

□ 1100

GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, global warming is upon us. The glaciers are melting, the West is on fire due to prolonged drought, the tundras of Alaska are melting and the White House has now confirmed this. It has issued a report that says global warming is occurring and we are responsible for it. But what does the White House say they are going to do about it? Nothing. They say we have just got to get used to it.

I was talking to a good young man, my son, who is a sophomore at Bainbridge High School, who says that the 15- and 16-year-old kids understand science enough to know that we have got to do something about global warming. We urge the President to get with the Bainbridge kids, the high school sophomores, who know we have got to do something about this problem. America deserves it and we ought to have it.

FULL PRESCRIPTION DRUG
BENEFIT UNDER MEDICARE

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a full drug benefit under Medicare. I have seen firsthand the lengths to which our seniors are forced to go in order to get the prescriptions that they need.

Recently I had the sad occasion to meet with a group of seniors from Massachusetts who were actually boarding a bus to travel to Canada in order to get prescription drugs that were not available to them at an affordable price in Massachusetts or elsewhere in the United States. One of these seniors is a woman named Rosemary Morgan, who is a 67-year-old woman who is fighting a recurring battle with breast cancer. Rosemary needs the drug Tamoxifen in order to keep her disease in check and to prolong her life. We are talking about a prescription drug that she needs desperately, not something that is merely an optional drug. However, because Medicare does not cover the cost of prescription drugs and Rosemary has no other form of drug coverage, she is forced to pay the highest prices in the world for this Tamoxifen. Were she to buy a year's supply at her CVS, it would be \$1,468. However, in Canada the same prescription is \$155 for a year's supply.

We need to do the right thing by our seniors and adopt a full prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

COMMEMORATION OF
JUNETEENTH

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today is Juneteenth, June 19, and for many who are not aware of that historical and very special day in America's history, it is the day that we commemorate the discovery that the slaves in the South had been freed. As a representative from the great State of Texas, it was the call from Galveston that indicated 2 years later after the Emancipation Proclamation that there had been a declaration of freedom for the slaves of the United States of America.

We hope that we will have a commission that will commemorate that great history, and as well let me say that I want to announce my joining as an original cosponsor with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and many of my colleagues who will today announce a legislative initiative to establish a monument or a recognition of those who were enslaved in the United States. Our history is our history, and we should recognize that and be prepared to acknowledge the wrongness of that history, but we should capture it and respect those who helped build this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will move forward in the light of our history to do good things by passing a real prescription drug bill for our seniors, and I hope that that will be done very soon on behalf of our seniors in America who need it.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES
ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA
VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3295 be instructed—

(1) to insist upon the provisions contained in section 504(a) of the House bill (relating to the effective date for the Federal minimum standards for State election systems); and

(2) to disagree to the provisions contained in section 104(b) of the Senate amendment to the House bill (relating to a safe harbor from the enforcement of the Federal minimum standards for State election systems for States receiving Federal funds under the bill).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295, the Help America Vote Act. As we all know,

conferees are currently involved in negotiations on the many tenacious differences that exist between the bills passed by each Chamber.

My motion to instruct will help provide guidance on what I consider two of the more critical differences that exist between the bills.

Section 1 of this motion instructs House conferees to insist on the date requiring States to conform to minimum national standards of November 2004 contained in the House bill. This is in contrast to the even more delayed 2006 effective date in the Senate bill. Currently under the House bill, States must conform to all minimum national standards within 2 years of the bill's enactment. In the special circumstances where a State can demonstrate to the Department of Justice that the State cannot meet the 2-year requirement, it can receive a waiver until November 2004. Under the Senate bill, States are not required to conform to the minimum national standards until January 2006.

Realize, Americans will return to the polls in November 2004 to elect a President. If the Senate's effective date becomes law, then we may very well face the same election day controversies that engulfed this Nation the last time we tried electing a President.

Section 2 of this motion instructs conferees to disagree with the safe harbor provision contained in section 104(b) of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3295. Under a provision added in the Senate by amendment, States which receive Federal funds under the bill are assumed to be in compliance with the bill's minimum national standards. Under the Senate amendment, States are provided with safe harbor until 2010, or 8 years from now, from being scrutinized or prosecuted for not complying with the minimum national standards in the bill. The one exception is that States can be prosecuted prior to 2010 for failing to conform with accessibility provisions in the bill as they pertain to individuals with disabilities.

If this provision becomes law, then we are giving States zero accountability until 2010 as they go about spending Federal dollars to conform their election systems. This is a horrible and dangerous path to embark on. If there is no enforcement until 2010, then States are essentially given the green light to nonconformity until 2010 despite any other provision in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I checked the website of the ranking Democrat of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). His website noted that 515 days have passed since the election day 2000 fiasco. Five hundred fifteen days, Mr. Speaker. In mentioning this number, I remind my colleagues and the American people that on a Federal level, our election system is no better off today than it was on election day 2000. Though some States have taken it upon themselves to reform their election laws, the clear majority have not.