell into that trap.''

POVERTY, DRUGS AND RISK

Often, though not always, drugs and money play a vital role as well. Indeed, Dr. Brimah said the desperate need for money had become an H.I.V. risk factor in the Delta in the same way that needle-sharing was in the cities.

The Mississippi Delta, where the young green cotton crop shares the summer landscape with immense catfish farming ponds, has for years been among the poorest regions in America.

The median income here in Leflore County was $21,027 in 1997, more than $7,000 below the state median, which is itself the second lowest in the country. Three of every 10 Leflore residents live below the poverty line. The unemployment rate in April was 7.1 percent (some neighboring counties have broken well into double digits) and the recent closing of several large plants has made work even harder to find than usual.

The poverty is apparent on the rough streets and unpaved alleys of black neighborhoods like Baptisttown and McLaurin, where men and women sweat out steamy nights on the porches of dilapidated shotgun shacks. Just across the Yazoo River lies another world of brick mansions and lovingly tended lawns, where the white people live.

As everywhere, some poor women here make ends meet through prostitution, But the more common practice is a less formalized sex-for-money exchange in which nothing is negotiated up front. Rather, several women and health workers explained, there is an unstated assumption that a woman who engaged in casual sex with a man will be rewarded with a little financial help, perhaps in paying the rent, perhaps in buying groceries. As one woman explained it to Dr. Brimah: ''You know how it is with men, doc. No honey, no money.

Gina M. Wingood, assistant professor of public health at Emory University who has studied AIDS in rural Alabama, said ''It's just trying to make ends meet, day-to-day survival. We sort of see it in terms of prostitution, but they see it as how they have to frame their lives, especially if they have children or elderly parents to care for.''

Jean, the 44-year-old AIDS patient, said she regularly operated that way. ''Some of them would pay for sex but it wasn't like I was out on the street,'' she said. ''The guy would just give me a little something sometimes. I had an apartment and had bills and I wasn't working.''

Jerome E. Winston, a health department worker who tracks the sexual networks of infected people in the Delta, said he had heard complaints from some women about other women who accepted insufficient compensation for their companionship.

''What we had said to us a couple of times by the other girls is that the younger girls are messing up the system because they're giving it away virtually for free,'' Dr. Winston said. ''They don't negotiate anything except for maybe a new CD or a pair of shoes.''

Sex is also sometimes exchanged for drugs, particularly crack cocaine, though this seems to be more common in larger towns in the southern part of the state.

Sharyn Janes, a professor of nursing at the University of Southern Mississippi, said she heard horror stories while conducting interviews with people considered at high risk of infection. One man, she said, told her that he once drove a woman out of town when she refused his demand for sex after he gave her crack. He told her that ''nobody gets a free ride'' and left her to walk home, Ms. Janes said.

TRACING SEXUAL NETWORKS

Because of the breadth and casualness of sexual networks here, an infection can be virtually impossible to track and control.

In the first half of 1999, for instance, health officials untangled a trail left by two H.I.V.-positive men in Greenwood who had had sex with 18 women over a three-year period. Two of the women had had sex with both men. Five were themselves infected with the virus, and they in turn had had sex with 24 other men.

A study of the cluster by the C.D.C. found that half of those interviewed had a history of other sexually transmitted diseases, that some of the H.I.V.-infected women were as young as 13, and that the median age of the infected women was 16, compared with 25 for the infected men.

''The teenager's concept is that this guy is older so he's going to know what he's doing and he will take care of me,'' said Dr. Shannon L. Hader, a Centers for Disease Control researcher who studied the Greenwood cluster. ''The reality is that older men have had more partners and are therefore more likely to have S.T.D.'s.''

Clearly, Dr. Hader said, messages about prevention are not getting through. The rural South is politically conservative, and prevention programs in the schools tend to be episodic and focused on abstinence. Parents of students in the Greenwood schools must grant written permission before their children can be taught about condoms. Many local pastors are also reluctant to encourage explicit discussions about sex.

Dr. Hader also found a lack of knowledge about H.I.V. treatment. Five of the seven infected members of the Greenwood cluster had no idea that those with H.I.V. could now live for long periods with the help of antiretroviral drugs. That misconception has made it difficult to get patients into care, where they could also receive information about not spreading the virus.

Those who do seek care have few options. Before Dr. Brimah opened his clinic here, AIDS patients had to travel more than two hours to Jackson or Memphis, a trip that many could not make. Sandra Moore, a 32-year-old Greenwood woman who first learned that she had AIDS in 1990, would sometimes

drive as far as New Orleans for treatment. Ms. Moore had withered to 60 pounds when she first visited Dr. Brimah, and was seemingly weeks away from death. Now on medication, she has increased her weight to 105 pounds and talks of living to see her four young children graduate from high school.

The cost of treatment is also prohibitive for many here. The pills typically prescribed by Dr. Brimah can cost up to $1,200 a month. Medicaid covers many of the poorest patients, and other state and federal programs help. But the working poor often have trouble qualifying for the programs.

Last year, Dr. Brimah received a three-year, $1.2 million grant under the Ryan White Care Act, the primary source of federal money for AIDS treatment. He uses the money to pay staff members, to buy equipment, supplies and medication, and to provide transportation to needy patients.

But in general, many Southern states have received a disproportionately small share of Ryan White funds. The money is appropriated to states by a formula based on the number of people living with AIDS in that state. But the growth of the epidemic in the South has been relatively recent, and many of those infected have not progressed from H.I.V. to AIDS. Congress changed the formula last year so that money will eventually be based on H.I.V. counts, but the new system might not take effect for years.

The other factors obstructing treatment, and thus prevention, are denial and stigma. Many infected women here never tell family members and close friends for fear of being shunned and abandoned.

''A lot of people don't understand about it,'' said Jane Smith, who has only told her pastor and her mother-in-law since learning two years ago that she has AIDS. ''I guess they're scared they can catch it from being around people with it, if they cough on them or shake their hands.''

One married couple, both infected, said they were open about their status when they lived in New York but had told no one since moving to Mississippi, not even their friends at Narcotics Anonymous meetings. ''Everybody would scatter if they knew,'' said the wife.

Jean has lied to her family members, telling them that she has cancer, and has batted away their questions. Her joy, she said, is her grandchildren, and she is convinced that her son would not let her near them if he knew.

''I want to tell my family,'' she said, ''but I know they're not going to accept it, and I'm just not strong enough right now for them to reject me. It would just send me over the edge.''

This article is entitled ''AIDS Epidemic Takes Toll on Black Women.'' Let me just cite a couple of things from it.

It says: ''While AIDS rates in the United States remain lower among women than men, women now account for a fourth of all newly diagnosed cases, double the percentage from 10 years ago. That growth has largely been driven by the disproportionate spread of the disease among heterosexual black women, particularly in the South.'' Again, the South.

''Black women, who make up 7 percent of the Nation's population, accounted for 16 percent of all new AIDS diagnoses in 1999, a percentage that has grown steadily since the syndrome was first identified 20 years ago. By comparison, black men made up 35 percent, white men 27 percent, Latino men 14 percent, and white and Latino women were each 4 percent.'' Again, in women.

One of the doctors who looked at this says that he hears repeatedly by his patients in New York, and this is a doctor in New York who treats HIV patients, says that his women patients understand clearly, or they say they understand clearly, that they were infected or could be infected with HIV transmitted heterosexually, but nevertheless they go ahead and do it. It is almost like smoking. They say it is like smokers knowing indeed that the smoking is killing them, but they go ahead and do it. It is almost like a death wish. The issue is, is it drugs or is it the need for money? What is driving this kind of reckless behavior?

He says that women often struggle to explain this recklessness. They look down at the floor and they say, I know that what has happened to me is that I was not sure, I didn't protect myself, but yet I knew I should have. I trusted this person. I knew this person. And I just wasn't thinking about getting HIV. These are older women.

Health workers and researchers are struggling to know, How do you make sense of this? How is the relationship between poverty and drugs and risk often a part of this? We just have to find how we address those issues and make sure that as the life and the quality of life in these communities, that people are not walking into their own death trap. Poverty is apparently on rough streets and in the cities, and the exchange of sex for money or the exchange of drug needles that cause that has a strong part to play in it.

''Clearly,'' Dr. Hader said, ''messages about prevention are not getting through.'' We need to find a way to get those messages through. The rural South is politically conservative, and prevention programs in the schools tend to be episodic at best and more focused on abstinence rather than on protection. Parents of students in many of the schools must have written permission before anything happens. Yet those children are getting the wrong message from other places, many of them becoming pregnant and their children are likewise infected. Most local pastors are reluctant to encourage an explicit or a frank dialogue among their young people so they understand the choices they have. You see, in the South there is indeed, we are fighting not only the lack of infrastructure, we are fighting the issue of attitude.

Mr. Speaker, there is indeed an issue of AIDS across our country. There is an issue of AIDS across this Nation. Certainly there is a severe pandemic in Africa, but there is a creeping disease that is indeed affecting us in the South and in rural communities throughout the United States, particularly in the South. It has the deadly effect of a silent killer. Those of us who know better are charged with the responsibility of waking our citizens up to this horrific disease and making sure that there are programs of intervention, programs of nurturing, care and counseling, and that our communities indeed will respond to it.

□ 2045

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I will later be adding some items to the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that in some respects is a dirty little secret. Yet more and more of us in Washington and more and more seniors around the country know about this dirty little secret. It is about the outrageously high prices that Americans pay for prescription drugs.

