



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2003

No. 84

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 10, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN 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. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution designating the week of June 9, 2003, as National Oceans Week and urging the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate recognition, programs, ceremonies, and activities to further ocean literacy, education, and exploration.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to again discuss an issue of great concern to American families. I am talking about extending the child tax credit to families that need it most.

A few weeks ago, this body passed a \$350 billion tax cut bill that gave every millionaire in this country a \$93,000 tax break. It made sure every corporation still had the right to avoid paying taxes by relocating overseas and taking American jobs with it. But the bill shorted 6.5 million low-income families who pay taxes and who are most in need. These families earn between \$10,500 and \$26,625 annually. Out of a \$350 billion bill, the President and Republicans in charge of this body could not find \$3.5 billion, 1 percent, for the poorest American families.

I tried to address this problem back on March 12 in the Committee on the Budget, but my amendment to extend this tax credit to those families was turned aside on a party-line vote. And then when it seemed that the Democrats had successfully included that provision in the larger tax package during the conference, the Republicans secretly eliminated it in the dead of night. Last week Democrats, united and resolute, said that that was not enough, that these 6.5 million families deserve this tax cut because they worked every bit as hard as the 25 million other families that will be receiving their tax refund in the mail next month. They pay almost 8 percent of their income in payroll taxes or sales taxes.

And last week the Senate restored the child tax credit to these hard-working families; and just yesterday the President's spokesperson called on the House to take up that legislation, but our colleagues on other side of the aisle just do not get it. They do not see the urgency in helping the 12 million children left behind by their tax bill. The majority whip said yesterday that he

did not know if the House would act on the other body's bill. As if that were not bad enough, the Chair of the Republican Study Committee said in this morning's Congress Daily, if the House is going to take up this legislation that the Republicans should get something in exchange.

It is always a deal with these people. It is as if there were no families who are trying to put food on their table or clothes on their children's backs. All they care about is taking care of their own people, like the Enrons who paid no taxes in 4 of the last 5 years. It was another colleague on the other side of the aisle who said one must pay an income tax in order to earn a tax credit. That is the way it works. But she did not care about Enron who paid no taxes the last 4 out of 5 years. For Republicans it is all about the deal. It is not about the fundamental values of fairness or of taking care of people. It is about the deal, what do we get in return.

We have passed three tax bills that benefit the wealthy in this last 3 years, but we have done nothing to help people that need it the most. It is high time the House of Representatives did its job. I commend the President for setting aside the quest for a deal and urging the House to take up this bill, which the other body passed by an overwhelming margin. We must restore what was stolen in the dead of night, and if we do not act soon, the families of these 12 million children will not be receiving the tax credit in the mail this July 1 like the other 25 million families. Now is the time for action.

PRICE CONTROLS NEVER WORK

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as we return from recess to write and act on legislation for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, I am asking my colleagues and the American people to resist the temptation to succumb to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5091

price controls. This is perennial around here. A lot of folks believe that price ceilings for pharmaceuticals to be a feasible solution to the high costs that we experience with pharmaceuticals, but they never work.

Against the advice of economic advisers, including Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman, one President instituted a broad range of price controls in August of 1971; but many of the Members saw the PBS series "Commanding Heights" last year in which the author, Daniel Yergin, recalled "the public was convinced that food prices were going up," so the President "opted for wage and price controls. Voters liked the price controls, and the President was reelected in a landslide." Owing to that we can control prices but we cannot control the laws of supply and demand, the economy did not respond as the President hoped it would. Mr. Yergin said, "Right away, the economy went out of whack; people couldn't cover their costs. Ranchers stopped sending their cattle to market. Farmers started drowning their chickens. Instead of controlling inflation, they were controlling shortages."

To those old enough to remember 1971, remember those price ceilings? Lines for gas were all over the place for our cars. Black markets were started. New work started for organized crime. Shortages on grocery shelves. And prices still continued to rise, while just as the public clamored about too expensive food, some begged for more price controls.

Why do price controls not work? According to even a basic-level college text dealing with macroeconomics by Byrns and Stone, "price ceilings keep monetary prices from rising but not average opportunity costs . . . there will be excess demand (or shortages). But price ceilings keep prices down, do not they? Unfortunately, the answer is NO!" This is from a basic text in all of our college economic courses.

The people who most value a good or service and are willing to pay an extra dollar in nonprice resources, such as waiting time, lobbying efforts, bribery, or black market premium, will do so. Have the Members noticed that more than a few Canadians who live under a price-controlled health care system, if they need health care beyond their primary care, what do they do? They travel to the United States to get it because it is the best in the world. So the Members do not have to trust what I am saying today. Just read some of the basic text in our college economic courses.

But why is it that a majority of pharmaceutical innovation occurs in the United States? Because the free market offers a reward to undertaking that risk. How many blockbuster drugs has Canada invented lately? The National Taxpayers Union warns lawmakers "America is the world leader in the research and development that results in innovative lifesaving medications." For the United States to look to Can-

ada for "drugs at an artificial price set by some other country would be, quite simply, a way to rob the pharmaceutical companies of revenue needed to refund research. It is certainly cheap to manufacture pills if someone else supplies the research and development funding. On average, it costs the pharmaceutical companies over \$800 million and takes 12 years to bring a new drug to market. While countries like Canada may beckon to us with their centrally controlled drug prices, none of those types of countries can begin to approach the United States in the development of new, innovative drugs that can save millions of lives."

Citizens for a Sound Economy point out "prescription drug prices differ between nations based on a variety of factors, including per capita income and type of health care system" that is provided. Perhaps one of the reasons American seniors and disabled are looking at Canada's and Europe's ceiling-priced pharmaceuticals is because that is what they lack. We do not hear seniors asking for relief on the prices of outpatient visits or MRIs because they are not paying out of pocket themselves.

One more unique viewpoint, that of interfering with Americans' right to vote with their dollars: Americans for Tax Reform ponders how the "impact of Canadian subsidies on the U.S. market will affect American taxpayers. Government subsidies of any kind interfere with market forces to drive competition and innovation. Foreign subsidies usurp taxpayers' ability to affect democratically the prices of necessary medicines."

The solution is not for Congress to manipulate prices, but to expand coverage to Medicare beneficiaries, to expand private sector health insurance coverage to the uninsured. Price controls never work.

THE IRONY OF NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BELL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the irony of No Child Left Behind, a very popular phrase here in our Nation's Capitol. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle tout No Child Left Behind when in actuality they deliberately choose to leave millions of children behind.

President Bush signed a new law that would provide tax cuts of \$93,500 to the 200,000 taxpayers making over \$1 million. Let us go over that again: \$93,500 in tax cuts to the 200,000 taxpayers making over \$1 million. However, 53 percent of all taxpayers will get less than \$100 under the GOP tax cut, just another example of the administration choosing the wealthiest over America's working families. But as they used to say on the old television commercials,

but wait, there is more. What is even more egregious in this particular case is that the administration chose not to provide or increase the child tax credit to working families making between \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year. That is right. If they make \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year, they miss out on the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in the other body dropped a provision added by Senator LINCOLN that would help nearly 12 million children and their families get such a tax credit. Out of that 12 million, a staggering 8 million received no child tax credit under the GOP law. Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan in no way, shape, or form protects the children that need it the most. Instead, the plan deliberately excludes these children. In actuality, the Republican plan should be called the "Plan to Leave Children Behind."

This is why I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2286, the Rangel-Davis-DeLauro bill. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this bill. It is a great start to preparing the damage inflicted by the administration's reckless and negligent tax package. H.R. 2286 would restore the child tax credit to families making minimum wage by providing greater tax relief to working families. Nineteen million children and their families would benefit from this bill. In fact, over 2 million children in my home State of Texas would benefit under the Rangel plan.

In addition to the child tax credit, H.R. 2286 would create more jobs. The provisions in this bill are key elements to the House Jobs and Economic Growth package and would create more than 1 million jobs without adding one penny to the deficit, welcome relief in a State like Texas where we are looking at our highest unemployment in 10 years, reaching close to 7 percent. Lastly, this bill has key elements that would ensure our brave men and women in uniform are not denied tax relief just because they are on active duty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2286. This tax plan is fair. It helps America's economy, America's men and women in uniform, and it helps America's working families. Most importantly, it allows us to not just talk about it, but it allows us to actually leave no child behind.

INNOVATION, MANUFACTURING, AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about the danger of losing good-paying jobs and our strong economy here in the United States.

Manufacturing has been America's economic strength. For 3 decades now, manufacturing productivity has increased more than any other sector of

our economy. The average manufacturing worker produces four times as much per hour as the average worker did 50 years ago. As a result, manufacturing has been one of the most important parts of the economy and has produced higher living standards for Americans as those products from American manufacturing have become cheaper and better and wages in manufacturing have risen. But now we are losing our manufacturing base as we tend to move towards a service economy.

With manufacturing suffering in recent years, other industries such as the service sector have offered alternative employment. The trouble is that manufacturing cannot be simply replaced by insurance companies or the legal profession or retail trades. There are only four economic sectors that generate material wealth. Only four. And they are agriculture, where they produce things; mining, where they produce things; manufacturing, where they produce things; or construction. And those are the four. Of those, only manufacturing is not limited by natural resources and is capable of export.

We need innovation to produce better products at competitive prices to regain our manufacturing leadership. We cannot pay American-level wages unless we can still be competitive. That means innovation for quality products and increased productivity. Innovation starts with basic research, followed by application and commercialization.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research under the Committee on Science, I am familiar with the government's efforts to find and promote basic research, mostly through the National Science Foundation. NSF has seen substantial increases in recent years, and we need to ensure that this money is spent in ways that research discoveries can have the greatest impact in terms of promoting innovation and practical application for United States businesses. The development of basic research for industrial use has generally been the province of businesses which undertake these efforts to create new products. Unfortunately, according to witnesses at a recent Committee on Science hearing, application is the hardest part. Companies facing intense competitive pressure find it difficult to set aside sufficient resources, money, to develop new products, especially if the results cannot be anticipated before 5 or 6 years. So we are having a gap. Government is now the substantial payer of basic research; and having that research with tech transfer and to apply that research for better and more products and efficient ways of manufacturing is what we are lacking.

Development also suffers from low prestige. The academic community and Federal grants generally reward those who seek knowledge for knowledge's sake rather than those who do the necessary development work. Some foreign countries spend their research dol-

lars monitoring our government funding basic research and then spend the rest of their government money to apply that research for commercial products ahead of our getting that application in the United States.

Another problem we face is the shortage of math and engineering talent. The United States has long lagged far behind other nations when it comes to producing top-notch engineering and research talent. Let me just give an example of China. China produces 10 times as many engineers as we do in the United States. This cannot continue if we expect to continue a strong economy in the United States. It cannot continue to go on without erosion of our international competitiveness. That is why I have pushed NSF to do a better job of promoting math and science careers to students. We need more capable math and science students for research and business and for our future.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the decline in manufacturing employment is something that we ignore at our peril. Over the long term, we cannot hope to have a healthy and growing economy unless we make lots of tangible goods that people want to buy both in the U.S. and overseas markets. Government needs to support not only basic research but to provide incentives for American business to develop applications to ensure continued economic health.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times story ran a headline: "Iraqis Are Out of Jobs, But Pay Day Still Comes." With the administration's blessing, 200,000 Iraqis are receiving \$20 a day for no-show jobs. They do not work. They do not show up for work. They do not do any work. Twenty bucks a day. I come from Chicago, from Cook County. We like no-show jobs. We think that is a good thing. We built an entire political party on no-show jobs, not at 20 bucks a day; but for everybody's appreciation, in the last 2 months we have given Iraqi families nearly \$900. That is equal to the amount that we would pay for the child credit. So we are paying Iraqis and Iraqi families 900 bucks over the last 2 months, which is equal to what we are fighting over here, which I do not believe we need to fight here in the House since the Senate agreed 94 to 6 for the same amount of money. Yet somehow we said in Iraq if they do not work, if they do not show up for work, we will give them 20 bucks a day. It is a no-show job. It looks pretty good to me. But here if they work full time, trying to help their families, trying to raise their kids with the right values,

trying to provide them clothes for school, food for the summer, a camp, a program, YMCA, they are not part of the American family.

