

MARITIME POLICY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1098.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1098, 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 415, nays 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Cooksey	Graves
Ackerman	Costello	Green (TX)
Aderholt	Cox	Green (WI)
Akin	Coyne	Greenwood
Allen	Cramer	Guerci
Andrews	Crane	Gutierrez
Army	Crenshaw	Gutknecht
Baca	Crowley	Hall (OH)
Bachus	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Baird	Culberson	Hansen
Baker	Cummings	Harman
Baldacci	Cunningham	Hart
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Barr	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Barrett	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Bartlett	Deal	Herger
Barton	DeFazio	Hill
Bass	DeGette	Hilleary
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hilliard
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hinchey
Berkley	DeLay	Hinojosa
Berman	DeMint	Hobson
Berry	Deutsch	Hoefel
Biggert	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Dicks	Holden
Bishop	Dingell	Holt
Blagojevich	Doggett	Honda
Blumenauer	Dooley	Hooley
Blunt	Doolittle	Horn
Boehlert	Doyle	Hostettler
Boehner	Dreier	Houghton
Bonilla	Duncan	Hoyer
Bonior	Dunn	Hulshof
Bono	Edwards	Hunter
Borski	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Boswell	Ehrlich	Hyde
Boucher	Emerson	Insee
Boyd	Engel	Isakson
Brady (PA)	English	Israel
Brady (TX)	Eshoo	Issa
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Istook
Brown (SC)	Evans	Jackson (IL)
Bryant	Everett	Jackson-Lee
Burr	Farr	(TX)
Burton	Fattah	Jefferson
Buyer	Ferguson	Jenkins
Callahan	Filmer	John
Calvert	Fletcher	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Foley	Johnson (IL)
Cantor	Ford	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Frank	Jones (NC)
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Jones (OH)
Cardin	Frost	Kanjorski
Carson (IN)	Gallegly	Kaptur
Carson (OK)	Ganske	Kelly
Castle	Gekas	Kennedy (MN)
Chabot	Gephardt	Kennedy (RI)
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kerns
Clay	Gilchrest	Kildee
Clayton	Gillmor	Kilpatrick
Clement	Gilman	Kind (WI)
Clyburn	Gonzalez	King (NY)
Coble	Goode	Kingston
Collins	Goodlatte	Kirk
Combest	Goss	Kleczka
Condit	Graham	Knollenberg
Conyers	Granger	Kolbe

Kucinich	Obey	Shimkus
LaFalce	Oliver	Shows
LaHood	Ortiz	Simmons
Lampson	Osborne	Simpson
Langevin	Ose	Skeen
Lantos	Otter	Skelton
Largent	Owens	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pastor	Smith (WA)
Leach	Payne	Snyder
Lee	Pelosi	Solis
Levin	Pence	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Spratt
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Stark
Linder	Phelps	Stearns
Lipinski	Pickering	Stenholm
LoBiondo	Pitts	Strickland
Lofgren	Platts	Stump
Lowe	Pombo	Stupak
Lucas (KY)	Pomeroy	Sununu
Lucas (OK)	Portman	Sweeney
Luther	Price (NC)	Tancredo
Maloney (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Tanner
Maloney (NY)	Putnam	Tauscher
Manzullo	Quinn	Tauzin
Markey	Radanovich	Terry
Mascara	Rahall	Thomas
Matheson	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (MO)	Regula	Thornberry
McCarthy (NY)	Rehberg	Thune
McCollum	Reyes	Thurman
McCrery	Reynolds	Tiahrt
McDermott	Riley	Tiberi
McGovern	Rivers	Tierney
McInnis	Rodriguez	Toomey
McIntyre	Roemer	Towns
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Traficant
McKinney	Rogers (MI)	Turner
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Udall (CO)
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Upton
Meeks (NY)	Roukema	Velazquez
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Millender-	Royce	Vitter
McDonald	Rush	Walden
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Walsh
Miller, Gary	Ryun (KS)	Wamp
Miller, George	Sabo	Waters
Mink	Sanchez	Watkins
Mollohan	Sanders	Watt (NC)
Moore	Sandlin	Watts (OK)
Moran (KS)	Sawyer	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Weiner
Morella	Schaffer	Weldon (PA)
Murtha	Schakowsky	Weller
Myrick	Schiff	Wexler
Nadler	Schrock	Whitfield
Napolitano	Scott	Wicker
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Wilson
Nethercutt	Serrano	Wolf
Ney	Shadegg	Woolsey
Northup	Shaw	Wu
Norwood	Shays	Wynn
Nussle	Sherman	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Sherwood	Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Becerra	McHugh	Sessions
Brown (FL)	Mica	Sisisky
Cannon	Moakley	Taylor (NC)
Gordon	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
Keller	Scarborough	

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1209

So (two-thirds of those present having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending

business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 459

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 459.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). 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.

THE GOVERNMENT'S APPETITE FOR LAND

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I did a Special Order about a tax cut and how one can never satisfy government's appetite or demand for money. I said then that if we gave every department and agency double what they got the year before, they might be happy for a short time, but they would soon be back crying about a shortfall in funding. Everyone supports education, for example, and I certainly do.

□ 1215

But you almost never hear the fact that education spending has gone up at a rate many times the rate of inflation over the last several years.

But I want to expand today on something else that I mentioned in that special order of a few days ago, and that is government's appetite for land.

Just as you can never satisfy government's appetite for money, you can never satisfy government's desire for land. They always want more, and they have been getting it at what people should realize is an alarming rate.

Today, over 30 percent of the land in the United States is owned by the Federal Government. Another almost 20 percent is owned by State and local governments or quasi-governmental agencies.