Now, I think most Americans are appreciative to the pharmaceutical industry for the miracles they have created over the last number of years. We are all delighted that we have drugs today to treat diseases which just a few years ago were untreatable. We are not unappreciative to what the pharmaceutical industry has done. But the dirty little secret is that the Americans are paying the lion's share, in fact, I might even argue that the Americans are paying the entire share of the research and development costs for these miracle drugs for all the other consumers around the rest of the world.

Several years ago, I talked to some seniors back in Minnesota and they talked to me about going to Canada to buy prescription drugs. But they told me that when they came back after they had their little vials of whatever drug it was, whether it was Claritin or Coumadin or Glucophage or whatever the drug would be, when they would try to reorder that drug from the pharmacy up in Winnipeg or wherever they had bought the drugs in from Canada, when they tried to reorder the drugs and when the drugs came into the United States, they were stopped by the FDA. The FDA then sent a very threatening letter to those seniors saying that if they tried to do this again that, in effect, they could be prosecuted.

Now, if one was a 78-year-old grandmother getting a letter from the Food and Drug Administration in effect saying that she could be prosecuted, that what she is doing is illegal and if she tries to do this again, there are serious consequences, that is a very threatening thing to happen to a senior.

Now, they told me this story. They told me what was happening in their trips, their bus trips to Canada. I have to be very honest. It really did not register with me. In fact, it was not until almost 2 years later when a seemingly unrelated event occurred.

What happened was hog prices to our hog producers, to our farmers in Minnesota, the prices collapsed. In fact, they reached Depression-era prices. Hogs dropped to $8 per hundred weight. Now, today hogs in Minnesota are selling for about $69 to $70 per hundred weight. So now hogs are profitable again. But we had a tremendous collapse in the price of hogs.

Now, to make matters worse there was a packing plant up in Canada that was supposed to come online. There was some construction delays. For whatever reason the plant was delayed in being brought online. The net result was there were thousands of Canadian hogs, at perhaps the worst time in the history of hog production in the United States, thousands of hogs were coming across and making a disaster even worse.

Not surprisingly many of our hog producers complained about all of these Canadian hogs coming into our markets. Those of us who represent those districts, we brought those complaints and concerns to some of the Federal officials in Washington. The answer we got was relatively short and simple. ''Well, that is NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. That is what free trade is all about. You support free trade, do you not, Congressman GUTKNECHT?'' I had to say, ''Yes, I do.''

It was then that the light bulb really went on. Because I said if we are going to have free trade in terms of pork bellies, we ought to have free trade in terms of Prilosec.

I began to do some research. I feel sometimes like that little boy who came in and asked his mother a question. His mother was busy, and she said, ''Why do you not go ask your dad?'' And the little boy said, ''Well, I do not want to know that much about it.''

Well, I feel like that little boy sometimes because the more I have learned about this prescription drug issue, the more angry I become.

There is really something wrong with a system that says that American consumers on average pay $69.99 for a month's supply of Allegra 120 while our friends over in Europe enjoy exactly the same drug made in exactly the same plant under the exact same FDA approval, our friends in Europe can buy that same drug for $20.88.

If you look at this list, this is not a complete list, in fact, this is not even my list. These numbers were compiled by a group who have been studying this issue for more years certainly than I have, a group called the Life Extension Foundation, and just recently they sent us a listing. They had done a study between the United States and Europe, and here are some of the numbers.

I hope people will look at this. Let us look at commonly prescribed drugs for senior seniors. I know it is commonly prescribed because my 82-year-old father takes Coumadin. He is fortunate. He worked for a union employer all of his life. He has a pretty generous prescription drug benefit as part of his insurance package; and as a result, he does not pay the full price. But if he did, and millions of American seniors do pay full price for Coumadin, the average price in the United States for a month's supply of Coumadin is $37.74. That exact same drug in Europe sells for an average of $8.22.

Let us look at Glucophage. That is a drug that is taken principally by diabetics. If you are a diabetic in the United States and you are on Glucophage, you are probably going to be on it for the rest of your life. A 30-day supply here in the United States sells for an average of $30.12. That exact same drug made in the same FDA-approved facility in Europe sells for only $4.11.

Let me say that again. The price in the United States, $30.12. The exact same drug in Europe sells for $4.11.

As you look at some of the more expensive drugs, and this is where it becomes incredibly problematic, where you have seniors or you have other consumers that do not have prescription drug coverage, they are paying full bore for these drugs, and more and more we are seeing drugs coming on to the market like, for example, Zithromax 500, a 30-day supply in the United States sells for $486. That is the average retail price. But our friends over in Europe, and let us remember the European Union now has a gross domestic product almost equal to the United States, their standard of living is almost equal to the United States. At one time after World War II and we had the Marshall Plan, certainly it was important for Americans to help rebuild Europe and in effect to subsidize Europe; but today Zithromax 500 sells for $486 in the United States. The same drug in Europe sells for $176.19.

Mr. Speaker, this is indefensible. This is unsupportable. There is no one in this body, there is no public policymaker in America, that can defend this chart. What is worse, the pharmaceutical industry cannot defend this chart. We have had representatives of what we call PHRMA into our office. We have showed them this chart and said please explain this chart.

These are multinational companies. Many of them are based in Europe. Many of the big pharmaceutical companies now are based in Geneva or London or Paris. How is it that you are willing to sell these drugs so much cheaper in European Union countries than you are here in the United States? Now the interesting thing is they do most of the research here in the United States and we are happy for that. We want the research to remain here in the United States. But the dirty little secret is, we subsidize the starving Swiss.

All I am saying with the simple amendment that I intend to offer tomorrow is that it is time to level the playing field. I do not believe in price controls. I do not believe in more government regulations. I think in the long run both price controls and government regulations are the wrong way to go. If you doubt that, just do a brief study of the former Soviet Union, because for over 70 years there is an experiment that failed. They tried to set prices. They tried to control markets.

Mr. Speaker, markets are more powerful than armies. What the Soviet Union proved more than anything else is that you cannot hold back markets. We are in the Information Age, Mr. Speaker, and these kinds of numbers, these huge differences between what Americans pay and what Europeans pay for exactly the same drugs, that system could only survive before the Information Age. Now people can get on their computer, they can go online and they can get this information. And they can find out that in Switzerland they are able to buy Biaxin for half the price that we pay in the United States. Once Americans realize this, because information is power, once Americans realize the huge differences that they pay for the same drugs, they are not going to stand for it. They are going to start marching on this Congress and they are going to demand that we do something.

In fact, how many times do we hear at some of our town hall meetings, Congress needs to do something? Well, I am going to go back to the point I made earlier. I do not support price controls, and the truth is some of the countries in the European Union have price controls. I think it is a bad idea, and I do not want to join them. But some of the countries in the European Union do not have price controls. Switzerland does not have price controls. Germany does not have price controls.

A German can go in and buy drugs in Switzerland or a German can go in and buy drugs in France or in any other country. The European Union allows free markets within that area.

It is interesting, because just a few years ago we passed the North American Free Trade Agreement and so pork bellies can go across the borders, and fruits and vegetables can go across the borders and lumber can go across the border. There is nothing to stop one of my constituents from going to Winnipeg, Manitoba and buying a Chevrolet. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is anything that would stop that consumer from going online and on the Web and ordering almost any product they want from Winnipeg, Manitoba; or Paris, France; or Rome; or Frankfurt, Germany; or anywhere else. There is only one product which we for some reason have singled out and said American consumers do not have access to world market prices, and those are pharmaceuticals.

Now I am not here tonight to beat up on the pharmaceutical industry. As I said earlier in the discussion, I am appreciative to what the pharmaceutical industry has done. Almost every one of us has a relative, a neighbor, a parent,

a child, that has benefited from the research that the pharmaceutical industry has done.

Before I yield to my friend, the good doctor, the gentleman from Des Moines, Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), I want to talk about the three ways that we as Americans subsidize the pharmaceutical industry, because this is not largely understood. The truth of the matter is, we subsidize the pharmaceutical industry in three different ways. First of all, we subsidize them through the Tax Code. What the pharmaceutical industry is saying today is well, we spend billions of dollars on research and most of it is done here in the United States. I said earlier in my discussion I am delighted that they do the research here in the United States. The numbers that we have, the latest numbers, is that the pharmaceutical industry in the last year that we have numbers for spent about $12 billion here in the United States on research, and that is good.

What they do not say is that on the tax forms, most of these corporations are so profitable that they are at the 50 percent tax bracket, that at least half of that gets written off on their Federal income tax form. More of that gets written off on their State income tax form. Now what they are also eligible in some circumstances for is an investment tax credit. So we subsidize the pharmaceutical industry and the research that they do through the Tax Code.

Secondly, this year we will spend close to $14 billion through the NIH and other various government agencies, including the Defense Department, on basic research, most of which is available to the pharmaceutical industry free of charge. In other words, we are putting all this money into NIH and through NIST and other science agencies, also through the Department of Defense, and most of that information, once a discovery is found, is made available to the public and to the pharmaceutical industry free of charge. So there is about $14 billion worth of public research that is paid for by the American taxpayers. That is the second way we subsidize the research that they do.