I want to tell the Members something. Here is an American official, a government official who said nobody is going to quibble about paying a few dollars into this economy.

I am going to quibble. I do not know whom he talks to. I do not know who is paying him except for all Americans, and he says nobody is going to quibble? But what we are quibbling about is whether the children of America, 12 million children, 6.5 million families, are going to get the same sense of value here in America that we are saying in Iraq that for 20 bucks a day they do not have to show up for work and we will pay them. But here if they show up for work, work hard and pay their taxes, they do not deserve a tax cut, that they are unappreciative.

Who are these children? They are America's children, and they have done right. Parents are trying to raise them with good values, trying to teach them right from wrong. And what do we do in Congress? We turn those values on their head. We turn those values upside down and say if they work full time trying to do right by their kids, they do not deserve a tax cut. We are going to treat Iraqis with a different sense of values, a different sense of appreciation.

Let us be clear about what this says about who we are. America's children. Enron in the last 4 out of 5 years had record profits, did not pay taxes 4 out of 5 years. They got breaks. WorldCom, \$12.5 billion in profits, 2 out of 3 years did not pay any taxes. They were big recipients of government contracts, yet did not pay taxes. We are paying their taxes. Tyco decided to move their address down to Bermuda, got a new ZIP code, new area code. \$600 million dollars in government taxes were not paid; yet they got benefits in government contracts. That is a form of corporate welfare. If they do not pay, if they do not work and they are a corporation, we take care of them. America's children, 12 million of them, we are not going to give them a tax cut.

Recently on a Friday, the unemployment rate hit 6.1 percent. When this President came to office, the unemployment rate was 4 percent. Nearly 3 million Americans have lost their jobs, and we have added \$3 trillion to the Nation's debt. What a deal, as we would say back in Chicago. \$3 trillion dollars added to the Nation's debt, and Americans are paying with their jobs.

I believe the Senate did right. They did right by our values as Americans; and I know people on the other side of the aisle. They are good people with good values, but those values that left the 12 million children on the floor while corporate interests were circling the conference room are not the values we came here to vote for. We all came not just to be a vote, but we came to be a voice for our values and the values

that say WorldCom is going to get protected; Iraq, 20 bucks, no-show jobs, they are going to get protected; 6.5 million American families work full time, making somewhere around \$20,000, and I am talking about a rookie cop, first-year teacher, first-year emergency worker, those types of people, they are not getting a tax cut. They are not worthy of it.

What does that say about who we are? So that tax bill is not just dollars and cents. It is a reflection of our values as Americans. And this person, this body, is going to quibble with an American official who thinks that somehow paying 20 bucks a day not to show up for work is valuable; but if one shows up every day trying to provide for their children, that is not valuable and it is not worthy of a tax cut. It is worthy of a tax cut. Those children are America's children. That mother and father earning \$20,000 are as valuable as if that mother and father were earning \$200,000.

So I would say that this House, this body, we did not come here to just be a vote. We came here to give voice to our values and the values that we all represent regardless of what part of the country we come from. Regardless of what party we are from says that those 12 million children, they too deserve to go to school, they too deserve to go to the YMCA, they too deserve to go to the summer camp, and they too deserve for their parents to put funds away for their higher education; and we in this body need to take up the Senate bill, take up the DeLauro bill and vote on it immediately so the President can sign it so that on July 1 their tax cut gets sent too so that when they show up for school like the Iraqis who do not show up for work, they get a tax cut too.

UCF CHAMPIONSHIP CHEERLEADING TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a big thrill to rise today to honor a hometown university, the University of Central Florida, and their cheerleading team for their Division I championship and cheerleading and dance team competition this year. UCF President John Hitt and the entire UCF family are simply thrilled with the success and are extraordinarily proud of this accomplishment. In fact, this is no fluke. UCF cheerleaders have finished in the top 10 for 9 out of the last 10 years. Talk about consistency. All champions exhibit quiet determination; but two teammates especially, Jamie Woode and James Kersey, demonstrated exceptional resolve above and beyond the call by competing with serious injuries, a broken fibula for Jamie and a torn rotator cuff for James. That is the UCF Knights spirit.

A student athlete's success is not merely measured by athletic performance, however. This 18-member team holds a cumulative 3.3 grade point average. During her 19-tenure as coach, Linda Gooch has witnessed all but one of her team members earning bachelors degrees, an all-too-rare accomplishment in Division I competitive student athletic programs. Today I will submit a resolution with many colleagues from Florida commending the fabulous success of the University of Central Florida cheerleading team on its championship this year and wish them continued success in the future both on and off the field.

THE CHILD TAX CREDIT, THE REPUBLICAN TAX BILL, AND THE RANGEL PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Houston, Texas, I stood with carpenters and letter carriers, working families who work for the communications industry of the Nation, builders who build in the hot sun and the very cold winters, and those who take our plates away in restaurants and hotels. Some would call them the working class: low-income families, middle-income families. The one thing that they probably are not considered to be in this Nation, though I abhor any sense of class distinctions, but they probably would not be considered elite.

So I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, in arguing on their behalf, particularly in light of the very inequitable tax bill that was passed just a few weeks ago. I think the argument could be made that the elite went free on that day and they marched the working poor and the working Americans into a locked jail and threw the key away because the \$550 billion tax cut that the President signed clearly did not represent working families of America, clearly did not represent individuals whose income may fall between \$10,000 to \$26,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in having a class between incomes. I certainly appreciate those who have made their way in this Nation and have built their income and capital upon the democracy and the free opportunity for business in this Nation. But, frankly, I think it is appalling and an outrage that we can be in this Congress, take our income every day, take the benefits of this Nation, and refuse to protect the least of those. The Senate has passed a bill. It has fixed its error. The first error came when they refused to take the Lincoln amendment in the last hours, Senator LINCOLN's amendment in the last hours of the tax negotiations. They left the working people off the table. So they enacted a bill that values the elite few over millions

of Americans and left out those who make between \$10,000 and \$26,000.

That is why I am here to support the Rangel-DeLauro bill as an original co-sponsor to restore that tax credit. What does that mean? That when the checks are issued in July to all the millions of others who are doing well, a tax credit for children, \$400 to make it a total of \$1,000, who will be left out? Those who make the 10,000 to \$26,000. Are they the deadbeats of America, are they the undeserving, are they the ones that my good friends on the other side continue to hammer over and over again they do not pay taxes? I reject it. I refute it. It is ridiculous. They pay payroll taxes. They pay property taxes. They pay sales taxes. They contribute to America's economy. How dare you provide this elitist response that these working families who get up every day and clean tables, these working families who get up every day and help build America, are you telling me that they do not deserve a tax credit on their children?

The reason, Mr. Speaker, that I add to this is that we have the worst unemployment in America that we have had in America's history amongst any President in the United States. We have gone up to 6.1 percent unemployment with unemployed reaching \$3.1 million. That means that the very people we are talking about per child tax credit may have only one bread winner in the family. Not two, but one. And that means that children who need these dollars maybe for the beginning of the school year are now denied because of the elitist attitude of this Congress and the Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to stand with that kind of Neanderthal thinking. I prefer standing with the hundreds who stood with me, working men and women who are appalled by the lack of a tax credit and equally appalled by the opportunity or the effort by this particular body, this Republican majority, to put a comp time bill on the floor of the House which eliminates any opportunity for individuals who get overtime pay and gives them only, only compensation by giving them comp time off. Not when they need it, Mr. Speaker, but when the employer says they can have it.

So here we go. We have got a tax scenario that penalizes working families. We have a working bill that violates the Fair Labor Standards Act, and we have an overall package that we are trying to help Americans and we cannot seem to get it on the floor of the House. We need to get the Rangel-DeLauro bill, H.R. 2286, on the floor of the House now, this week. We must continue to fight for providing them along with our United States military personnel whose salaries fall within that \$10,000 to \$26,000 a year. We have got to stand to create jobs when we have seen such an enormous loss of jobs. Mr. Speaker what we have here is a failing of the United States Congress,

failing of our constitutional duties and certainly a failing to the American people. Vote for the Rangel-DeLauro bill, and vote to eliminate the bad comp bill that will destroy working families all over America.

Just over 1 week ago, the President signed a new law that provides tax cuts of \$93,500 to the 200,000 taxpayers making over \$1 million, while 53 percent of all taxpayers would get less than \$100 under the law.

The Republicans chose not to provide or to increase the child tax credit to working families making between \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year, in order to make room for a dividend tax cut.

Republicans deliberately chose to leave these children and their families behind.

Republicans also deliberately chose to drop a provision added by Senator LINCOLN that would help nearly 12 million children and their families to get the child tax credit—8 million of whom would get no child tax credit at all under the new law.

This provision would have helped low income families with children who make that are working hard to make ends meet.

On May 29, 2003 White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said, "Everybody was aware in the conference of what was in, and what was out. So that was very well-known to all the conferees, including to the White House. Does tax relief go to the people who pay income taxes and forgive their income taxes, or does it go above and beyond the forgiving of all income taxes, and you actually get a check from the government? This [GOP tax conference agreement] certainly does deliver tax relief to the people who pay income taxes." (May 29, 2003)

Today, Majority Leader TOM DELAY responded that the House would not move stand-alone legislation on this issue. He said, "There's a lot of other things that are more important than that. To me it's a little difficult to give tax relief to people who don't pay income taxes."

First Republicans refused to give workers the same pension rights that corporate CEOs have.

Then they pushed through a \$350 billion tax cut, which fails to increase the child tax credit for working families making \$10,000 to \$26,625 a year.

Now, the Republicans are working to take away overtime pay with H.R. 1119 the so-called Comp Time bill and describing it as a "family-friendly" idea.

In reality, this is the Republican's concerted, long-term attack on America's working families that must be stopped.

SUPPORT FOR WORKING FAMILIES

Democrats are offering a package to help hard working Americans and create jobs.

Democrats are taking the first step (H.R. 2286) to begin to repair the damage from this reckless and irresponsible tax package.

The Rangel-Davis-DeLauro bill will provide greater tax relief to the families of 19 million children who make the minimum wage that are struggling to make ends meet.

In addition to restoring the child tax credit provision that Republicans dropped in the middle of the night, the Rangel bill would make the child tax credit available to 1.7 million more families by providing that those earning \$7,500 or more could get the credit.

Under current law, the tax credit it is limited to those who make over \$10,500.

The Range package will benefit 19 million children in America; over 2 million children in Texas alone.

Furthermore, the Rangel bill would accelerate marriage penalty relief for families that receive the Earned Income Tax Credit. And it is fully paid for—the bills calls for no deficit spending.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO FIGHT FOR MEN AND WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

The Democratic package would make sure that our men and women in the military are not denied tax relief just because they are deployed in Iraq.

Specifically, the bill would count combat pay for purposes of the Child Tax Credit.