So today you have about half the land in some type of public or governmental ownership.

The most alarming thing is the speed with which this government greed for land has grown over the past 30 years or 40 years.

Another alarming aspect of this trend is the growing number of restrictions that government at all levels is putting on the land that does remain in private hands.

A few years ago, the National Home Builders Association told me if there was strict enforcement of the wetlands rules and regulations, over 60 percent of the developable land would be off limits for homes.

Now some who already have nice homes might think this would be good, to stop most development. But you cannot stop it, because the population keeps growing, and people have to have someplace to live.

So what happens? When government keeps buying and restricting more and more land, it does two things: It drives up the costs and causes more and more people to be jammed closer and closer together.

First, it drives up land and building costs so that many young or lower income families are priced out of the housing market, especially for new homes.

Second, it forces developers to build on smaller and smaller postage-stamp-size lots or build townhouses or apartments.

Do you ever wonder why subdivisions built in the 1950s or 1960s often have big yards and now new subdivisions do not, or why new homes that should cost \$50 a square foot now cost \$100 a square foot or more? It is in large part because government keeps buying or restricting so much land.

This trend is causing more and more people to be jammed into smaller and smaller areas, increasing traffic, pollution, crime, and just an overall feeling of being overcrowded.

It is sometimes referred to as the urban sprawl, and environmental extremists are attacking it because they know it is unpopular, but they are the very people who have caused it.

Most of these environmental extremists come from very wealthy families, and they probably have nice homes already or even second homes in the country.

But it is not fair and it is not right, Mr. Speaker, for the people who already have what they want to demand policies that drive up the costs and put an important part of the American dream out of reach for millions of younger or lower income people.

Make no mistake about it, when government buys or restricts more and more land, it drives up the costs of the rest of the land. And this hurts poor and lower income and middle income people the most.

Even those forced to live in apartments are hurt, because apartment developers have to pass their exorbitant land and regulatory costs on to their tenants. When government takes land, they almost always take it from poor or lower income people or small farmers.

We have way too many industrial parks in this country today. States and local governments, which do almost nothing for older small businesses, will give almost anything to some big company to move from someplace else.

Is it right for governments to take property for very little paid to small farmers and then give it to big foreign or multinational companies or even to big companies to develop resort areas for the wealthy? I do not think so.

One of the most important things we need to do to insure future prosperity is to stop government at all levels from taking over more private property. Anyone who does not understand this should read a book called *The Noblest Triumph, Property and Prosperity Through the Ages* by Tom Bethell. The whole book is important, but a couple of brief excerpts: The Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman has said, "You cannot have a free society without private property? Recent immigrants have been delighted to find you can buy property in the United States without paying bribes."

The call for secure property rights in Third World countries today is not an attempt to help the rich. It is not the property of those who have access to Swiss bank accounts that needs to be protected. It is the small and insecure possessions of the poor.

This key point was well understood by Pope Leo XIII who wrote that the fundamental principle of socialism, which would make all possessions public property, is to be utterly rejected because it injures the very ones whom it seeks to help."

Over the years, when government has taken private property, it has most often taken it from lower and middle income people and small farmers. Today, federal, state and local governments, and quasi-governmental agencies now own about half the land in this Nation. The most disturbing thing is the rapid rate at which this taking has increased in the last 40 years. Environmentalists who have supported most of this should realize that the worst polluters in the world have been the socialist nations, because their economies do not generate enough income to do good things for the environment, and that private property is almost always better cared for than public property and at a much lower cost.

ELECTION REFORM

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, I announced the introduction of a resolution calling on Congress to enact meaningful election reform legislation.

Today, I am proud to introduce another measure on election reform and to announce an important voting technology demonstration I am sponsoring

tomorrow with my former secretary of state colleagues who are presently now in the House and the Senate.

I am pleased to introduce legislation today to improve the voting process for millions of elderly Americans and persons with disabilities.

In every election year, many of these people stay at home, stay away from the polls, not from apathy but from concern about their ability to cast a vote independently. The elderly and visually impaired may not be able to decipher small print or confusing ballots, and people in wheelchairs may have difficulty maneuvering in older voting booths.

Unfortunately, this problem is pervasive throughout the United States. With nearly one in five Americans having some level of disability and approximately 35 million Americans over the age of 65, we must act now to ensure that our voting system is accessible to all Americans.

To ensure that Americans are not discouraged from voting because of outdated voting equipment and inaccessible voting places, I am introducing the Voting Opportunity through Technology and Education, or VOTE, Act. This measure would require the Federal Election Commission to establish voluntary accessibility and ease-of-use standards for polling places in voting equipment.

In 1984, Congress passed the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act. This legislation required that all polling places in the United States be made accessible to the elderly and the disabled, but provided the FEC with little enforcement power. With the establishment of the new accessibility and ease-of-use standards in my VOTE Act, the FEC would be able to provide secretaries of state and election administrators with more information and support services to help them comply with accessible laws.

Additionally, the voting technology industry could use these standards to ensure that their products may be correctly used by all Americans at the polls. Finally, the VOTE Act would provide grants to States so that they may improve their voting systems and educate poll workers and voters about the availability and benefits of these new technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I know first-hand how modern voting systems can increase voter turnout and improve accuracy. As a secretary of state for the State of Rhode Island, I was the chief architect of a plan to upgrade the State's voting system and equipment. The replacement of outdated lever machines with optical scan equipment and Braille and tactile ballots helped increase voter turnout and significantly reduced chances of error.

To highlight this equipment, as well as other voting technologies now available, I am joining former secretaries of