The final way that we subsidize them is in the prices that we pay. These are outrageous. These are indefensible. Again, I am not here to really beat up on the pharmaceutical industry, because they are only doing what any industry, what any business, would do in terms of exploiting a market opportunity that we have given them. We give them a 17-year patent in which they can sell these drugs in the United States and really no one can compete against them. In other words, we give them a monopoly and on balance I think that is a good idea. They are exploiting this market opportunity. No, it is not ''shame on the pharmaceutical industry for creating this kind of an environment.'' It is shame on us. It is shame on our own FDA for allowing this system to develop whereby Americans are paying for all of the research and most of the profits of the large pharmaceutical companies, many of which are not even based here in the United States.

□ 2100

I am delighted to have joining us today one of the physicians who serves here in the House, the gentleman from Des Moines, Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), a former wrestler and Iowa Hawkeye, a good friend, and one who is not afraid to take on giants.

I have to tell the gentleman, I reread the story from the Book of Samuel tonight of David and Goliath, and it was a powerful story. And sometimes when I think about the huge pharmaceutical industry and the simple little amendment, I feel like David, who went out on to that field, and he took from his sack a small stone, and he slung it at Goliath, and that is sort of where we are with this small amendment.

But I want to welcome the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), who is one, as I say, who we do not always agree, but, I will tell you, I have always admired and respected, and we are delighted to have the gentleman here tonight to talk a little bit about pharmaceuticals. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GANSKE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and would like to enter into a colloquy with him.

I think the gentleman is pointing out an important difference in the price in the United States for some of those drugs and the price in Europe. Now, correct me if I am wrong, but most of those European countries do not have price controls; is that correct? Some do, some do not.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Some do, some do not. We do not want to get into a debate, because, in truth, I do not support price controls. I think the best way to break the backs of price controls is to have open markets, because once the pharmaceutical industry and European countries realize that American consumers are going to be buying from them at their prices, I think it is going to force the European Union and the pharmaceutical industry to come to a better agreement so we level the playing field. That is really what I am trying to say.

Yes, some have price controls, some do not. Every country has a slightly different regimen in how they deal with monopolies.

Mr. GANSKE. But it is a fair statement that the prices are significantly lower for the very same prescription drugs that are made in the United States that are sent overseas, that they are significantly lower, sometimes half as much or even a quarter as much, in some countries, as they are in the United States. Is that not a fair statement?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is absolutely correct. As I say, these are not my numbers. This was an Independent Life Extension Foundation study done just recently between the United States and countries in the European Union.

Let me point out, and the gentleman is more familiar with some of these drugs than I am, that Glucophage, which is a drug that I understand that once many diabetes patients take, they take it daily, in fact I guess they have given them a new patent now. Instead of a twice-a-day tablet, there is a once-a-day tablet, which gives them an extra 17 years on their patent.

We are talking about seven times more. You talk about a patient who is going to have to take that perhaps for the next 30 years, you start multiplying that difference, we are talking about thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars, multiplied by, I do not remember the exact number, but something like 35 percent of all Medicare expenditures are in one way or another related to diabetes-related illnesses.

I believe the amendment we are talking about ultimately, when fully implemented, when consumers have access and understand how it works, could save American consumers $30 billion a year.

Mr. GANSKE. I want to just pin this down. The gentleman would say it is fair to say that there are many countries in the world where the prices are significantly less than they are in the United States; even though the drugs are exactly the same, they are made in the United States, they are shipped overseas, where they do not have price controls in those countries, but that the price is set by what the market will bear. Would the gentleman say that is a correct statement?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is a correct statement based on all of the evidence and research that I have received from independent agencies. That is correct. In fact, we even have an independent study of Canada, where they do have price controls, but they are not as firm as some people think. But a study done by the Canadian Government suggests that they are saving Canadian consumers upwards of 50 percent.

Mr. GANSKE. Now, the difference, the reason that we have these very high prices in United States, as versus, say, Switzerland, is because we cannot reimport those drugs from Switzerland into the United States because we have a Federal law that prevents that from happening. Is that the correct story?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. There again, the FDA holds that, yes, we have that law. Now, last year in Congress we passed legislation by overwhelming votes, it was something like 376 to 25 here in the House, it was 90-some to 3, I think, in the Senate, essentially going on record that we want to make it clear that law-abiding citizens should not be prevented from bringing legal drugs back into the United States, especially for personal use. So, the law, in my opinion, today is not clear.

What we want to do with the amendment that I intend to offer tomorrow is clarify the legislative intent so there is

no misunderstanding between the pharmaceutical industry, the FDA and American consumers that law-abiding citizens who have a legal prescription from a physician do have the right, using mail order, using the Web, using other methods, the telephone, they can call a pharmacy in Ireland or Geneva and be able to order that drug and have it brought back in the United States, so long, again, as it is a legal, non-narcotic drug. That is the amendment I intend to offer. That, I believe, will ultimately level the playing field between the prices that Americans pay and what consumers in other countries pay, regardless of whether or not they have price controls.

Mr. GANSKE. That would mean, for instance, that a citizen in Minnesota could cross the border into Canada with a prescription and get it filled there, or a citizen in Texas or Arizona or New Mexico could cross the border and get a prescription filled there, and that would not be illegal. They could bring that back into the United States. That is the gist of the gentleman's amendment; is that correct?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. That is correct.

Mr. GANSKE. Okay. Now, then, we had hearings in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, talking about how there are some counterfeit drugs that get into the market. These hearings primarily focused on some very expensive drugs, like growth hormones, that are used for body building and other types of uses and sometimes can cost as much as $2,000 a vial. It has been reported in the press that some of that medicine is not real, that there has been adulteration or false packaging.

Now, my understanding is that this has happened within the United States. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Absolutely. The counterfeit drugs that some of these people are talking, or adulterated drugs, first of all, I want to make it clear, my amendment does not make them legal. We are only talking about drugs that are otherwise legal in the United States, where people have a legitimate prescription from a doctor. Principally what we are talking about, where this really happens, is when people travel.

For example, let me give you a story from one of the ladies at one of my town hall meetings. She has a skin condition, I think called eczema or psoriasis, but, anyway, she has a skin condition, and to deal with that and manage it, her doctor in Rochester, Minnesota, has prescribed a particular ointment only available with a prescription, and in Minnesota it sells for about $130 for one tube.

She was traveling in Ireland a couple of years ago and began to run out of this cream. She went to a pharmacy in Ireland, she had her prescription with her, she went into the local pharmacy, took her prescription, they had exactly the same drug, in exactly the same tube, made by exactly the same company, and it was $30.

Now, when she got back to the United States, she said to herself, because she needs about a tube of this ointment every month, so $130 times 12 versus $30 times 12 is a saving of $1,200 per year to this one individual.

She looked at the tube, and on the tube or on the box that it came in, it had the name of the pharmacy, and it had the phone number. Now, she did what a lot of American consumers would do to save $1,200 a year. She picked up the phone, made a $2 phone call to Ireland and said, could I get that prescription refilled? The pharmacist over there said, absolutely. So he shipped her another supply.

Mr. GANSKE. But there is nothing in the gentleman's amendment that would prevent the FDA from intercepting that shipment, that drug that she had ordered, and testing it, just like they would do if she had ordered it from a retailer in the United States and had it shipped to her home, is there?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No. In fact, if the FDA wants to test it, and, frankly, I want the FDA to enforce laws against illegal drugs. But can I just show the gentleman another chart, because I think it talks to this very point.

The problem with the FDA is not that they do not have the power to inspect; it is that they spend all of their time chasing legal drugs and law-abiding citizens. They are focusing on the wrong end.

Last year, for example, instead of stopping illegal drugs imported by illicit traffickers, some of the people the gentleman heard testimony about, what they have done is spent most of their effort going after approved drugs with law-abiding citizens. Last year the FDA detained 18 times more packages coming in from Canada than from Mexico.

We do not have a problem with Canada. We know a lot about the pharmacies in Canada. They have strong and stringent regulations in Canada. So why is the FDA detaining 90 times more packages from Canada? This was last year. Last year the FDA detained 90 times more packages from Canada than from Mexico.

They are chasing law-abiding citizens bringing legal drugs in. What they need to do is focus on the traffic that the gentleman was talking about, where you have adulterated drugs, where you have got illegal drugs, where you have got all kinds of mischief going on, which, incidentally, the gentleman and I both know that as long as we try to play by the rules that the FDA has set in place now, you are going to get more of. Because more and more consumers who cannot afford some of these very expensive drugs, as we talked about before the gentleman arrived, Zithromax 500, $486 in the United States, $176 in Europe, what you are going to do is get more and more law-abiding citizens trying to figure out, how can I get those drugs, either legally or illegally, in the United States? Because the truth of the matter is that a drug somebody cannot afford is neither safe nor effective.

Mr. GANSKE. So let me get this straight. What the gentleman would like is he would like the FDA to have enhanced enforcement to make sure that not only drugs coming into the United States from other countries are checked to make sure they are valid, but also to make sure that shipments that originate within the United States are not adulterated and are real drugs, too. And I believe at the bottom of the gentleman's other thought, the gentleman points out that we appropriated additional millions of dollars for border enforcement last year.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. And the FDA refused to use it, and that is why we need this amendment this year, is to clarify what we said last year, stop chasing law-abiding citizens with legal drugs and legal prescriptions.