Republicans enacted a \$350 billion tax bill, and yet they failed to make sure that our men and women in combat are able to take full advantage of the child tax credit.

The Democratic Plan will also create jobs for the soldiers who are returning home, their loved ones and others in need of employment.

These provisions are key elements of the Democratic House Jobs and Economic Growth package that will create more than 1 million jobs this year without adding one penny to the deficit.

Democrats know that by putting money in the hands of working Americans and by keeping our fiscal house in order can we create jobs and build a strong economy.

IRAQ AND WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was in the grocery checkout line buying some Motrin for my ailing 8-year-old daughter late this Saturday night; and the woman next to me, seeing me wearing something of a Republican T-shirt on the weekend but not recognizing me as a Congressman, said, "I guess your President is in some hot water over weapons of mass destruction." And that seems to be what many on the other side of the aisle and many in the national debate would like to say about the President, that somehow this administration either directly or indirectly intentionally or unintentionally exaggerated the threat of weapons of mass destruction and the WMD program of the Nation of Iraq during the months and weeks leading up to Operation Iraqi Freedom. It is an extraordinary assertion, and as I went on to describe there in the checkout line last Saturday night and rise today to describe, it is patently untenable and ignores the real and demonstrable history of the nation of Iraq and the region.

First, a lesson in history. We go back to 1981 when Israel was forced to bomb Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor at Osirak. In fact, the United Nations established at that time that Iraq had begun a nuclear weapons program and, in their words, chemical and biological weapons capability systems. In fact, in the immediate aftermath of the last

Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein and his regime as a part of the cease fire agreement acknowledged extensive biological and chemical weapons programs; and I cite now from UNSCOM's sources, the U.N. agency responsible for overseeing the cease fire of Iraq, that Iraq itself acknowledged 10,000 nerve gas warheads, 1,500 chemical weapons, and 412 tons of chemical weapons agents.

Last week before the Committee on International Relations, John Bolton, the Under Secretary for Arms Control at the U.S. State Department testified before us; and I asked him very specifically, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the assessment of the WMD program in Iraq changed significantly from the Clinton administration to the Bush administration. He hesitated and then very carefully said it had not changed in any significant way and that in many respects the Clinton administration assessed the WMD program in Iraq precisely the same as the Bush administration did. Citing those hundreds of tons of chemical and biological agents that Iraq admitted it had in 1991, Under Secretary of State John Bolton said, "Both administrations said these materials were unaccounted for."

In fact, when President Clinton bombed Iraq in 1998 after they expelled our weapons inspectors, he justified the bombing by saying "it was necessary to attack Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological programs and its capacity to threaten its neighbors." So said President Bill Clinton. So those who would say that in the 5 years leading up from the time Iraq expelled weapons inspectors to the time of Operation Iraqi Freedom that somehow, even though he refused to admit it, Saddam Hussein willingly and privately destroyed his enormous cache of weapons of mass destruction, ignore common sense, ignore history, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, we would have to believe the worst of George W. Bush and the best of Saddam Hussein to believe that there was not an extraordinary program of biological, chemical and even a nascent program for nuclear weapons being developed in the nation of Iraq and the capital of Baghdad.

Facts are stubborn things, and reciting those facts that Iraq admitted to in 1991 and establishing a decade-long pattern of deception and denial confirms, as our Iraqi survey group continues to scour that country for further evidence of a WMD program, I remain confident, as the President said yesterday, that we will not only continue to find evidence of a program, the mobile labs, the biological and chemical suits and the syringes that were found with antidotes for chemical deployments, but the day will come in the very near future, I am confident, that U.S. and coalition forces will find the elusive evidence of a program of weapons of mass destruction.

ELIMINATION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT FOR 12 MILLION CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about that sleight of hand that happened in the last few days when the Republicans put together the newest tax cut for the American people. At the time, they decided to eliminate the child tax credit for 12 million children here in the United States, because, of course, they had to find a way to pay for their tax cut for dividend earnings. One would say, so what? It is just 12 million children that we are not going to give the tax credit to their families for. But it was 12 million children of low-income families. That means that if they made somewhere between \$10,000 and \$26,000 as a family they would not get that child tax credit. People tell me all the time there is no possibility. They just cannot make \$10,000 a year because \$10,000 a year, they cannot live on that. Darn right. They cannot live on \$10,000 a year.

Let us look at what it takes to live when they are making minimum wage, minimum wage in Orange County, California, where I live. Let us say they live in Santa Ana and they are making minimum wage, and there are a lot of people who make minimum wage out there. Why? We have got Disneyland; we have got tourist attractions there. We have got the maids who make the bed when they come and stay in Anaheim. The dishwashers, the people who serve. We have the gardeners who are cleaning up everything, the janitors. They all make minimum wage; and they make no benefits, most of them.

So minimum wage, and in California it is higher than the rest of the Nation. Our minimum wage is \$6.15 an hour. Multiply that if they are going to work for 2,040 hours a week. That is working every week. That comes to less than \$13,000 a year. But by the time just their payroll taxes get pulled out of that paycheck, they are taking home about \$11,000. And let us say that they are a family of three, that they have got a child, that they go home to live in their one-bedroom rented apartment in Santa Ana, California, where the average rent is \$950 a month. When they do all the math, they figure out that earning minimum wage means they can barely pay their apartment rent. That is not their utilities. It is not health care. It is not clothes for them or their children. It is not school books or supplies. It is not transportation to get to their job, and it is not food. It is not medicine. So, yes, it is very difficult to live on minimum wage where I live, but a lot of people do it. They are working hard every single day.

I remember about a year ago we unionized our janitors there, and they had a contract that would pay \$6.40 an

hour. And the workers came to put in their bid of whether they were going to accept that contract or not, \$6.40 an hour for cleaning toilets, cleaning toilet after toilet after toilet in a high-rise all night long every floor. Who do the Members think cleans those buildings? And they were voting on this, \$6.40 an hour. That was the contract. One holiday a year and 5 sick days a year. There was this guy, this older gentleman who was crying as he put in his "yes" vote, and he said to me "You know, Congresswoman, I have been a janitor here for 17 years. This is the first time that I will get a raise."

People live and they work very hard for these wages. So I hear the other side say it does not matter; we should not give people this tax credit. We need to give people that tax credit. What about the 200,000 families that are in our military, some of them stationed in Iraq, having put their lives on the line who are not eligible for the child tax credit because the other side decided that they needed to give rich people more money? When we first discovered it and we started to talk about it, some said, oh, my God, we did not know. How could that happen? Someone just slipped it in. Nobody slipped it in. The White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer said it was a very well-known fact what they were doing and the White House knew about it.

Let us pass the DeLauro bill. We have got to get money to the families who really need it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask the occupants of the gallery not to show signs of approval or disapproval.

PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES AND ITS CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, most Americans believe that the first duty of the Federal Government is to protect the security of the United States and its citizens. By any objective assessment, when the threat to our security takes a form of foreign armies, navies or intercontinental missiles, we have done an exemplary job. When it comes to threats confronting us, new threats, the sort that resulted in the attacks like that on September 11, we continue to ignore gaping holes in our national defense. As it becomes more evident that we need better information about who is in our country, we are about to surrender that identification process to foreign governments. We must adhere to a policy of closed borders with open, guarded doors. We cannot rely on for-

eign nations, even allies, to be thorough enough to issue identification that meets our rigorous standards. Do we really want to rely on the government of Mexico and the dozens of other countries that will be lining up to issue consular IDs to tell us who is living illegally in our country? I think not. The majority of Americans believe that we should not either.

Given the very real and deadly threats that we face, how wise is it to have millions of Americans, people living illegally in this country using dozens of identity documents issued by governments all around the globe to do everything from opening a bank account to boarding planes. I have recently been informed that our customs office in New York is actually allowing customs forms as people enter into this country to be turned in and they are simultaneously not checking the names of the people turning in the customs forms to compare it to a list of known terrorists. Customs forms pile up and are entered several days later. This is later when these people are already in our country. It is kind of the "come on in and we will check you later" process, that "we will check you later if we can find you." Is this what we really had in mind when we promised the American people that we would do everything within reason to prevent another catastrophe like 9-11 and we spent billions of tax dollars to create a Department of Homeland Security? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker; and I do not think our American citizens do either.

TAX CUT TO WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for her eloquent statement on behalf of the people who are left out of the Republican tax cut bill and the people who like the Narvaez family in my district are working hard every single day. This is Maria Narvaez and her daughters Alma and Elia. She has another daughter too. She is standing in front of a community organization called Family Matters in my district and all of us would hope that to every Member of Congress that families really do matter.

To Ms. Narvaez, they really do. She works also in a day care center taking care of other people's children, and for all of her full-time work she earns \$20,000. When the tax cut bill passed the Senate originally, it had a refundable tax credit. She would have gotten up to another \$400, which may not mean much to some people, but could mean a lot to Maria and her daughters and her son, who are pictured there. She would have taken that money and

gone right out and maybe paid a few bills or bought some extra food for the family or some clothes. Money would have gone directly into the economy and would have helped to create more jobs and stimulate growth.

But instead, what the House Republicans said is that she and her family are just simply not wealthy enough to have a tax cut because in the dead of night what happened to that Senate provision that would have given her a tax cut that would have given her a rebate, Vice President CHENEY went in and said, wait a minute, and he helped negotiate this, the bill that was passed goes too high. It spends too much money. So somebody is going to have to be cut out. And in the dark of night, in a secret negotiating deal, it was families like the Narvaez family who were cut out.

It is not just her. I talked to a mother of a Marine yesterday. I had breakfast with her. And she was telling me, he is in Iraq right now but she was telling me that when she went to visit him at his base there was a church nearby that had a big box in front of it and she said what is that box? And that is for donations of clothing for the military families. Understand that I am not talking about the generals and I am not talking about the people that are sitting at the Pentagon. I am talking about the young men and women, the privates, the privates first class who are over in Iraq who are risking their lives every day, some of them losing their lives, and we do not know how many have been injured in that war, those people also have been cut out of this bill, and this is what the majority leader said. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, said there are a lot of other things that are more important; and what that must mean is that it is more important to give an average of \$90,000 tax cut to millionaires, and it is more important to pass a tax dividend cut, the taxes we pay on dividends, to cut that, than to ensure families who are making less than \$26,000 to have a few extra dollars to spend on their families.

And the reality is that if Congress does not act by the end of June, 6.5 million low-income families will not receive their refund checks at the same time as the middle-class families do. So we are under a time frame here. It is not something that we can just chat about. Who does benefit then from the tax cut bill? Let us talk about who actually gets a benefit. Vice President CHENEY who negotiated that deal that cut this family out will reap about \$116,000 a year from the dividend and capital gains provisions in the tax bill. Maria will have to work about 10 years in order to have an income that equals the 1-year tax cut that the Vice President will get, and that is not the only thing. John Snow, the Secretary of the Treasury, will get in 1 year a tax cut about \$332,000.

She will have to work 16 years to get that. Let us talk about fairness here.

Let us talk about what is good for the economy and good for families. Let us do what the Senate did when they fixed it. Let us give a tax cut to working families.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon today.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

PRAYER

The Reverend Phillip Kaim, Diocese of Rockford, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we open Congress for another day, we ask that You open the hearts and minds of our legislators to do Your will. We ask that You gift them with the wisdom to know Your will, the prudence to know the means to accomplish it, and the courage to follow through, to persevere, and overcome any obstacles put in their path.

