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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:
WASHINGTON, DC, June 7, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Dan Miller to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:
H.R. 435. An act to make miscellaneous and technical changes to various trade laws, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:
S. 741. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to combat the overutilization of prison health care services and control rising prisoner health care costs.
S. 1059. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.
S. 1060. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.
S. 1061. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military construction, and for other purposes.
S. 1062. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member other than the majority or the minority leaders, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenuer) for 5 minutes.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. Blumenuer. Mr. Speaker, at home this last week, and in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this weekend, I heard from people from all across the country who want the Federal Government to be a better partner in promoting livable communities so that our families can be safe, economically secure and healthy. Reducing the threat of gun violence is at the core of what will make communities more livable, yet the apologists for gun violence have been hard at work during our recess seeking to derail the modest steps that would make our children safer from guns.

People of conscience should push back. Under the leadership of Congress, there have been nine multiple shooting deaths on our school campuses involving children shooting other children and their teachers. The epidemic of gun violence amongst our youth has tragic consequences in terms of loss of life, physical safety and the health of our communities. Yet for all the media attention given to Jonesboro, Springfield and the Littleton massacres, tragedies like this occur daily, with over 12 children being killed in a typical 24-hour period. The only difference is that unlike Littleton or Springfield, the pain is scattered from town to town in isolated bursts. Even though these tragedies occur without massive media attention, they nonetheless produce pain every bit as real and lasting in communities across the country.

This Sunday, in Milwaukee, the papers were full of a tragic example of a young man shooting his best friend. While I was reading that on the plane, a 3-year-old in Baltimore shot himself in the head and he lies in the hospital now, critically wounded. These numbers are staggering and uniquely American. Each year more than 5,000 children are killed by firearms. By contrast, only 15 people in the entire Nation of Japan were murdered with handguns last year. At the same time, the apologists for gun violence contend that there are no useful government initiatives to reduce this violence other than simply stricter enforcement of the laws, more prison time for criminals and wider use of firearms. I strongly disagree.

We in the House of Representatives should vote and pass the three gun safety elements in the Senate legislation, which would require triggers locks on all new handguns, background checks for sales at gun shows and a ban on the sale of ammunition magazines of more than 10 rounds. These are minor steps, but meaningful if they serve as a starting point for a more deliberate and comprehensive approach to ending gun violence.

An important bill which I was pleased to cosponsor with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCarthy) includes several measures designed to keep guns out of kids' hands. H.R. 1342 is being supported by a growing number of people of conscience on both sides of the aisle. It should be the vehicle that deals comprehensively with these concerns.

Another important approach is legislation that I just introduced today that takes a page from our successful efforts at reducing deaths on our highways. Thirty years ago Congress started simple, common-sense legislation that has cut the death rate on our highways in half. We can do the same with handguns.

My legislation would, for instance, assure that the Consumer Product Safety Commission devotes as much time to regulating real guns as it does to toy guns. It would require new guns to have an indicator to show it is loaded. It would extend the Brady law to deny people with a history of violent and reckless behavior the ability to purchase and own firearms, and it would require the Federal Government to establish a date in the near future when all the guns that we purchase for our Federal employees are personalized so that those guns cannot be used against them or stolen.

The Speaker of the House has argued against extraneous riders dealing with gun safety laws. I find this ironic when we just passed an absolute abomination of a spending bill supposedly to finance our troops in Kosovo and other emergencies, but included everything from defining reindeer as livestock to relaxing environmental regulations on mining. Why is it that when it comes to the special interests we are willing to make exceptions, but not when it comes to our children? They should be at least as important as well-connected lobbyists.

It is time to pass comprehensive legislation to protect our children, our families and our communities from senseless gun violence, and we ought to do it now.