Let me just suggest this: I do not know how many of our colleagues have gotten a package recently from UPS or Federal Express, I believe even the Post Office does it now, but they put a bar code on those packages. The truth of the matter is I believe that within a matter of months, if the FDA was serious about this and did not want to pursue law-abiding American citizens who are trying to save a few bucks on their prescription drugs, they could create a bar coding technology to know where that package came from, when it was shipped, and, frankly, they could even put what is in it.

In fact, we now have the technology, and it is used in most hospitals, the software was developed in Minneapolis, Minnesota, I can put them in touch with the people that developed it, in virtually every hospital now, when you go in the hospital, they put a bar-coded bracelet around your arm, and when they dispense prescription drugs in the hospital, when they bring them in, they take the wand across your bracelet and a wand across the bar code on the package so that they know, they can literally go back to their computer and know that at 3:10 p.m. this afternoon, you were given two tablets of Tylenol, or whatever the drug happened to be.

That kind of technology is not science fiction. This is available today. And if the FDA is serious about this, we can help them solve the problem.

The real issue is I do not think the FDA wants to solve this problem. They continue to commingle illegal drugs with legal drugs, and they continue to pursue the law-abiding citizens bringing in legal drugs, and yet there are literally millions of dollars of illegal drugs not only coming in from outside the United States, but, as the gentleman suggested, they are originating in the United States, and little or nothing is being done about that.

□ 2115

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very, very important point;

and I hope that some of our colleagues are in their offices working tonight, listening to the gentleman's presentation, because for sure, when the gentleman's amendment comes up, we are going to hear tomorrow all kinds of horror stories about how an adulterated drug or a fake substance could be imported from the United States so the patient would not be getting the medicine that they need, or even worse. But the real point is that that can happen within the United States just as easily, and that what we really want is we want the FDA to do its job, both on drugs that would come back into this country, but also on drugs that would be moving within this country, from one State to another State.

It is easy to think, if we have a drug that could cost $2,000 a vial, that we could have organized crime create some labels in New York, put some substance into that vial, and ship it over to California and have a big scam operation going on. I mean, that is happening within the United States.

But what the gentleman is talking about for the vast majority of our senior citizens or others who need medicines are not that that vial of growth hormone that costs $2,000, but the difference in, if the gentleman would put the other chart up with some of the examples of the prices, let us take, for example, Coumadin. That is a blood thinner. In the United States, it is going to cost $37 for a 30-day supply; in Europe it will cost $8.22. It does not make sense for organized crime to get involved with changing labels for a drug of that price range when it is going to an individual.

Now, if we are talking about wholesale, larger shipments, then I think it is a legitimate concern; but it is also one that I would answer just like we did last year, by appropriating more money for the FDA to step up its surveillance and make sure that it does not happen. But I will tell the gentleman something. If we take that drug that costs $500, the Zithromax, $486 for a 30-day supply, we can have just as big of a problem with a fake drug within the United States as from anything coming from overseas.

So I believe that these issues are being mixed up in an effort to basically defeat what I see as a free market approach to helping bring drug prices down in the United States. We have very high prices here because there is protection for the high prices here when we cannot introduce competition with lower-priced drugs, the same drugs from overseas. If we would allow our constituents to be able to order that drug from Pharmaworld in Geneva, Switzerland, at half the price, we know what would happen here. We know that the competition would drive the prices down at our pharmacies in this country too.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, markets work.

Mr. GANSKE. Or, for example, someone's local pharmacist would be able to order that drug from the wholesaler at the lower price and would be able to pass those savings on to the consumer. That is why this idea passed the House of Representatives with 350-plus votes just a year or so ago. But I believe, then, that the opponents to that legislation brought forward this issue of the fact that there are fake drugs that are occasionally found and then used that to try to knock down the whole idea of increased competition from overseas.

Really, the solution is simply, both within the United States and from drugs that could come in from abroad, making sure that the FDA does its job. This is part of a bill that I introduced on prescription drugs. The other main aspect of that bill is that for low-income seniors, we would allow them to utilize the State Medicaid drug programs up to 175 percent of poverty and get a Medicaid card and be able to go to their local pharmacist; and I believe that there is a way to work with the pharmaceutical houses on that issue and avoid a national drug pricing mechanism. That is a little different issue, but the idea that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Gutknecht) has, I think, is a legitimate one, and it basically is a free market approach. It just makes the market a little bigger. It makes it more global than a protectionist policy that stops at our borders that prevents the very same drugs made in the United States, made in New Jersey and shipped overseas as versus consumed here, the very same drugs, from coming back in at a somewhat less price.

So tomorrow, when we debate this, we will probably not have that much time. It will probably be a time-limited amendment. There have been a lot of opponents that have been putting newspaper ads into newspapers around the country or even running television and radio ads on this issue; but I will tell the gentleman, I have a lot of constituents back in Des Moines, Iowa, who, when they go down to Texas for the winter, they take their prescriptions, they go across, they look at the labels, they see it is made in the United States, the same drug, they bring it back for half price. The gentleman's amendment tomorrow would allow them to continue to do that. I think that it would be somewhat difficult for many Members of this House to switch their vote from supporting that idea last year to voting against it this year.

I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I think Members understand this issue, and it really is a choice between are you going to stand with your seniors who are having a difficult time affording their prescription drugs, or are you going to defend the FDA bureaucracy and the pharmaceutical industry. I think that really is the vote. At some point, if they vote, particularly if they change their vote this year, they are going to have to explain this chart to their constituents. They are going to have to explain why they should have to pay $30.12 for Glucophage in the United States when their European friends can buy it for $4.11.

Let me just talk briefly, if I can, about the whole issue of safety because frankly, that is an area where our opponents have really focused in and there have been a lot of scare tactics, as the gentleman mentioned, running newspaper ads and radio ads and television ads. But the interesting thing is at least in my area, my seniors are a whole lot smarter than those ads, because most of the calls that are coming in are saying absolutely, this is the right way to go. They understand these price differences, they understand safety, they understand that they are willing to take a slight risk. The most important thing is when they go down to the local pharmacy, they might get the wrong medication. It might get in the wrong bottle. There is always some element of risk.

Out there in New York Harbor, it is called the Statue of Liberty, it is not called the Statue of Security. We always take some risk. I cannot say that my amendment is risk-free, but as the gentleman indicated, the system today is not risk-free. But here is the interesting thing. In all of the advertising, they do not mention any people who have ever been injured by bringing legal drugs into the United States with a prescription. Not one. There is no known study that demonstrates that public health has been injured by patients importing legal medications with a prescription under the order of their doctor.

What is more, millions of Americans have no prescription drug coverage. And as I said earlier, a drug that one cannot afford is neither safe nor effective. That is when people start cutting up their pills. That is when they start looking to back-street vendors or people who may be selling adulterated drugs. Let us just talk about safety, because when we mention the FDA, we talk about drugs and medical devices and so forth, but we forget that part of the reason this amendment is in order to the agriculture appropriations bill is because it is the Food and Drug Administration. They get their money through the agriculture appropriation bill.

I asked my staff a few weeks ago, I said, now, wait a second. We import literally hundreds of thousands of pounds of raw meat every day. We import millions of pounds of fruits and vegetables. There must be some studies that people get sick, because I remember a couple of years ago, there were some kids who had gotten sick, about 200 kids who got sick from eating strawberries imported from Mexico. Maybe the gentleman remembers the story, that somehow, some pathogen had gotten on the strawberries and they got sick. Well, what did the FDA do about that? The truth is, almost nothing.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, in that situation, what Congress responsibly does is it provides the resources to the USDA to do those inspections at the border. That is why, for instance, we have increased our funding for making sure that Foot and Mouth Disease does not get into the United States. That is why last year we appropriated $23 million extra dollars for the FDA to do its appropriate job with monitoring to make sure that drug shipments that will come back in are the real thing.

But still, I just have to get back to this point, and that is that one can go down to the local pharmacy, they have their medicine from somewhere in California or New Jersey or Florida. What is their level of confidence? Their level of confidence is that we have an FDA that monitors that every so often. But every so often, once in a while, very rarely, especially with this particularly very, very high-priced drugs, they have found that there have been some fraudulent drugs. They are doing their job when they find that. And they will do their job if Congress appropriates the appropriate amount of money to monitor any medicines coming back into the country from Switzerland or Germany or Ireland or Canada. I mean, it is not a problem that cannot be solved.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, the savings to the individual that we are talking about is the difference between, as the gentleman has already said, is the difference between many times their having the drug at all for their heart failure or for their high blood pressure or for other serious conditions. There is no question. We would not be dealing with the issue of high cost of prescription drugs in this Congress, it would not have been such a big issue in the last presidential campaign if this were not a real problem.

So I commend my colleague from Minnesota for talking about this. I look forward to the debate tomorrow on this amendment. I do think that the gentleman's amendment is well thought out because, correct me on this, but there is nothing in the gentleman's amendment that would prevent any funding for the FDA to do its job; is that correct?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No, it just simply says you cannot use the money to pursue law-abiding citizens who have a legal prescription.

Mr. GANSKE. But there is no decrease in the funding overall for the FDA's surveillance.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No. We have made it clear to the FDA, as we did last year, you tell us what you need to do this job, and we will see that you get the funding. They asked for $23 million. We appropriated $23 million. Then after we had appropriated the $23 million and literally let them write the language, they reneged on the deal. So this year, in effect we are saying, and we really mean it.