As we open Congress, we keep in our thoughts and prayers all the men and women in our armed services, especially those still deployed in Iraq, who risk their lives every day to protect our cherished freedom. We ask You to keep them safe and out of harm's way. We also ask that You provide sufficient chaplains to serve this unique and challenging ministry.

We ask all of this in Your Holy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MICHAUD 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 FATHER PHILLIP KAIM

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, today the House opened with a prayer from our guest chaplain, Father Phil Kaim. Father Kaim is a newly ordained priest in the Rockford diocese in the State of Illinois. Father Kaim is also a close personal friend of mine and a former member of my staff.

When Phil worked in my office, I always admired his clarity of vision, his strong conviction, and his compassion for those around him. Phil had a knack for politics. He worked for me for almost 10 years.

He served in my office as my district director and was my eyes and ears back home in Illinois. Phil was very good at his job, but I guess he decided he had a higher calling. Six years ago he made a decision to become a priest, and after the election of November of 1998 he left my employment, packed his bags and moved to Rome to study at the North American College to become a Roman Catholic priest.

On May 17 of this year he was ordained. He will return to Rome later this year to continue his studies.

Father Kaim, thank you for your prayer today and good luck to what I know will be a bright future.

CLASS ACTION REFORM GOOD FOR FAMILIES

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be taking up another bill that will directly benefit working families: the Class Action Fairness Act of 2003. And as we know, the class action process was designed to help consumers with similar troubles pool their resources for legal assistance and streamline what might otherwise be thousands, even millions, of separate claims.

But in the last 10 years, class action filings have risen 1,000 percent. For all their apparent popularity, one would think class action suits have suddenly become more beneficial to consumers, but the evidence suggests in that time the class action system has been abused more often than ever. A suit against the Bank of Boston, for instance, yielded just \$8.64 cents for every plaintiff, but cost \$90 each in lawyers' bills.

A class action against Blockbuster Video racked up more than \$9 million in legal fees, but yielded plaintiffs a mere \$1 off coupon for future rental at Blockbuster.

Class actions have become more popular, but not because they have suddenly started benefitting consumers more. After all, under the current system, the suits get bogged down in State courts where the settlements are often not equally distributed among members of the class. Meanwhile, the cost of all this litigation is being

passed on by companies to the American consumer. The courts, the companies, and the consumers are not benefitting them.

But who is? Who else? The trial lawyers. The American people get the joke, Mr. Speaker. No matter who loses in class action suits, the winners are always the same: The trial lawyers. Even if their clients do not get any money or are not being paid, the lawyers always seem to be paid.

So the reforms we will take up this week will streamline the class action system and provide for new consumer protection against abusive lawsuits. This Republican majority is committed to meeting the needs of the American people and reining in the excesses of our litigious trial lawyer community.

So I look forward to the debate on this bill, Mr. Speaker, to see if the same can be said of their friends on the other side of the aisle.

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CREDIT ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, the recent tax bill carelessly neglects 12 million children in America's low-income working families by cutting them out of the child tax credit plan.

I asked the House Committee on Government Reform to investigate what this would mean to the State of Maine. They found that in my home district, 21,000 working families will receive no benefit. These are families who work hard, pay taxes, play by the rules, and who were still left out in the cold.

Cutting these people out was just plain wrong. That is why I have introduced the Working Family Tax Credit Act of 2003, along with my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). This bill will fix the problem and assure that all working families get some benefit. In a tax bill that gives \$90 billion of its tax cut exclusively to millionaires, making sure that working families who make \$25,000 a year should be able to get some tax relief is the least this Congress can do.

FAMILIES SHOULD CHOOSE WHAT IS BEST FOR THEM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House was scheduled to consider the Family Time Flexibility Act. But some of our friends on the other side of the aisle opposed the idea of allowing workers to choose what their overtime is worth, so we did not get to vote on it.

When workers spend extra time at work, they should determine how much that time is worth, not employers and not politicians. This bill would allow

them to do that. It gives employees the choice of how they are compensated for time they work over and above their normal work week.

In my district this is a big deal. There are a lot of hardworking people there who work a lot of overtime and a lot of close-knit families whose time is precious enough as it is. They should not be forced to take more money when what they need is some extra time at home.

But in order to appease special interests, our friends on the other side opposed this bill and prevented a vote on it. They opposed the right of workers to choose what is best for their families. They put the demands of big labor unions over the rights of parents to spend more time with their kids, and I think that is a crime.

EXTEND CHILD TAX CREDIT TO LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to discuss extending the Child Tax Credit to the families that need it most. This morning I came to the House floor to again call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to pass the legislation to give these 6.5 million taxpaying families what they have rightfully earned.

The other body has passed a bill. The President has said the House should take it up and he will sign it. Why is the Republican leadership so reluctant to lift a finger to help people who work, people who pay taxes, people who have children? Republicans pass tax cut after tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, and then they cut out the families of 12 million children, families that pay a greater percent of their incomes, 8 percent of their income in taxes; more than Enron did in the last 4 out of the last 5 years. They paid no taxes.

Now we hear the Republican leadership wants something in exchange. As I said this morning, there is always a deal with these people. It has nothing to do with values or fairness. It is all about taking care of their own. It is all about taking care of Enron, WorldCom, and Tyco.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop playing games. It is time for the House to take the other body's legislation. Let us help 6.5 million families share in the benefits of this tax cut. It is the right thing to do.

STATE DEPARTMENT IS AIDING ILLEGAL ALIENS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, it is not bad enough that foreign governments are brazenly distributing identi-

fication documents to their nationals in order to make it easier for them to violate our immigration laws, it now appears that our government is aiding in the effort.

Perhaps I am a bit inaccurate in referring to the State Department as "our government." Anyone who has been around here any length of time knows that the State Department operates as a separate entity with its own agenda and set of rules and are often unconnected to the wishes of the administration and are often disdainful of any congressional input except when they are up here asking for money.

Recently a memo came into our possession, which emanated from our Embassy in Managua and was sent to Secretary Powell. It was asking for directions in the task of helping the government of Nicaragua create these ID cards to distribute to Nicaraguan nationals living illegally in the United States. They want to do this so that these illegal aliens can more easily obtain benefits, get breeder documents, and generally live here undisturbed while they violate our laws.

You got it. That is our government in league with a foreign government as they aid and abet their illegal aliens living in the United States.

Beam me up, as our friend used to say, Mr. Speaker, beam me up.

ADMINISTRATION MUST HAVE ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the credibility gap is growing. First the administration said the U.S. had to sweep aside the U.N. inspections and the Security Council because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction which were an imminent threat.

No weapons have been found to justify the war. So why did we go to war?

Now Paul Wolfowitz says, "The truth is that for reasons that have a lot to do with the U.S. Government bureaucracy, we settled on the one issue that everyone could agree on which was weapons of mass destruction as the core reason."

Now their story is changing. Iraq had a weapons program, they say. No longer weapons of mass destruction but a program. Is this now the core reason?

Bait and switch will not work here, nor will a pretense for war. If this administration can fabricate reasons for the war after the fact, where will America be headed for war next?

Congress must demand accountability for the wanton exercise of war power, loss of life, destruction of property, waste of tax dollars, and damage to America's reputation.

□ 1215

Thirty-three Members of the House have now signed the resolution of inquiry to demand the White House tell the truth.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the House leadership for bringing before us a resolution to raise awareness and encourage prevention of sexual assault in the United States.

One person victimized by sexual assault is far too many, but unfortunately, one person on average is sexually assaulted every 2 minutes in the United States alone. These can be our neighbors, our friends, or even our family members.

For these victims and for the people who help them, this resolution salutes them for survival. For organizations, businesses and media, this resolution promotes awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of these horrific crimes.

Mr. Speaker, no one deserves to be sexually assaulted. I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution, S.J. Res. 8, on the House floor today.

MIGHTY DUCKS

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Mighty Ducks of Anaheim for their spectacular success in the 2002-2003 National Hockey League season. Even though they did not win the Stanley Cup this year, they came into the playoffs as the seventh-best team in the Western conference, faced down their critics, and made it to the Stanley Cup finals for the first time in their 10-year history.

Sweeping the Detroit Red Wings in four games, the Dallas Stars in six, and the Minnesota Wild in four, the Ducks proved that they were a serious contender for the sport's most coveted trophy; and Jean Sebastien Giguere, the Duck's spectacular goal tender, was selected as the most valuable player, winning that trophy for his hard work and incredible skill that gave the Ducks their fire throughout all of these playoff games.

Congratulations to my hometown team, the Mighty Ducks. Thanks for making this season a great one to watch and for making us proud.

TRIBUTE TO AL DAVIS

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge the passing of Committee on Ways and Means' staff member Al Davis who died on May 30. Like so many of his staffers that I hope are watching today, the re-

gard that we as Members of this House hold for you is unparalleled. You are the ones who genuinely make the trains run on time.

In the case of Al Davis, the information he provided to members of the Committee on Ways and Means as our economist were not only quality statistics but they were always reliable, a fact that the media and our critics often missed. It is people like this who day in and day out provide us with legendary support, and I particularly will miss the volumes of data he provided to me on the issue of alternative minimum tax.

He was a political warrior, like so many who staff this Congress; but he was also an individual who held great regard for this institution and was never disdainful of any of its Members. Even those who opposed his ideas respected him.

If we were offering a sitcom on the life of Al Davis, we would have called it "Humble Al." I never heard anybody who did not find a compliment for Al Davis, and those of us who would acknowledge what he did when he whispered in our ear vital statistics are forever grateful for the service he rendered. We all will miss Al Davis.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, House Majority Whip Blunt said GOP Members find no urgency to act for a child tax credit, but there was an incredible urgency in this House a couple of weeks ago when we acted in the dark of the night to extend an average \$93,500 tax break to every millionaire in America.

Then the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) said, if we give people a tax break that do not pay taxes, it is welfare. Excuse me, someone who earns \$27,000 a year pays \$1,890 in FICA taxes. They pay taxes, regressive taxes; and guess what, every penny of those FICA taxes that is supposed to go into the Social Security surplus, the lockbox, that that side of the aisle used to support, that the President used to support, is being borrowed and being mailed in big checks to the wealthy. She may call that welfare; I call it Reverse Robin Hood.

NEXT GENERATION HISPANIC- SERVING INSTITUTIONS

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our educational future of America, I rise today in favor of H.R. 2238, a piece of legislation filed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that would allow an opportunity for us to get additional resources for those youngsters and those individuals

throughout this country, Latinos, that are attending the Hispanic-serving institutions to be able to get additional resources to get their master's and their Ph.D.'s.

This bill will strengthen the Hispanic-serving institution programs by establishing a competitive grants program to extend graduate degrees program opportunities for the Hispanic-serving institutions.

The bill will support graduate fellowships, services for graduate students, facilities, and improve our college and university faculty and technology. Current law only provides for those that are attending 2- and 4-year institutions and not allows for master's and Ph.D.'s.

It is important that we look at providing additional resources so that these youngsters can go and obtain their master's and their Ph.D.'s. I ask for my colleagues' support on H.R. 2238.

AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL STANDING IS BEING DAMAGED

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, we have now gone 80 days without finding any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Questions are mounting as to whether the intelligence presented by the administration was manipulated or deliberately misinterpreted to create a false justification for the war.

Regardless of whether we supported or opposed the war, this is a critical issue. America's international standing is being damaged by this failure; and more importantly, this issue raises serious doubts about our intelligence apparatus, and it raises potential constitutional concerns.

I urge all of us to look carefully at this lapse, and I urge Congress to work in a bipartisan way to find out how this happened and to take steps to ensure that Congress and the American people are never misled when it comes to the issue of sending our American fighting men and women into harm's way about the purpose and the extent of the problem.

AMERICA'S FAMILIES AND CHILDREN ARE IMPORTANT

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in light of today's news reports to really thank Republicans for finally agreeing with us that all children and families of America are important, whether or not they are wealthy.

Two weeks ago, these same Republicans did not understand that lesson. Two weeks ago, they sacrificed the well-being of 6.5 million families, including 12 million children, so that they could pass tax breaks and dividend tax cuts for their wealthiest friends. Republicans thought that their

actions really would have gone unnoticed, but how wrong they were.

In California, for example, without this new legislation, almost 1.3 million California families would receive no child tax credit, including 2.4 million children. The Republicans would have especially hurt minority families because one-third of all Latino families would miss out on the tax break, while half of all African American families would not receive the credit.

Thankfully now, the majority is really beginning to listen and beginning to understand that those families who do not make any more than \$26,000 should also receive the same benefit that every family that earns up to \$110,000 and over would receive.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of sexual assault in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Whereas, on average, another person is sexually assaulted in the United States every two minutes;

Whereas, the Department of Justice reports that 248,000 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2001;

Whereas, 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape;

Whereas, children and young adults are most at risk, as 44 percent of sexual assault victims are under the age of 18, and 80 percent are under the age of 30;

Whereas, sexual assault affects women, men, and children of all racial, social, religious, age, ethnic, and economic groups in the United States;

Whereas, less than 40 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies;

Whereas, two-thirds of sexual crimes are committed by persons who are not strangers to the victims;

Whereas, the rate of sexual assaults has decreased by half in the last decade;

Whereas, because of recent advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies have the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases;

Whereas, aggressive prosecution can incarcerate rapists and therefore prevent them from committing further crimes;

Whereas, sexual assault victims suffer emotional scars long after the physical scars have healed; and

Whereas, free, confidential help is available to all victims of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States, and other organizations that provide services to assist victims of sexual assault: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage both the prevention of sexual assault and the prosecution of its perpetrators;

(B) it is appropriate to salute the more than 20,000,000 victims who have survived sexual assault in the United States and the efforts of victims, volunteers, and professionals who combat sexual assault;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to its victims, and encouraging the increased prosecution and punishment of its perpetrators; and

(D) police, forensic workers, and prosecutors should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of the offenders;

(2) Congress urges national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, and the media to promote, through National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of sexual assault; and

(3) Congress supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 S.J. Res. 8.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution as a way to further increase awareness of sexual assault and recognize the important contributions of victims in various groups that combat sexual assault. The police, forensic workers, and prosecutors should be praised for their hard work and dedication to this fight.

Through recent advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies

have developed the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases. The work of these individuals to prosecute sexual assault cases and incarcerating the offenders makes all of us safer.

We must also recognize the work of victims, national and community organizations, private sector supporters, and the media in this area. These groups helped to increase public awareness and provide support for individuals affected by this dramatic experience. Public awareness is a vital tool in combatting the incidence of sexual assault. It is noteworthy that the rate of sexual assaults has decreased by half in the last decade.

This resolution also recognizes the plight of victims of sexual assault. Often, victims suffer emotional scars that remain long after the physical scars have healed. Free, confidential help is available to all victims of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers in the United States and other organizations that provide services to assist the victims of sexual assault.

Hopefully, public awareness of this issue will also help victims to recognize that they are not alone and encourage them to come forward and report the crime. Currently, less than 40 percent of the sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies.

This resolution offers the support of this Congress and brings attention to this very important issue. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the individuals and organizations that dedicate themselves to combatting sexual assault.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in supporting S.J. Res. 8 to call attention to National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month. The purpose of this resolution is to increase public awareness of sexual assault and to recognize the important contributions of various individuals and groups across the United States that combat sexual assault.

Mr. Speaker, sexual assault victims are primarily young people with 44 percent of the victims under the age of 18, 80 percent under the age of 30. Sexual assault affects women, men, children of all races, social, religious, age, ethnic and economic groups and even prisoners. Yet less than 40 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Speaker, as we recognize Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, Congress also recognizes that other tools are also important in preventing and addressing sexual assault. With advances in DNA technology, law

enforcement agencies have been able to identify and prosecute many offenders, and the potential exists to identify tens of thousands of additional offenders in unsolved rape cases. That is why it is so important that Congress provide additional resources needed to immediately eliminate the current backlog of rape evidence kits across the United States.

I look forward to working with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, in authorizing and funding the Debbie Smith Act and other bills aimed at reducing the DNA backlog.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, some would be quick to point out that this resolution is about symbolism; but in this area and on this subject, symbolism is important. Symbolism can help us raise the profile of this very important issue.

As the previous speaker, the chairman, just alluded, there are things that we should celebrate in our battle against sexual assault. Rape is down 50 percent over the last decade. We have recently passed the Protect Act, child abduction legislation, that I think will offer new tools and resources in the fight against sexual assault. The committee is developing DNA legislation that will provide additional tools and resources; but as we all know, we have so far to go.

A person is sexually assaulted in this country every 2 minutes.

□ 1230

According to the Department of Justice, nearly 250,000 people were assaulted in 2001 alone; 1 in 6 women have been the victim of rape or attempted rape.

This resolution declares that Congress supports the goals and ideals of the National Sexual Assault Awareness Month. We can use this opportunity to educate the public on how to prevent sexual assault. We can use this opportunity to recognize those in the community that volunteer numerous hours to work with victims. We can use this opportunity to recognize law enforcement for their dedicated work in this battle against sexual assault in the areas of increased conviction and increased prevention, and we can use this opportunity to salute the more than 20 million victims who have survived sexual assault. We stand with them. By raising the profile, hopefully these numbers will fall and we will have fewer victims, we will have more convictions, and we will have greater awareness of this awful battle we must fight.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) who is a lead sponsor

of this resolution, an advocate for the issue.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 8, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for all of their hard work on this issue and this resolution and for their work in preventing sexual assault and rape.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) and I introduced the companion legislation to this bill, H.J. Res. 36 in the House earlier. This April is Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, but it is important to remember that preventing sexual assault should be a top priority during each month of the year.

We must also remember that violence against women is not just a woman's issue, it is a man's issue, a family's issue, and an issue that is important to society at large.

According to the Department of Justice, someone is sexually assaulted in this country every 82 seconds. That translates to over 1,000 a day, and over 380,000 sexual assaults every year; yet we have the ability to help protect our daughters, our sisters, and our friends by putting rapists behind bars using DNA evidence. We know that DNA evidence is better than a fresh set of fingerprints, and we know it is often better than eyewitness testimony.

Earlier this year I reintroduced with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) an important piece of legislation that would take important steps to prevent sexual assaults from occurring. The Debbie Smith Act would provide critical funding for eliminating the backlog of unprocessed DNA evidence, for establishing sexual assault forensic examiner programs, and for training law enforcement and prosecutors about how to use DNA technology most effectively.

The bill also establishes a national standard for the collection of DNA evidence, thereby ensuring that the evidence is processed in a reasonable amount of time. I authored this bill after Debbie Smith testified before the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. She spoke about the tool of DNA and how it can be used to convict rapists. She was raped near her home in 1989, and for 6½ years she lived in fear that her attacker would return to fulfill the threat he had made to her that day, that if she told anyone, he would kill her. Only on the day that her husband told her that the man that had raped Debbie had been identified through a DNA match and was in prison was Debbie able to breathe again.

Tragically, there are other Debbie Smiths out there, other women still living in fear because they do not know if their attacker will come back to them again. The Debbie Smith Act will help to bring justice and closure to the survivors of rapes and their families,

and it will help prevent rapes by putting rapists behind bars.

This is an issue that both Republicans and Democrats agree on. Attorney General Ashcroft earlier this year stated that he supported a \$1 billion initiative to process DNA evidence. This is clearly very important because there is an estimated 350,000 to 500,000 kits unprocessed around the country. It is no wonder that only 2 percent of women who are raped will ever see their attacker spend a day in jail, but each rape kit represents a life, the life of a person like Debbie Smith, and each rape kit represents a predator, a rapist who may strike again and again. Law enforcement tells us that most rapists, if not caught, will attack approximately, or at least, 8 times.

It is time to put DNA evidence to work stopping rapes and sexual assaults from occurring around the country, and I do believe that this year we will pass this bill. It is needed, it is important, and we will pass it because there is strong bipartisan support from the White House, from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), and many others. I thank everyone who has worked on it. There is no greater way to celebrate Sexual Assault Month than to pass legislation that will prevent sexual assaults in the future. I am hopeful this year we will be able to achieve that.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 8, the joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of sexual assault in the United States.

The statistics on the widespread nature of sexual assault are alarming. It is estimated that one in six women in the United States have been victims of rape or attempted rape. One in five children will be a victim of sexual abuse before reaching the age of 18. However, recent educational efforts have proved successful—therate of sexual assaults has decreased by half in the last decade. It is critical to the safety of all Americans that we build on these efforts.

Sexual assault is perpetuated by silence. One of the most startling aspects of sex crimes is how many go unreported. The joint resolution we are voting on today is a step in acknowledging the all too prevalent reality of sexual assault. Further, we must support the existing programs and resources for victims of sexual assault and their families, such as the National Sexual Assault Hotline and more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as a show of commitment to the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 8, a resolution to raise awareness and encourage prevention of sexual assault. There is no crime that is more personal, more intrusive, or more painful than rape, and it must be a priority of this Congress and this Administration to work toward an end to this violence. Unfortunately, while this resolution is a nice demonstration of sympathy and support from the Congress, it is woefully inadequate. While I strongly support its passage,

the Republican Leadership should allow the House to consider legislation to provide real relief to victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. It is my hope that this resolution will be followed by consideration of H.R. 1267, the Domestic Violence Screening, Treatment, and Protection Act; H.R. 1046, the Debbie Smith Act dealing with the DNA evidence backlog; H.R. 394, the Violence Against Women Civil Rights Restoration Act; and many others.

We have come a long way in the last 30 years since women started speaking up and speaking out against sexual assault. We are now better able to treat rape victims in emergency rooms; law enforcement has access to tools to teach them how to respond to the crime of sexual assault; and there are social and mental health services available to women who are survivors of rape. I am grateful for this progress.

However, as we've raised awareness of this violence, we have also learned that it reaches far deeper into every aspect of our society than we wanted to admit or acknowledge. It is far more likely that perpetrators know their victims and aren't just strangers in the bushes. And women aren't the only victims—one in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape. Furthermore, teens are twice as likely as any other age group to be victims of crime—nearly one-third of all sexual assault victims are raped between the ages of 12 and 17, and one in five girls becomes a victim of violence in dating relationships.

We've also heard a lot this year about women at the Air Force Academy who have been victims of sexual assault. It is a disgrace that so many women have been re-victimized and silenced as a result of our military's reaction to these violent crimes. We must work hard to change the culture in every branch and at every level of the military from one that accepts violence against women to one that condemns such violence and treats victims, and all women, with respect and equality. But what we haven't heard much about is that men in the military are also victims of sexual assault. A special report appeared in January 2003 and revealed that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs began collecting nationwide data on the extent to which men have been sexually traumatized in the armed services. The preliminary results are that nearly 22,500 male veterans—more than one of every 100 former soldiers, sailors and airmen treated by the VA—reported being sexually traumatized by peers or superiors during their military careers. This once again shows that sexual violence is about humiliation, degradation, and control.