Now, in conference committee I am willing to work with them to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to come back briefly, and I know the gentleman has to go; but I want to come back to the safety issue. There is another secret that the FDA does not want to talk about, and I started to mention how many tons of raw meat and fruits and vegetables come into the United States. There has been concern about pathogens and what they can do. The gentleman is a physician; and I might just ask him, if someone gets salmonella, what can happen?

□ 2130

Mr. GANSKE. Well, one can die.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. One can die. In fact, I had a friend who got salmonella. He was virtually blinded. He can still see, and I do not know what his vision level is, but he almost died, and he ended up with a severe loss of vision from salmonella.

I did not know until this particular episode how serious it was, and that one of the consequences can be a loss of vision. This is a study done by the FDA in 1999. They analyzed 1,003 samples of produce items coming into the United States from other countries. I have the numbers here in terms of how much we import from different countries.

From Canada, for example, the latest year we have, we imported 335,000 metric tons of beef into the United States. We imported 322,000 pounds of pork. We imported from Mexico a grand total of 3.1 million metric tons of fruits and vegetables from Mexico. We imported from South America over $742 million worth of fruits and vegetables from South America.

Now, we import a lot of food into this country every single day. Here are the numbers. According to their study, the total percentage of food that was contaminated with either salmonella, shigella, and I am probably not saying that right, or E. Coli, the total percentage of that sample that they took was 4.4 percent.

Now, we know people get sick every single day in the United States. I have had food poisoning twice in my life. We know there are thousands of people who get sick from food poisoning, from salmonella. We know that is serious. What is the FDA doing to inspect every single piece of produce, every pork belly, every carcass of beef that comes into the United States?

Do Members know what they are doing? It would not be fair to say nothing, but it would be almost fair. Almost nothing is done.

I just want to make one last point, and it is this. What the FDA is doing in terms of prescription drugs is they are going to build a wall about a mile high. Yet, when it comes to food that we eat every day, of which, by their own study, 4.4 percent is contaminated with salmonella and other dangerous pathogens, there is almost no inspection, almost none. It comes right across the border.

If we are going to say we have to be absolutely certain of every single package of pharmaceuticals, then by golly, should we not say the same for fruits, for vegetables, for pork bellies? That is all I am saying. I am willing to work with them, and with new technology I think we can have a system that will be far safer than it is today, but they do not want to work with us.

Mr. GANSKE. Continuing the gentleman's analogy, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is saying is that there is not anyone in this House who is going to propose that we cut off all imports of beef or vegetables or fruits that come into the United States. Nobody is proposing that. If there is a problem related to pathogens in meat or in some of those vegetables, that is why we have a USDA. That is why we have an inspection process. That is why we appropriate a certain amount of money.

If there is a problem, then we will appropriate more funds for the inspection to make sure that our food and vegetables coming into the United States are safe. But as the gentleman has pointed out on prescription drugs, there is no known scientific study demonstrating a threat of injury to patients importing medications with a prescription from industrialized countries.

When we went to the Food and Drug Administration last year, we said, ''If there is an increase in the flow of reimported drugs, what do you think you need to do to adequately inspect those to make sure there is not a problem?'' They told us, and we appropriated that. We can continue to do the same.

The real question is, do we allow some competition to help lower the cost of prescription drugs. I think it will be a very interesting vote here on the floor tomorrow on this amendment, because I think that the opponents to last year's legislation have seized upon a red herring. They have seized upon the fact that even within the United States there have been a few examples of exceptionally high-priced drugs where there has been fraud. Then they say, ''Well, see, if there have been a few cases here in the United States, that could happen from drugs imported from abroad.''

I think my response and the gentleman's response to that would be that that is even more reason why we adequately fund the FDA, but it can happen in the United States just the same as it could happen on a reimported drug. That is not a reason per se to argue against reimportation.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, here is another chart that basically says we have to do something to bring our prices into line. Last year the average senior in the United States, well, seniors in the United States got a cost of living adjustment in Social Security of 3–½ percent. Total expenditures on pharmaceuticals went up 19 percent. We cannot continue this. This will eat us out of house and home. This kind of thing, this is what is causing consumers to look at ways that they can save some money.

This chart, as I say, when our colleagues vote tomorrow, and I have prepared this and I will make this available to any Member who wants a mailing in a sense explaining, A, the problem, the chart, the differentials, and it also answers the four most commonly asked questions or arguments against this simple little amendment. Anybody who wants a copy can get a copy of the amendment. It is a very simple amendment.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would mind reading that amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would be happy to. It is now in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, ''Amendment to H.R. 2330 as reported offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT of Minnesota.''

''At the end of Title VII, insert after the last section preceding any short title the following section, section 7: None of the amounts made available in this act to the Food and Drug Administration may be used under Section 801 of the Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act to prevent an individual who is not in the business of importing prescription drugs within the meaning of Section 801(g),'' and I am not a lawyer, but we had three very smart ones help write this, ''of such act from importing a prescription drug that, 1, appears to be FDA approved; 2, does not appear to be a controlled substance,'' and we do not even allow codeine under my amendment, we are not talking about any controlled substances or narcotics, ''or, number 3, and appears to be manufactured, prepared, propagated, compounded, or processed in an establishment registered pursuant to section 510 of such act.''

In other words, it has to be made in an FDA-approved plant. It has to be sold through FDA-approved channels. It has to be sold with a legal prescription.

Again, simply put, this says the FDA cannot spend its resources chasing law-abiding citizens who are bringing in legal drugs with a legal prescription. That is all we are saying in this amendment. We are not talking about bulk reimportation.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the gentleman's amendment that reduces the amount of funding to the FDA?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No. It just says they cannot spend the money chasing law-abiding citizens. Go after the people who really are the problem.

More importantly, I would love to see the FDA do a better job of policing the fruits and vegetables, and the pork bellies and all the beef and raw meat that comes into this country every day.

I do not want to scare people, but that was a scary number to me. Does it not bother the gentleman that 4.4 percent of the samples that they tested had either salmonella, shigella, or other dangerous pathogens present on the product? That bothers me.

The gentleman has a pretty good solution to some of this. It is electronic pasteurization. That is the term I like to use. Frankly, I think we need to move down that path. But this is the scary thing. If the gentleman has ever had food poisoning, in some respects I think it is far more dangerous than people trying to save a few bucks on coumadin by buying it through a pharmacy in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, speaking from personal experience, I have had a life-threatening experience with food poisoning, which became a case of encephalitis. It is a serious problem.

I believe that the USDA is doing a pretty good job on its inspection of meat and vegetables, fruit. I would certainly be in favor of additional funding for that, and I am in favor of additional funding to help the FDA do its job of monitoring the validity of drugs in this country, as well as that that would be imported or reimported.

I just want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, for bringing this important issue to the attention of our colleagues.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) for coming down to visit with us tonight. This is a very important issue.

Ultimately, if we open up the markets and we allow American consumers to have access to prescription drugs at world market prices, I believe that this simple little amendment, once fully implemented, could save American consumers $30 billion.

I may be wrong, it may be $28 billion, it may be $31 billion, but even here in Washington, that is a lot of money. If one is a consumer that needs a drug, like that lady with that ointment, and one can save $1,200 a year buying the same drug that comes from the same manufacturer from the same FDA-approved facility simply by picking up a phone and making a $2 phone call to Ireland, I do not think we as public policymakers should stand idly by and allow our own FDA to stand between American consumers, and particularly American senior consumers, we should not and cannot stand idly by and allow our own FDA to stand between those people and lower prescription drug prices.

I just want to close with a few other points. Some say a Medicare drug benefit will eliminate the need for importation and open markets. Mr. Speaker, if we think about that argument for even a moment we will realize that simply shifting high drug prices to the government only transfers these huge pharmaceutical bills to the American taxpayers.

Moreover, Medicare coverage will not help the millions of Americans who currently have no prescription drug benefit. So simply shifting the burden of $300 billion, or whatever the number we ultimately come up with, and I support expanding the Medicare program. In fact, I think the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) has the best program in doing it through the Medicaid systems that every State already has in place.

But it is not an answer to just create a new entitlement funded by the Federal Government. If we do not get control of prices of prescription drugs, if we continue to allow what really amounts to unregulated monopolies, where American consumers, through the Tax Code, through the research dollars that taxpayers pay for and ultimately through the prices that they pay for, if we stand idly by and say, well, I guess American consumers have to pay for all of the research of all of the governments and all the other people of the rest of the world, then shame on us. Shame on us. We have an opportunity tomorrow to set the record straight.

We do not necessarily want price controls in the United States. We do not want a huge bureaucracy and more regulations. But we do want to have access to markets.

In a couple of weeks, we are going to have another great debate about free trade. The President of the United States, I have supported giving the President what used to be called fast track trading authority. Now I think we have a somewhat different name, advanced trade authority or trade promotion authority. There is some other term for it.

Basically, I support giving the President more lattitude to negotiate trade agreements. I support that idea. I support free markets.

However, Mr. Speaker, I support free markets when it comes to American consumers, too. We cannot just have free markets when it benefits large corporations, we have to have free markets when they benefit consumers, too.

This idea that we are going to stand idly by and allow American consumers to pay three, four, five, six, seven times more for the same prescription drugs in the Information Age, as they say back home, that dog will not hunt.

I do not know if we are going to win this debate tomorrow on the amendment or not. I do not know what is going to happen. We have given every good argument. We have talked about free trade, about safety, about prices, about how we can help American consumers.