We must commit ourselves to ending violence against women this month and every month. We must fully fund all Violence Against

Women Act programs. We must speak up when we hear people speak about sexual violence in a dismissive or harmful way. We must educate our sons to be nonviolent and to treat women with respect. I believe that if we commit ourselves, we can end violence against women. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for S.J. Res. 8.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 8, the Joint Resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the raising awareness and encouraging prevention of sexual assault in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

WHAT S.J. RES. 8 DOES

The Resolution echoes the goals and ideals of the National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, namely to increase public awareness of the occurrence and the effects of sexual assault and to improve our nation's overall ability to prevent new incidents.

The need for this legislation stems from data compiled by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network. Specifically, the fact that "a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2 minutes" and that 248,000 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2001 as reported by the Department of Justice underscores the urgent and emergent nature of this problem. Furthermore, the Resolution cites statistics that 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of either rape or attempted rape. In addition, in terms of victim age, 44 percent are under the age of 18 and 80 percent are under the age of 30. I support this legislation because sexual assault has a significant and direct effect on the lives of many of the constituents in my legislative District.

EFFECT ON STATE AND LOCAL CONSTITUENT DISTRICT

Between 1997 and 2001, the number of family violence incidence reported and the number of women killed by intimate male partners has remained at a consistent high (See Attachment 1).

In Texas, 35 percent of the women killed in 1997 were murdered by an intimate male partner, which is higher than the national average of 28 percent as reported by the FBI (Texas Council on Family Violence, 2002).

In Houston, 21,621 family violence incidents were reported. Out of this number, 15 women were killed by intimate male partners (Texas Council on Family Violence, 2001).

In Harris County in 2001, 26,353 family violence incidents were reported. Likewise in 2001 and out of this number, 22 women were killed by intimate male partners (Texas Department of Public Safety, 2002). In addition, every 20 minutes, there is 1 domestic violence

incident reported to the police (3 domestic violence events every hour in the County). The National Crime Victimization Survey reports that in 1998, only 50 percent of all actual domestic violence incidents are reported. According to the Harris County Public Health & Environment Services, likely factors that have led to the increased number of incidents include: "changes in law relating to domestic violence, increase [sic] public awareness of domestic violence, increase in support facilities for Domestic Violence survivors established by the government and various community groups, more effective involvement of the law enforcement in the incidents of domestic violence, and better tools provided to District Attorney's Office for prosecuting the offenders of domestic violence."

OTHER RELEVANT DATA

The direct harmful effects of sexual assault and domestic violence have been well documented:

Pregnancy—A 1996 review indicated that between 0.9 percent and 20.1 percent of women experienced Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) (Center for Disease Control (CDC)).

Elderly—An estimated 551,011 elderly persons (aged 60 and over) suffered abuse, neglect, and/or self-neglect in domestic settings in 1996 (National Center for Victims of Crime, 1998). The median age for elder abuse victims was 77.9 years in 1996.

Disabled—Women with disabilities face the same risks as all women face, plus those associated with their particular disability. Furthermore, studies have shown that women with physical disabilities more likely received abusive treatment from attendants and health care providers (Center for Research on Women with Disabilities, 1997)

Homeless/Low-Income—A study of 777 homeless parents (predominantly mothers) in ten U.S. cities revealed that 22 percent had relocated because of domestic violence (Homes for the Homeless, 1998). Furthermore, a survey conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors indicated that 46 percent of the surveyed cities identified domestic violence as a primary cause of homelessness (1998).

Men affected—According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 1998, men were found to be victims of approximately 160,000 violent crimes by an intimate partner.

The vast and diverse statistics mentioned above relative to the very problems targeted by S.J. Res. 8, in my legislative "back yard" as well as nationwide warrant my attention as well as the attention of my colleagues. For the above stated reasons, I vote in favor of S.J. Res. 8 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

ATTACHMENT 1

	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997
Family violence incidents	180,385	175,282	177,176	175,725	181,773
Women killed by intimate male partners	113	104	133	116	102

Source: Texas Council on Family Violence, 2001.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her advocacy, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 8.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY
IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1529) to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to the dismissal of certain involuntary cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1529

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Involuntary Bankruptcy Improvement Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT.

Section 303 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j)(1) If—

"(A) the petition under this section is false or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement;

"(B) the debtor is an individual; and

"(C) the court dismisses such petition;

the court, upon motion of the debtor, shall expunge from the records of the court such petition, all the records relating to such petition in particular, and all references to such petition.

"(2) If the debtor is an individual and the court dismisses a petition under this section, the court may enter an order prohibiting all consumer reporting agencies (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act) from making any consumer report (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act) that contains any information relating to such petition or to the case commenced by the filing of such petition."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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. 1529.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1529, the Involuntary Bankruptcy Improvement Act of 2003, a bill I introduced earlier this year that addresses a very serious and possibly growing problem with respect to abuse of the judicial process by extremists and others.

Under current law, a debtor can voluntarily commence a bankruptcy case or be involuntarily forced into bankruptcy by one or more creditors. Although rarely used, an involuntary bankruptcy petition can be a useful creditor collection tool. It can preserve and maximize assets for the benefit of creditors and provide for the appointment of a bankruptcy trustee to investigate a debtor's financial affairs.

Unfortunately, tax protesters and other extremists are now resorting to filing fraudulent involuntary bankruptcy petitions against public officials and private individuals as yet another weapon in their arsenal of abusive litigation tactics, such as filing false liens.

Last year, for instance, a tax protester filed fraudulent involuntary bankruptcy petitions against 36 local public officials in my district in Wisconsin, including the county sheriff, the circuit judge, and nearly every member of the county board of supervisors. Some of these individuals only discovered that they were the subject of a pending involuntary bankruptcy case after their lines of credit were terminated or they were charged higher interest rates. Worse yet, an involuntary bankruptcy filing, as with most bankruptcy cases, is a matter of public record and can appear on an individual's credit report for up to 10 years even if the involuntary bankruptcy filing is fraudulent and the case is dismissed by the court.

As a result, innocent individuals continue to experience credit problems long after these abusive cases are dismissed. As the Hartford Courant reported last month, it sometimes takes years for corrections to be made to a person's credit report. As a result, the individual may potentially be forced to pay higher interest rates until the proper steps can be taken to fix their credit report.

While abusive bankruptcy filings are not pervasive, they have occurred in various districts across the Nation. According to an informal survey conducted by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the National Conference of Bankruptcy Clerks, fraudulent involuntary bankruptcy cases have recently been filed in California, Ohio, Maine, Nebraska, and North Carolina. Organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League and the National District Attorneys Association have expressed concern that this litigation tactic may become even more widespread.

H.R. 1529 responds to the serious problems presented by abusive involuntary bankruptcy filings in two respects:

First, it amends the Bankruptcy Code to require the bankruptcy court, on motion of the debtor, to expunge all records relating to a fraudulent involuntary bankruptcy case from the court's files under certain conditions.

Second, it authorizes the bankruptcy court to prohibit all credit reporting agencies from issuing a consumer report containing any reference to a fraudulent involuntary bankruptcy case where the debtor is an individual and the court has dismissed the petition.

This bill offers great forward but very much-needed relief to innocent victims of abusive involuntary bankruptcy petitions. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1529, the Involuntary Bankruptcy Improvement Act of 2003, a bill which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary with bipartisan support and without dissent.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for moving so quickly to deal with a real and pernicious problem. This legislation is a good first step in providing bankruptcy courts with congressional guidance in dealing with the phenomenon of malicious and baseless involuntary bankruptcy petitions. It augments the existing powers of the bankruptcy court and makes clear Congress' intent to ensure that the targets of this abuse will have available to them meaningful protection from the lasting effects of meritless involuntary bankruptcy petitions.

An involuntary bankruptcy petition, even if no order for relief is entered, and even if dismissed expeditiously by the court, can inflict lasting damage. Credit reporting agencies generally list the filing of a bankruptcy petition on a person's credit report almost immediately. This can destroy the ability of an individual to obtain credit or to obtain credit on appropriate terms, even if the petition is wholly without merit. For this reason, the dismissal of the case alone does not provide adequate relief.

This problem is a real one. Cases have already been filed for malicious and harassing purposes. Congress must make clear that the bankruptcy system cannot be used to harass and injure people.

Mr. Speaker, there are other changes in the Bankruptcy Code that are equally pressing and equally noncontroversial. Many of these improvements have been unnecessarily held hostage to a larger and far more controversial bankruptcy bill, our family farmers and fishermen, the stability of our financial markets, and the rights of parties whose cases are unnecessarily delayed because of inadequate judicial resources deserve better. I hope we will be able to work with the chairman of the committee to deal as expeditiously with these problems as we have with this one. So I commend the chairman for his efforts, and I urge my colleagues to support the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1529, the "Involuntary Bankruptcy Improvement Act of 2003." I support this bill to protect innocent individuals from fraudulently filed involuntary petitions for bankruptcy.

Financial struggles and bankruptcies are a continuing problem for many Americans. In January of 2003 alone, there were thousands of Chapter 7 and 11 in my home State of Texas. In Dallas there were 3,208 Chapter 7

bankruptcy filings and 257 Chapter 11 bankruptcy filings. In Fort Worth, there were 3,161 Chapter 7 filings and 210 Chapter 11 filings.

Bankruptcy petitions are designed to satisfy creditors and also provide relief to the debtor. Our bankruptcy laws allow debtors to voluntarily file a petition for relief, and also allow creditors to file involuntary petitions against debtors. Despite the goal of satisfying both debtor and creditor, debtors who go through bankruptcy invariably leave the proceedings with a very poor credit history. This depleted credit can seriously affect the debtor's ability to buy a home or a car, get a loan, or make use of many services we often take for granted.

Unfortunately many have used the involuntary bankruptcy petition, and the negative credit impact that results, as a harassment tool. Many public officials have been the victims of involuntary bankruptcy petitions.

H.R. 1529 amends the Bankruptcy Code to the benefit of individuals who have been the victims of fraudulently filed bankruptcy petitions. Under H.R. 1529, a debtor may file a motion with the court to expunge from the court records the filing of the involuntary bankruptcy petition. The motion will be granted in those bankruptcies where three requirements are met: First, the petition is false or contains any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements; second, if the debtor is an individual; and third, the court dismisses the petition.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1529 because it grants needed relief to the victims of fraudulently filed bankruptcy petitions. H.R. 1529 imposes modest requirements on the debtor and allows the debtor to easily correct their damaged credit history. I support H.R. 1529 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 1245

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1529.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1086) to encourage the development and promulgation of voluntary consensus standards by providing relief under the antitrust laws to standards development organizations with respect to conduct engaged in for the purpose of developing voluntary consensus standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1086

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1993, the Congress amended and renamed the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 (now known as the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.)) by enacting the National Cooperative Production Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103-42) to encourage the use of collaborative, procompetitive activity in the form of research and production joint ventures that provide adequate disclosure to the antitrust enforcement agencies about the nature and scope of the activity involved.

(2) Subsequently, in 1995, the Congress in enacting the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) recognized the importance of technical standards developed by voluntary consensus standards bodies to our national economy by requiring the use of such standards to the extent practicable by Federal agencies and by encouraging Federal agency representatives to participate in ongoing standards development activities. The Office of Management and Budget on February 18, 1998, revised Circular A-119 to reflect these changes made in law.

(3) Following enactment of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, technical standards developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies have replaced thousands of unique Government standards and specifications allowing the national economy to operate in a more unified fashion.