I do not know whether we are going to win this amendment tomorrow, but we are going to fight a good fight. We are saying to the administration, it is time for them to decide, are they going to stand on the side of the big pharmaceutical industries? Are they going to defend an FDA bureaucracy which cannot even protect American consumers all that well from food-borne pathogens? Or are they going to stand with American consumers, stand with seniors?

I will say this, if the FDA decides that they want to take Grandma to court for trying to save an extra $35 on a three-months' supply of coumadin, some of the people in this room are going to be there on the courthouse steps to meet them.

This is an important issue. It amounts to billions of dollars. It is the right thing to do. It is good policy, and ultimately, it means good things for American consumers.

Frankly, I think in the long light of history it will be good for the pharmaceutical industry, because it will force the Europeans to rethink their pricing structures. It will level the playing field. That is what we want to do, and we hope tomorrow, with the support of the Members of this Congress, we are going to get that done and send a clear message that we stand with American consumers, we stand with free markets.

It is time for us to say the subsidization of the starving Swiss must end.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2149

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending a funeral for a family member.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. PUTNAM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for June 25 and the balance of the week on account of attending the birth of his first child.

Mr. PAUL (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of MR. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. WICKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family medical issues.

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:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs.MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHESON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes,today.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. FLAKE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, July 12.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. 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.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 11, 2001, at 10 a.m.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 2001

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 107th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable J. RANDY FORBES, 4th Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2743. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Establishment of Marketable Quantity and Allotment Percentage; Reformulation of Sales Histories and Other Modifications Under the Cranberry Marketing Order [Docket Nos. FV01–929–2 FR and FV00–929–7 FR] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the District of Columbia Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Request Act and Fiscal Year 2001 Supplemental Budget Request, pursuant to Public Law 105–33 section 11701(a)(1) (111 Stat. 780); (H. Doc. No. 107–94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2745. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James C. King, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2746. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Donald L. Peterson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2747. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's revisions to both the Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 and FY 02 Annual Materials Plan (AMP); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2748. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's review of policy on payment of claims; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2749. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Resolution Funding Corporation Operations (RIN: 1505–AA79) received June 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2750. A letter from the Assistant General, Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mortgage Insurance Premiums in Multifamily Housing Programs [Docket No. FR–4679–I–01] (RIN: 2502–AH64) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2751. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Federal Housing Administration's (FHA) Annual Management Report for Fiscal Year 2001, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2752. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the Corporation's Annual Report for calendar year 2000, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827(a); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2753. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–B–7415] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2754. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final—National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Clarification of Letter of Map Amendment Determinations (RIN: 3067–AD19) received July 2,

2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2755. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2756. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Electronic Submission of Securities Transaction Information by Exchange Members, Brokers, and Dealers [Release No. 34–44494; File No. S7–12–00] (RIN: 3235–AH69) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2757. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the Cost Estimate For Pay-As-You-Go Calculations; to the Committee on the Budget.

2758. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Innovation, Department of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Federal Family Education Loan Program and William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2759. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority—Improving Vocational Rehabilitation Services for Individuals who are Blind or have Severe Visual Impairments and on Improving Vocational Rehabilitation Services for Individuals Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2760. A letter from the Deputy Director National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority—Strategies for Promoting Information Technology (IT)-based Educational Opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities, Strategies for Promoting Information Technology (IT)-based Employment and Training Opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities, and Wayfinding Technologies for Individuals Who Are Blind, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2761. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—American Indian and Alaska Native Education Research Grant Program—received June 22, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2762. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Work-Study Programs, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, and Special Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership Program—received June 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2763. A letter from the Chairperson, National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's Report entitled, ''The Accessible Future''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2764. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the third annual report mandated by the International Anti-Bribery and Fair Competition Act of 1998; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2765. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on the effectiveness of delivery of electronic records to consumers using electronic mail as compared with the delivery of written records via the US Postal Service and private express mail services, pursuant to Section 105(a) of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2766. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Research Service Awards (RIN: 0925–AA16) received June 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2767. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Child Health; Revisions to the Regulations Implementing the State Children's Health Insurance Program [HCFA–2006–IFC] (RIN: 0938–AL00) received June 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2768. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 00F–1482] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2769. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan Revision for Colorado; Long-Term Strategy of State Implementation Plan for Class I Visibility Protection: Craig Station Requirements [CO–001–0055; FRL–7005–8] received June 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2770. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Houston/Galveston Ozone Nonattainment Area Vehicle Miles Traveled Offset Plan [TX 28–1–7382a; FRL–7008–3] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2771. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval Of Section 112(I) Program of Delegation; Ohio [FRL–7009–6] received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2772. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2001 [MD Docket No. 01–76] received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2773. A letter from the Chairman and Secretary, Federal Trade Commission and Department of Commerce, transmitting a joint report entitled, ''Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act: The Consumer Consent Provision in Section 101(c)(1)(C)(ii)''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2774. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Standardized NUHOMS –24P and –52B Revision (RIN: 3150–AG75) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 12543 of January 7, 1986, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); (H. Doc. No. 107–95); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2776. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Sweden [Transmittal No. DTC 073–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Netherlands [Transmittal No. DTC 072–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2778. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 062–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2779. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective June 17, 2001, the Central African Republic has been designated as a 20% danger pay location, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

2780. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Solicitation for Proposals: To Promote the use of Market Based Mechanisms to Address Environmental Issues—received June 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2781. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the twenty-fourth Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up, covering the period from October 1, 2000 to March 31, 2001 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2782. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2783. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2784. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2785. A letter from the Counsel to the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2786. A letter from the Counsel to the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting the

FY 2000 annual report on International Mail Volumes, Costs, and Revenues; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Associate Deputy Administrator for Management and Administration, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2790. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2791. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''Impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 on the Administration of Elections for Federal Office, 1999–2000,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1973gg–7; to the Committee on House Administration.

2792. A letter from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on House Administration.

2793. 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; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Spruce-fir Moss Spider (RIN: 1018–AG38) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2794. 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; Final Determination of Critical Habitat for Wintering Piping Plovers (RIN: 1018–AG13) received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2795. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulations under the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 [OAG 101I] (RIN: 1105–AA78) received June 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2796. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's report Regarding Merger Review Procedures, required by Public Law 106–533, section 630(c), 114 Stat. 2762 (2000); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fee for Services to Support FEMA's Offsite Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program (RIN: 3067–AC87) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2798. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Supplemental Property Acquisition and Elevation Assistance (RIN: 3067–AD06) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2799. A letter from the The President Of The United States, transmitting notification of his intention to add the Republic of Georgia to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), pursuant to Public Law 104–188, section 1952(a)(110 Stat. 1917); (H. Doc. No. 107–96); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2800. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegation of Authority [T.D. ATF–450] (RIN: 1512–AC19) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2801. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Volatile Fruit-Flavor Concentrate Shipments and Alternation With Other Premises (2000R–290P) [T.D. ATF–455; Ref: Notice No. 823] (RIN: 1512–AB59) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2802. A letter from the Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Procedures for Florence Agreement Program [Docket No. 000331091–0177–02] (RIN: 0625–AA47) received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2803. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2001–39] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2804. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Guidance on Implementation of Withholding and Reporting Regulations [Notice 2001–43] received July 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2805. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Removal of Federal Reserve Banks as Federal Depositaries [TD 8952] (RIN: 1545–AY10) received June 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2806. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Amendment of Qualified Plans for the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 [Notice 2001–42] received June 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2807. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Qualified Pension, Profit Sharing and Stock Bonus Plans [Rev. Rul. 2001–30] received June 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2808. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Nondiscrimination Requirements for Certain Defined Contribution Retirement Plans [TD 8954] (RIN: 1545–AY36) received June 28, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2809. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Notional Principal Contracts— received July 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2810. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Extension of Expiration Dates for Several Body System Listings (RIN: 0960–AF59) received June 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the proposed plan for the U.S. Army Communications—Electronics Command (CECOM) Research, Development, and Engineering Community (RDEC), have been approved under authority of the National Defense Authority Acts for Fiscal Years 1995 and 2001; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

2812. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Annual Report required by the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 and Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 231u(b)(1); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

2813. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft bill entitled, ''Medicare Contracting Reform Amendments of 2001''; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

2814. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2001 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2815. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an account of Federal expenditures for climate change programs and activities; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, International Relations, Science, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

2816. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, International Relations, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Veterans' Affairs, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, Government Reform, the Budget, and Ways and Means.

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:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 271. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center (Rept. 107–122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 695. A bill to establish the Oil Region National Heritage Area; with an amendment (Rept. 107–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1628. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail (Rept. 107–124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2215. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107–125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2137. A bill to make clerical and other technical amendments to title 18, United States Code, and other laws relating to crime and criminal procedure (Rept. 107–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1892. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the acceptance of an affidavit of support

from another eligible sponsor if the original sponsor has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that the original sponsor's classification petition should not be revoked; with an amendment (Rept. 107–127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 807. A bill for the relief of Rabon Lowry of Pembroke, North Carolina (Rept. 107–128). Referred to the private calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 560. An act for the relief of Rita Mirembe Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembe) (Rept. 107–129). Referred to the private calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEFLEY: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. In the Matter of Representative Earl F. Hilliard (Rept. 107–130). Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NEY: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2356. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform (Rept. 107–131 Pt. 1); adversely.

Mr. NEY: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2360. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to restrict the use of non-Federal funds by national political parties, to revise the limitations on the amount of certain contributions which may be made under such Act, to promote the availability of information on communications made with respect to campaigns for Federal elections, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107–132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2356 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2356. Referral to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than July 10, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of June 28, 2001]

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BACA, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 2404. A bill to authorize Federal agency participation and financial assistance for programs and for infrastructure improvements for the purposes of increasing deliverable water supplies, conserving water and energy, restoring ecosystems, and enhancing environmental quality in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

[Submitted July 10, 2001]

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2435. A bill to encourage the secure disclosure and protected exchange of information about cyber security problems, solutions, test practices and test results, and related matters in connection with critical infrastructure protection; referred to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 2436. A bill to provide secure energy supplies for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 2437. A bill to deem hospitals in Hillsdale County, Michigan, as being located in the Kalamazoo-Battle Creek, Michigan, Metropolitan Statistical Area for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 2438. A bill to elevate the Environmental Protection Agency to Cabinet-level status and redesignate such agency as the Department of Environmental Protection; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FORD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to require retailers of farm-raised fish inform consumers, at the final point of sale to consumers, of the country of origin of the commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 2440. A bill to rename Wolf Trap Farm Park as ''Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to redesignate a facility as the National Hansen's Disease Programs Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRUCCI:

H.R. 2442. A bill to provide veterans benefits to certain individuals who serve in the United States merchant marine during a period of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPSON:

H.R. 2443. A bill to promote the development of the United States space tourism industry, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2444. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10–Anthracenedione,1,8-dihydroxy-4-[[4-(2-hydroxyethyl)phenyl]amino]-5-nitro-); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2445. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Colbaltate(2-), [6-(amino-.kappa.N)-5-[[2-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-4-nitrophenyl]a o-.kappa.N1]-N-methyl-2-naphthalenesulfonamidato(2-)][6-(ami o-.kappa.N)-5-[[2-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-4-nitrophenyl]azo-.kapp.N1]-2-naphthal nesulfonato,(3-)]-, disodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2446. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Chromate(2-), [3-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-4-[[2-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-1-naphthaleny]azo-kappa.N2]-1-naphthalenesulfonato(3-)] [1-[[2-(hydroxy-.kappa.O)-5-[4-methoxyphenyl)azo]phenyl]azo- kappa.N2]-2-naphthalenolato(2-)-.kappa.O]-, disodium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2447. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzenesulfonic acid,2,2'-[(1-methyl-1,2-ethanediyl)bis[imino(6-fluoro-1,3,5 triazine-4,2-diyl)imino[2-[(aminocarbonyl)amino]-4,1-phenyl n]azo]]bis[5-[(4-sulfophenyl)azo]-, sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2448. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a mixture of 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 6-amino-5-[[2-[(cyclohexylm ethylamino) sulfonyl]phenyl]azo]-4 -hydroxy-, monosodium salt, 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 6-amino-5-[[4-chloro-2-(trifluoromethy)phenyl]azo]-4-hydroxy-, monosodium salt, and 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 6-amino-4-hydroxy-5-[[2-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]azo]-, monosodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to primary health providers who establish practices in health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2450. A bill to authorize grants for the construction of memorials to honor men and women of the United States who were killed or disabled while serving as law enforcement or public safety officers; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2451. A bill to require recreational camps to report information concerning deaths and certain injuries and illnesses to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to direct the Secretary to collect the information in a central data system, to establish a President's Advisory Council on Recreational Camps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to provide for implementation of the management plan for the Corridor to protect resources critical to maintaining and interpreting the distinctive character of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to improve injection safety in immunization and other disease control programs administered under that Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 2454. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5472 Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles,

California, as the ''Congressman Julian C. Dixon Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 183. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society and its mission of promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the love and expression of musical performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. Con. Res. 184. A concurrent resolution providing for a National Day of Reconciliation; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

123. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 403 memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation reforming the Federal Freedom to Farm law and the sugar support program to correct the current inequities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

124. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 11 memorializing the United States Congress to call for a repudiation of the agreement reached last year to allow the Navy to resume firing training on the island of Vieques; to the Committee on Armed Services.

125. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 140 memorializing the United States Congress to study the feasibility of insurance coverage for loss, damage, or diminution in value to property caused by drought; to the Committee on Financial Services.

126. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 214 memorializing the United States Congress to to fully fund its obligations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

127. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 385 memorializing the United States Congress to ensure ethanol and biodiesel are included as part of any lasting energy policy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

128. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 405 memorializing the United States Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency to increase Illinois' nitrogen oxide emission allowances budget; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

129. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 92 memorializing the United States Congress to offer condolences to the people of the State of Israel and especially to the families of those victims who suffered losses in the terrorist attack of June 1, 2001, in Tel Aviv; Strongly condemn that attack and any use of terrorism in order to achieve political gains or for any other reason; and, Reaffirm the desire of the people of the United States to assist the parties in their efforts to achieve a full and lasting peace; to the Committee on International Relations.

130. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 76 memorializing the United States Congress to direct the Minerals Management Service of the United States Department of the Interior to develop a plan for impact mitigation relative to the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

131. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 50 memorializing the United States Congress to express its desire to the National Marine Fisheries Service that the pending charter boat moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico not be implemented; to the Committee on Resources.

132. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 230 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.

133. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 93 memorializing the United States Congress to ratify the Southern Dairy Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

134. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 75 memorializing the United States Congress to repeal mandatory minimum sentences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

135. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 370 memorializing the United States Congress to support reform of our Federal immigration laws to allow the many hard working immigrants in Illinois to work towards becoming citizens through a legalization program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 340 memorializing the United States Congress to initiate an investigation of possible collusion among petroleum companies resulting in rapid unexplained price increases in motor fuel throughout the Midwest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

137. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 86 memorializing the United States Congress to support, with funding, the expeditious implementation of the proposed Maurepas Swamp diversion from the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

138. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the United States Army Corps of Engineers to replace the proposed St. Claude Avenue Bridge and the Claiborne Avenue Bridge in Orleans Parish with tunnels or fixed high-rise bridges in conjunction with a project to replace the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal lock; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

139. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 124 memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation to provide for government-furnished markers for the graves of all veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

140. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 36 memorializing the United States Congress to take certain actions to increase efforts to halt the illegal dumping of foreign steel in this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

141. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 238 memorializing the United States Congress to fully fund and deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective, affordable global missile defense system, including a sea-based system to intercept theater and long-range missiles, space-based sensors and ground-based interceptors and radar, to protect all Americans, United States troops stationed abroad and our nation's allies from ballistic missile attack; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

142. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution No. 651 memorializing the United States Congress to support significant reforms to our nations voting system; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and the Judiciary.

143. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 167 memorializing the United States Congress to fully fund the Estuary Restoration Act of 2000; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Resources.

144. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the United States Congress to support the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act introduced in the 107th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

145. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10 memorializing the United States Congress to support the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act introduced in the 107th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

146. Also,a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 137 memorializing the United States Congress to enact the Steel Revitalization Act of 2001; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means.

147. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 129 memorializing the United States Congress to fully implement the Gulf Hypoxia Action Plan in cooperation with the Gulf of Mexico/Mississippi River Watershed Nutrient Task Force; jointly to the Committees on Science, Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. QUINN introduced a bill (H.R. 2455) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey the vessel U.S.S. *Sphinx* to the Dunkirk Historical Lighthouse and Veterans Park Museum for use as a military museum;

which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 31: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 35: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 64: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 65: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 91: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HORN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 147: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 162: Mr. KIRK..
H.R. 175: Mr. LARGENT.
H.R. 183: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 236: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 239: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 257: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 267: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. NUSSLE, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 269: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 281: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 303: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
H.R. 335: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 389: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 415: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 425: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 439: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 440: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 443: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 448: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 471: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 500: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 506: Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 536: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 537: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 548: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BERRY, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 595: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 599: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 632: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 663: Mr. EHRLICH and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 664: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 677: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 687: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 701: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HILL, Mr. BACA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 702: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 703: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 781: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FORD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 782: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 794: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 817: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 827: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 848: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 854: Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 866: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 932: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 937: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 952: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 964: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 978: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1004: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1011: Mr. FORD and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 1070: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1090: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1109: Mr. STUMP, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1110: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 1112: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1129: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1143: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1150: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1162: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1177: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1191: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 1192: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1198: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1254: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 1266: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1276: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1293: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ALLEN.,
H.R. 1305: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1330: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1338: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1348: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1354: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1360: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1367: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1371: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1377: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PENCE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1382: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1388: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 1431: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1452: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1464: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 1465: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1485: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1486: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1487: Mr. MOORE and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1488: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1520: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1522: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1553: Mr. WU, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1556: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FORD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1581: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1582: Mr. FILNER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1592: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1609: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1644: Mr. THUNE.
H.R. 1672: Mr. BACA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1673: Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1674: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1694: Mr. HEFLEY and Ms. HART.
H.R. 1700: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TIAHRT, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1701: Mr. REYES, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEY, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1718: Ms. WATSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BACA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. REYES, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1726: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1733: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1744: Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1750: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1751: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1759: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1770: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1773: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1790: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1795: Mr. SHAYS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1810: Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1822: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1841: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1847: Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 1882: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1891: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 1896: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1908: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1909: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1911: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1930: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1939: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1948: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 1954: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1972: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1973: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1975: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KERNS, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1990: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2009: Mr. BACA and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2013: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2018: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BRADY of Texas: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2029: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2036: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2057: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. HART, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2058: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2059: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2074: Ms. LEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2079: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2080: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2081: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2088: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 2095: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2107: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 2109: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2117: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2122: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 2125: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 2134: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2145: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 2148: Mr. COYNE, Mr. KIND, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2154: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 2158: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 2163: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 2166: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2173: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FROST, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 2174: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 2175: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2178: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2200: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2230: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2233: Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2240: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2263: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2277: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2281: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2294: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2319: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2323: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 2327: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2328: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2331: Mr. OSE.