(4) Having the same technical standards used by Federal agencies and by the private sector permits the Government to avoid the cost of developing duplicative Government standards and to more readily use products and components designed for the commercial marketplace, thereby enhancing quality and safety and reducing costs.

(5) Technical standards are written by hundreds of nonprofit voluntary consensus standards bodies in a nonexclusionary fashion, using thousands of volunteers from the private and public sectors, and are developed under the standards development principles set out in Circular Number A-119, as revised February 18, 1998, of the Office of Management and Budget, including principles that require openness, balance, transparency, consensus, and due process. Such principles provide for—

(A) notice to all parties known to be affected by the particular standards development activity,

(B) the opportunity to participate in standards development or modification,

(C) balancing interests so that standards development activities are not dominated by any single group of interested persons,

(D) readily available access to essential information regarding proposed and final standards,

(E) the requirement that substantial agreement be reached on all material points after the consideration of all views and objections, and

(F) the right to express a position, to have it considered, and to appeal an adverse decision.

(6) There are tens of thousands of voluntary consensus standards available for government use. Most of these standards are kept current through interim amendments and interpretations, issuance of addenda, and periodic reaffirmation, revision, or reissuance every 3 to 5 years.

(7) Standards developed by government entities generally are not subject to challenge under the antitrust laws.

(8) Private developers of the technical standards that are used as Government standards are often not similarly protected, leaving such developers vulnerable to being named as codefendants in lawsuits even though the likelihood of their being held liable is remote in most cases, and they generally have limited resources to defend themselves in such lawsuits.

(9) Standards development organizations do not stand to benefit from any antitrust violations that might occur in the voluntary consensus standards development process.

(10) As was the case with respect to research and production joint ventures before the passage of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, if relief from the threat of liability under the antitrust laws is not granted to voluntary consensus standards bodies, both regarding the development of new standards and efforts to keep existing standards current, such bodies could be forced to cut back on standards development activities at great financial cost both to the Government and to the national economy.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4301) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The term ‘standards development activity’ means any action taken by a standards development organization for the purpose of developing, promulgating, revising, amending, reissuing, interpreting, or otherwise maintaining a voluntary consensus standard, or using such standard in conformity assessment activities, including actions relating to the intellectual property policies of the standards development organization.

“(8) The term ‘standards development organization’ means a domestic or international organization that plans, develops, establishes, or coordinates voluntary consensus standards using procedures that incorporate the attributes of openness, balance of interests, due process, an appeals process, and consensus in a manner consistent with the Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-119, as revised February 10, 1998.

“(9) The term ‘technical standard’ has the meaning given such term in section 12(d)(4) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995.

“(10) The term ‘voluntary consensus standard’ has the meaning given such term in Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-119, as revised February 10, 1998.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The term ‘standards development activity’ excludes the following activities:

“(1) Exchanging information among competitors relating to cost, sales, profitability, prices, marketing, or distribution of any product, process, or service that is not reasonably required for the purpose of developing or promulgating a voluntary consensus standard, or using such standard in conformity assessment activities.

“(2) Entering into any agreement or engaging in any other conduct that would allocate a market with a competitor.

“(3) Entering into any agreement or conspiracy that would set or restrain prices of any good or service.”.

SEC. 4. RULE OF REASON STANDARD.

Section 3 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4302) is amended by striking “of any person

in making or performing a contract to carry out a joint venture shall" and inserting the following: "of—

"(1) any person in making or performing a contract to carry out a joint venture, or

"(2) a standards development organization while engaged in a standards development activity, shall".

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON RECOVERY.

Section 4 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4303) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (c)(1) by inserting ", or for a standards development activity engaged in by a standards development organization against which such claim is made" after "joint venture", and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting ", or of a standards development activity engaged in by a standards development organization" before the period at the end, and

(B) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (f), and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not be construed to modify the liability under the antitrust laws of any person (other than a standards development organization) who—

"(1) directly (or through an employee or agent) participates in a standards development activity with respect to which a violation of any of the antitrust laws is found,

"(2) is not a fulltime employee of the standards development organization that engaged in such activity, and

"(3) is, or is an employee or agent of a person who is, engaged in a line of commerce that is likely to benefit directly from the operation of the standards development activity with respect to which such violation is found."

SEC. 6. ATTORNEY FEES.

Section 5 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4304) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting ", or of a standards development activity engaged in by a standards development organization" after "joint venture", and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply with respect to any person who—

"(1) directly participates in a standards development activity with respect to which a violation of any of the antitrust laws is found,

"(2) is not a fulltime employee of a standards development organization that engaged in such activity, and

"(3) is, or is an employee or agent of a person who is, engaged in a line of commerce that is likely to benefit directly from the operation of the standards development activity with respect to which such violation is found."

SEC. 7. DISCLOSURE OF STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY.

Section 6 of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 (15 U.S.C. 4305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively,

(B) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) A standards development organization may, not later than 90 days after commencing a standards development activity engaged in for the purpose of developing or promulgating a voluntary consensus standards or not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003,

whichever is later, file simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Commission, a written notification disclosing—

"(A) the name and principal place of business of the standards development organization, and

"(B) documents showing the nature and scope of such activity.

Any standards development organization may file additional disclosure notifications pursuant to this section as are appropriate to extend the protections of section 4 to standards development activities that are not covered by the initial filing or that have changed significantly since the initial filing."

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the 1st sentence by inserting ", or a notice with respect to such standards development activity that identifies the standards development organization engaged in such activity and that describes such activity in general terms" before the period at the end, and

(B) in the last sentence by inserting "or available to such organization, as the case may be" before the period,

(3) in subsection (d)(2) by inserting ", or the standards development activity," after "venture",

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "person who" and inserting "person or standards development organization that", and

(B) by inserting "or any standards development organization" after "person" the last place it appears, and

(5) in subsection (g)(1) by inserting "or standards development organization" after "person".

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or modify the antitrust treatment under existing law of—

(1) parties participating in standards development activity of standards development organizations within the scope of this Act, or

(2) other organizations and parties engaged in standard-setting processes not within the scope of this amendment to the Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 bill, H.R. 1086.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1086, the Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003. Technical standards play a critical, but sometimes overlooked, role in fostering competition and promoting public health and safety. Without standards, there would be no compatibility among broad categories of alternative products and less confidence in a range of building, fire and safety codes that advance the public welfare.

Unlike most other countries, standards development is conducted by private, not-for-profit organizations in the United States. This approach reflects the fact that private organizations are better able to keep pace with the rapid pace of technological change. In 1996, Congress passed the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act to encourage government agencies to assist in the development and adoption of private, voluntary standards wherever possible. While this legislation has encouraged government adoption of privately developed standards, it has also increased the vulnerability of standards-developing organizations to antitrust litigation. The frequency with which standards-developing organizations are named in lawsuits stifles their ability to obtain technical information, hampers their efficiency and effectiveness, and undermines the public benefits which they advance.

I introduced H.R. 1086 to address this problem. H.R. 1086 merely codifies the "rule of reason" for antitrust scrutiny of standards-development organizations, limits their civil antitrust liability to actual damages, and provides for the recovery of attorneys' fees to substantially prevailing parties in antitrust cases filed against these organizations.

However, H.R. 1086 does not automatically accord these protections to all standards-setting. These protections extend only to the standards-development organizations which disclose the nature and scope of their activities to the Department of Justice and to the Federal Trade Commission. In addition, this legislation applies to standards-developing organizations whose standards-setting process adheres to principles of openness, voluntariness, balance, cooperation, transparency, consensus, and due process. Finally, H.R. 1086 contains extensive notification requirements which ensure that all parties who may be affected by standard-developing activities are apprised of the scope and nature of these activities.

Mr. Speaker, while several people deserve credit for this legislation, I would like to personally recognize House Science Committee chief counsel Barry Beringer, whose hard work and dedication brought this legislation to the floor and bring credit to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that this legislation has attracted the co-sponsorship of Judiciary Committee Ranking Member CONYERS, as well as 12 of its members. In addition, H.R. 1086 continues the Judiciary Committee's bipartisan tradition of striking the proper balance between pro-competitive activity while ensuring the active role of Federal antitrust agencies in the promotion of competition in our market economy.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I wish to express my strong support for

this legislation and my appreciation to Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Ranking Member CONYERS for their bipartisan leadership in bringing it to the floor.

Nearly 20 years ago, Congress passed legislation known as the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 which permitted certain cooperative ventures to reduce their exposure to treble damages currently provided for under antitrust laws by making advance disclosures of their activities. The bill before us would provide similar relief to nonprofit organizations that develop voluntary technical standards, known as standards-development organizations, or commonly referred to as SDOs. As the chairman indicated, these standards developed by these organizations play an essential role in enhancing public safety, facilitating market access, and promoting trade and innovation.

Yet despite these pro-competitive effects, these SDOs can find themselves named as defendants in suits between business competitors alleging violations of the antitrust laws. Once they are sued, these organizations are forced to expend considerable resources on protracted discovery proceedings before they are finally able to prevail on motions for summary judgment which occurs in 100 percent of the cases, from my information.

The bill, like the National Cooperative Research Act before it, takes a moderate approach to addressing this problem. It does not create, as the chairman indicated, a statutory exemption or confer immunity from the operation of the antitrust laws. Most significantly, it merely "de-trebles" antitrust damages in cases where accurate predisclosure of collaborative activities has been made to the Department of Justice and the FTC.

I think this is the right approach. Congress should allow the antitrust laws to operate as they were meant to, without creating special exemptions and carve-outs for particular industries. This bill does not create an exemption for SDOs. Instead, it grants them limited relief of the same type and in the same manner as the relief provided for by the National Cooperative Research Act to certain cooperative joint ventures. It is a moderate approach, and it has worked well.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for their cooperative joint venture in support of this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of my good friend, Jim Shannon, a former Member of this body and former Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He currently serves as president and CEO of the National Fire Protection Association, an international organization that develops the fire safety codes and standards that protect all of us. The NFPA just happens to be based in my hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts; and Jim Shannon and this fine organi-

zation have worked very hard to advance this legislation. I want to acknowledge their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER. We have worked hard, along with a number of standard development organizations, technology companies and other private interests to craft a bill that will provide some important protections to encourage nonprofit standard development organizations, or SDOs, to continue their critical work of collaborating to set pro-competitive standards in this industries. SDOs set thousands of standards that keep us safe and provide uniformity for everything from fire protections to computer systems to building construction, for example.

This bill provides a commonsense safe harbor for standard development organizations. Those that voluntarily disclose their activities to federal antitrust authorities will only be subject to single damages should a lawsuit later arise. Those who refuse to disclose their activities, or those who take actions beyond their disclosure, will still be subject to treble damages under the antitrust statutes. This bill does not exempt anyone from the antitrust laws, but it does apply the rule of reason to SDOs. Therefore the procompetitive market effects will be balanced against the anti-competitive market effects of an action before a violation of the antitrust laws is found. Organizations that commit per se violations—making agreements or standards about price, market share or territory division, for example—will still be fully liable for their actions.

The rationale for such favored treatment is the SDOs, as nonprofits that serve a cross-section of an industry, are unlikely themselves to engage in anticompetitive activities. However, if free from the threat of treble damages, they can increase efficiency and facilitate the gathering a wealth of technical expertise from a wide array of interests to enhance product quality and safety while reducing costs.