H.R. 2338: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2339: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2340: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FROST, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2348: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2349: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2360: Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2375: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GRUCCI.

H.R. 2392: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2412: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.

H.R. 2413: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HORN, Mr. Frost, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. COYNE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARRETT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BAKER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OSE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 89: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 174: Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 75: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. HULSHOF.

H. Res. 152: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. MOORE.

H. Res. 154: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H. Res. 159: Mr. TURNER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2330

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Add before the short title at the end the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel of the Department of Agriculture who permit the payment limitation specified in section 1001(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308(2)) to be exceeded in any manner (whether through payments in excess of such limitation, permitting repayment of marketing loans at a lower rate, the issuance of certificates redeemable for commodities, or forfeiture of a loan commodity when the payment limitation level is reached), except, in the case of a husband and wife, the total amount of the payments specified in section 1001(3) of that Act that they may receive during the 2001 crop year may not exceed $150,000.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Insert after title III the following:

TITLE IV—MODIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. MODIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) INCREASED LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''No person'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (i), no person''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) INCREASED LIMIT TO ALLOW RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(1) INCREASE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the opposition personal funds amount with respect to a candidate for election to the office of Senator or Representative in or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress exceeds the threshold amount, the limit under subsection (a)(1)(A) (in this subsection referred to as the 'applicable limit') with respect to that candidate shall be the increased limit.

''(B) THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—

''(i) STATE-BY-STATE AND DISTRICT-BY-DISTRICT COMPETITIVE AND FAIR CAMPAIGN FORMULA.—In this subsection, the threshold amount with respect to an election cycle of a candidate described in subparagraph (A) is an amount equal to the sum of—

''(I) $150,000; and

''(II) $0.04 multiplied by the voting age population.

''(ii) VOTING AGE POPULATION.—In this subparagraph, the term 'voting age population' means—

''(I) in the case of a candidate for the office of Senator, the voting age population of the State of the candidate (as certified under section 315(e)); or

''(II) in the case of a candidate for the office of Representative in or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, the voting population of the district the candidate seeks to represent (as certified under section 315(e)).

''(C) INCREASED LIMIT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), for purposes of subparagraph (A), if the opposition personal funds amount is over—

''(i) 2 times the threshold amount, but not over 4 times that amount—

''(I) the increased limit shall be 3 times the applicable limit; and

''(II) the limit under subsection (a)(3) shall not apply with respect to any contribution made with respect to a candidate if such contribution is made under the increased limit of subparagraph (A) during a period in which

the candidate may accept such a contribution;

''(ii) 4 times the threshold amount, but not over 10 times that amount—

''(I) the increased limit shall be 6 times the applicable limit; and

''(II) the limit under subsection (a)(3) shall not apply with respect to any contribution made with respect to a candidate if such contribution is made under the increased limit of subparagraph (A) during a period in which the candidate may accept such a contribution; and

''(iii) 10 times the threshold amount—

''(I) the increased limit shall be 6 times the applicable limit;

''(II) the limit under subsection (a)(3) shall not apply with respect to any contribution made with respect to a candidate if such contribution is made under the increased limit of subparagraph (A) during a period in which the candidate may accept such a contribution; and

''(III) the limits under subsection (d) with respect to any expenditure by a State or national committee of a political party shall not apply.

''(D) OPPOSITION PERSONAL FUNDS AMOUNT.—The opposition personal funds amount is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(i) the greatest aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds (as defined in section 304(a)(6)(B)) that an opposing candidate in the same election makes; over

''(ii) the aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds made by the candidate with respect to the election.

''(2) TIME TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER INCREASED LIMIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a candidate and the candidate's authorized committee shall not accept any contribution, and a party committee shall not make any expenditure, under the increased limit under paragraph (1)—

''(i) until the candidate has received notification of the opposition personal funds amount under section 304(a)(6)(B); and

''(ii) to the extent that such contribution, when added to the aggregate amount of contributions previously accepted and party expenditures previously made under the increased limits under this subsection for the election cycle, exceeds 110 percent of the opposition personal funds amount.

''(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL OF AN OPPOSING CANDIDATE.—A candidate and a candidate's authorized committee shall not accept any contribution and a party shall not make any expenditure under the increased limit after the date on which an opposing candidate ceases to be a candidate to the extent that the amount of such increased limit is attributable to such an opposing candidate.

''(3) DISPOSAL OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount of contributions accepted by a candidate or a candidate's authorized committee under the increased limit under paragraph (1) and not otherwise expended in connection with the election with respect to which such contributions relate shall, not later than 50 days after the date of such election, be used in the manner described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) RETURN TO CONTRIBUTORS.—A candidate or a candidate's authorized committee shall return the excess contribution to the person who made the contribution.

''(j) LIMITATION ON REPAYMENT OF PERSONAL LOANS.—Any candidate who incurs personal loans made after the date of enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2001 in connection with the candidate's campaign for election shall not repay (directly or indirectly), to the extent such loans exceed $250,000, such loans from any contributions made to such candidate or any authorized committee of such candidate after the date of such election.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(i) DEFINITION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—In this subparagraph, the term 'expenditure from personal funds' means—

''(I) an expenditure made by a candidate using personal funds; and

''(II) a contribution or loan made by a candidate using personal funds or a loan secured using such funds to the candidate's authorized committee.

''(ii) DECLARATION OF INTENT.—Not later than the date that is 15 days after the date on which an individual becomes a candidate for the office of Senator or Representative in or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, the candidate shall file a declaration stating the total amount of expenditures from personal funds that the candidate intends to make, or to obligate to make, with respect to the election that will exceed the State-by-State and District-by-District competitive and fair campaign formula with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iii) INITIAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 24 hours after a candidate described in clause (ii) makes or obligates to make an aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds in excess of 2 times the threshold amount in connection with any election, the candidate shall file a notification with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iv) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.—After a candidate files an initial notification under clause (iii), the candidate shall file an additional notification each time expenditures from personal funds are made or obligated to be made in an aggregate amount that exceed $10,000 with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

Such notification shall be filed not later than 24 hours after the expenditure is made.

''(v) CONTENTS.—A notification under clause (iii) or (iv) shall include—

''(I) the name of the candidate and the office sought by the candidate;

''(II) the date and amount of each expenditure; and

''(III) the total amount of expenditures from personal funds that the candidate has made, or obligated to make, with respect to an election as of the date of the expenditure that is the subject of the notification.

''(C) NOTIFICATION OF DISPOSAL OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—In the next regularly scheduled report after the date of the election for which a candidate seeks nomination for election to, or election to, Federal office, the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee shall submit to the Commission a report indicating the source and amount of any excess contributions (as determined under paragraph (1) of section 315(i)) and the manner in which the candidate or the candidate's authorized committee used such funds.

''(D) ENFORCEMENT.—For provisions providing for the enforcement of the reporting requirements under this paragraph, see section 309.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) ELECTION CYCLE.—The term 'election cycle' means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent election for the specific office or seat that a candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the next election for that office or seat. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a primary election and a general election shall be considered to be separate elections.

''(21) PERSONAL FUNDS.—The term 'personal funds' means an amount that is derived from—

''(A) any asset that, under applicable State law, at the time the individual became a candidate, the candidate had legal right of access to or control over, and with respect to which the candidate had—

''(i) legal and rightful title; or

''(ii) an equitable interest;

''(B) income received during the current election cycle of the candidate, including—

''(i) a salary and other earned income from bona fide employment;

''(ii) dividends and proceeds from the sale of the candidate's stocks or other investments;

''(iii) bequests to the candidate;

''(iv) income from trusts established before the beginning of the election cycle;

''(v) income from trusts established by bequest after the beginning of the election cycle of which the candidate is the beneficiary;

''(vi) gifts of a personal nature that had been customarily received by the candidate prior to the beginning of the election cycle; and

''(vii) proceeds from lotteries and similar legal games of chance; and

''(C) a portion of assets that are jointly owned by the candidate and the candidate's spouse equal to the candidate's share of the asset under the instrument of conveyance or ownership, but if no specific share is indicated by an instrument of conveyance or ownership, the value of ½ of the property.''.

H.R. 2360

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Insert after title III the following:

TITLE IV—REQUIRING CANDIDATES USING CORPORATE AIRCRAFT TO REIMBURSE CORPORATION AT CHARTER RATE

SEC. 401. REQUIRING CANDIDATES USING CORPORATE AIRCRAFT TO REIMBURSE CORPORATION OR UNION AT CHARTER RATE.

Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) No candidate, agent of a candidate, or person traveling on behalf of a candidate may use an airplane which is owned or leased by a corporation for travel in connection with a Federal election unless the candidate, agent, or person in advance reimburses the corporation an amount equal to the usual charter rate for such use.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the use of an airplane which is owned or leased by a corporation which is licensed to offer commercial services for travel.''.