This is the third bipartisan bill in the last 20 years that has provided some limitation on damages for antitrust liability in order to encourage cooperative behaviors by entities seeking to engage in procompetitive activities. This policy has worked well for research and joint ventures under the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 and I trust it will improve the creative environment for standards setting organizations as well. An expansion of this policy to standard development organizations will allow them to improve their innovative efforts, involve a wider range of industries and technical entities, and improve product safety and development.

I'd like to thank the chairman for his cooperative efforts on this bill and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I support H.R. 1086, "The Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003."

This act amends the National Cooperative Standards Development Act to provide antitrust protections to specific activities of standard development organizations (SDOs) relating to the development of voluntary consensus standards. Among other provisions, H.R. 1086 amends the NCRA to limit the recovery of antitrust damages against SDOs if the organi-

zations predisclose the nature and scope of their standards development activity to the proper antitrust authorities. H.R. 1086 also amends the NCRA to include SDOs in the framework of NCRA that awards reasonable attorneys' fees to the substantially prevailing party.

The provisions of H.R. 1086 protect SDOs, and in turn, SDOs help protect consumers and the public. SDOs are nonprofit organizations that establish voluntary industry standards. These standards ensure competition within various industries, promote manufacturing compatibility, and reduce the risk that consumers will be stranded with a product that is incompatible with products from other manufacturers.

The nature of the standards development process requires competing companies to bring their competitive ideas to the voluntary standards development process. When one of the companies believes its market position has been compromised by the standards development process that company will likely resort to litigation. It is not uncommon for the SDO to be named as a defendant. For nonprofit organizations like SDOs, litigation can be very costly and disruptive to their operations, and treble antitrust damages can be financially crippling.

Under H.R. 1086, the recovery of damages against SDOs is limited of the organizations prediscloses the nature and scope of their standards development activity to the proper antitrust authorities. Furthermore, SDOs are only liable for treble damages under antitrust laws if they fail to disclose the nature and scope of their voluntary standards setting activity.

H.R. 1086 strikes a good balance. It does not grant SDOs full antitrust immunity, but it provides SDOs' with protection from treble damages when they provide proper disclosure.

H.R. 1086 also benefits the consumer. It enables the SDOs to develop industry standards that promote price competition, intensify corporate rivalry, and encourage the development of new products.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1086, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1086, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN WTO TO END EUROPEAN UNION'S TRADE PRACTICES REGARDING BIOTECHNOLOGY

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 252) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the United States in its efforts

within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's protectionist and discriminatory trade practices of the past five years regarding agricultural biotechnology, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 252

Whereas agriculture biotechnology has been subject to the strictest testing, based on sound science, by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency prior to commercialization or human consumption;

Whereas Americans have been consuming genetically-modified corn and soybean products, which are subject to a rigorous Federal review process, for years with no documentation of any adverse health consequences;

Whereas, according to recent studies, biotechnology has made substantial contributions to the protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides, reducing soil erosion and creating an environment more hospitable to wildlife;

Whereas agriculture biotechnology holds tremendous promise for helping solve food security and human health crises in the developing world;

Whereas there is objective and experience-based agreement in the scientific community, including the National Academies of Science, the American Medical Association, the Royal Society of the United Kingdom, the French Academy of Medicine, the French Academy of Sciences, the joint report of the national science academies of the United Kingdom, the United States, Brazil, China, India and Mexico, twenty Nobel Prize winners, leading plant science and biology organizations in the United States and thousands of individual scientists, that biotech foods are safe and valuable;

Whereas European Union decisions on agriculture and food biotechnology are being driven by policies that have no scientific justification, do not take into account its capacity for solving problems facing mankind, and are critical of the leading role of the United States in scientific advancement;

Whereas since the late 1990s, the European Union has opposed the use of agriculture biotechnology and pursued policies which result in slowing the development and support of genetically-engineered products around the world;

Whereas the five-year moratorium on the approval of new agriculture biotechnology products entering the European market has no scientific basis, effectively prohibits most United States corn exports to Europe, violates European Union law, and clearly breaches World Trade Organization (WTO) rules;

Whereas since its implementation in October 1998, the moratorium has blocked more than \$300,000,000 annually in United States corn exports to countries in the European Union;

Whereas the European Union's unjustified moratorium on agriculture biotech approvals has ramifications far beyond the United States and Europe, forcing a slowdown in the adoption and acceptance of beneficial biotechnology to the detriment of starving people around the world; and

Whereas in the fall of 2002 it was reported that famine-stricken African countries rejected humanitarian food aid from the United States because of ill-informed health and environmental concerns and fear that future exports to the European Union would be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports and applauds the efforts of the

Administration on behalf of the Nation's farmers and sound science by challenging the long-standing, unwarranted moratorium imposed in the European Union on agriculture and food biotech products and encourages the President to continue to press this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 252 introduced by my good friend from Missouri, Majority Whip Roy Blunt. This important resolution expresses support for the administration's World Trade Organization case against the European Union's unwarranted moratorium on agriculture and food biotech products.

On May 13, 2003, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick and Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman announced that the United States, Argentina, Canada, and Egypt would file a WTO case against the European Union over its illegal 5-year moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products. Other countries expressing support for this case by joining it as third parties include Australia, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, and Uruguay.

Since the late 1990s, the European Union has opposed the use of agriculture biotechnology and pursued policies opposing genetically engineered products around the world. The current 5-year moratorium on the approval of new agriculture biotechnology products entering the European market has no scientific basis, effectively prohibits most United States corn exports to Europe, violates European Union law, and clearly breaches World Trade Organization rules.

According to recent studies, biotechnology has made substantial contributions to the protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides, reducing soil erosion and creating an environment more hospitable to wildlife. Since its implementation in October 1998, the moratorium has blocked more than \$300 million annually in United States corn exports to countries in the European Union. This is completely unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support the administration, sound science, and United States farmers at the WTO.

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

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

Earlier this year, the U.S. Trade Representative announced that the United States would file a World Trade Organization case against the European Union over its 5-year moratorium on approving genetically modified foods. The measure before us today supports the Bush administration's challenge to the EU's longstanding moratorium.

The European Union is made up of sovereign countries whose citizens have decided that they would rather not eat genetically modified food. Mr. Speaker, when did the United States acquire the right to tell Europeans what they should be eating? The issue before us is not trade discrimination as the proponents of this bill have argued. The individual EU countries are simply debating whether or not to implement a domestic policy related to genetically modified food which would also be applied to imports.

Due to the lack of hard data about the long-term health effects, in the United States there has also been public concern about consuming genetically modified products. According to a Rutgers University Food Policy Institute study, 90 percent of Americans said that foods created through genetic engineering should have labels on them. I am proud to join with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) in his efforts to require the labeling of genetically engineered food.

Although there have been few studies devoted to health effects of genetically modified food, some scientists claim that there may be a link between the resurgence of infectious diseases and genetic modifications in the U.S. food supply. There have even been cases of lab animals suffering immune system damage and allergic reactions after eating biotech food.

I think that Members would agree that the WTO should not interfere with the creation of domestic law in this Chamber, so I ask Members to apply the same principle to our friends in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this heavy-handed measure.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 252. I commend the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this important resolution.

It is clear that the U.S. must send a strong and unmistakable message to the European Union that its discriminatory and protectionist trade practices regarding biotechnology will not be tolerated. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, this Member asserts that this is an important issue in trans-Atlantic relations. This resolution puts the House on record as supporting the U.S. in its efforts within the World Trade Organization to end these practices.

The EU's current moratorium on approving new agricultural biotech products has no scientific basis.

□ 1300

It harms U.S. agricultural producers and it exacerbates food shortages in Africa. This Member has been strongly

urging the administration to take action on this issue by bringing a case against the EU to the WTO, and is very pleased the announcement has been made that we have done so.

The current EU restrictions on the importation of food with genetically modified organisms, GMOs, have cost agricultural producers billions of dollars in recent years. The U.S. must be aggressive in knocking down such non-tariff trade restrictions.

The EU's delay on lifting the moratorium on biotech crops is unacceptable and the WTO action is certainly appropriate. The intransigence by the EU is having a very detrimental effect on American farmers. It has been reported that since the early 1990s, U.S. corn exports to Europe have plummeted 95 percent, and this issue is one of the causes. Incredibly, too, they have used their emotional arguments against GMOs to coerce African countries facing famine not to accept donated American food and agricultural products. So in contrast to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said, this is strictly not a European issue, this is coercion on their part against African countries who are compelled to leave that food donated to deal with famine and malnutrition setting on the docks.

Also troubling are the indications that the EU is planning to move forward with labeling and traceability requirements that will continue to act as a mechanism to block U.S. agriculture products. This clearly runs counter to the WTO principle that rules should be based on scientific evidence.

I think it is interesting to note that David Byrne, EU Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection, has been quoted as saying, "The EU's position on genetically modified food is that it is as safe as conventional food." However, the moratorium remains in place and American farmers continue to lose valuable markets, not just in Europe, but third world countries. This matters because it is more important to the farmers today facing difficult times due to the ongoing drought and lower revenue.

When filing the WTO case, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick stated clearly why it is so important for the U.S. to take action. He said, "The EU's moratorium violates WTO rules. People around the world have been eating biotech food for years. Biotech food helps nourish the world's hungry population, offers tremendous opportunities for better health and nutrition and protects the environment by reducing soil erosion and pesticide use." This Member believes that the EU's GMO standards are transparently devoid of any relationship to sound science, and are either based strictly on emotion or are designed quite simply as trade barriers, or both.

The U.S. is correct in taking strong action to bring this back to reason. I strongly support H.R. 252 and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), for his leadership on this matter to protect consumers in this country and also to protect the rights of farmers.

The fact of the matter is that this action would harm U.S. farmers. EU consumers have clearly expressed their desire to buy non-genetically engineered foods. However, the weak U.S. biotech regulations prevent U.S. exports of non-genetically engineered foods because of fears they are contaminated. H. Res. 252 fails to address weak agriculture regulations that leave non-GE food vulnerable to contamination by genetically engineered foods.

EU consumers are clamoring for non-genetically engineered food. All we need to do is to sell them what they want and U.S. farmers will have a strong market again.

When you think about it, U.S. agriculture has been the pride of the world. We have been the breadbasket of the world. Our agriculture is second to none. But of course, when you have these corporate agribusinesses come in with a different agenda, then you see the interests of farmers undermined.

Now, several farm organizations oppose H. Res. 252 because it supports a complaint to the World Trade Organization challenging the EU's authorization system on approving genetically engineered food. H. Res. 252 is a gift to corporate agribusiness. That is why the National Family Farm Coalition, the American Corn Growers Association and the Soybean Producers of America all oppose H. Res. 252.

Family farmers have suffered a great deal of damage to their trade markets because agribusiness pushed a product on U.S. farmers that the people of the world rightfully refused to accept.

The recently completed national survey of corn producers by the American Corn Growers Foundation, conducted as farmers began planting corn in April, shows that farmers do not support this complaint to the WTO. Seventy-six percent of farmers stated that the U.S. should not file a WTO lawsuit against Europe regarding genetically engineered food. Seventy-eight percent of farmers believe in keeping your customers satisfied and in keeping world markets open to U.S. corn, and that means planting traditional non-GMO corn varieties instead of biotech GMO corn varieties. Eighty-two percent of farmers believe that the U.S. Government must respect the rights of Europeans, Japanese, and all consumers worldwide so they are able to make a choice as to whether they and their children consume foods containing genetically engineered commodities.

Only, and I say only, large agribusiness supports the bill and this bill will increase the profits of large agribusiness, and it will do it at the expense of farmers and at the expense of consumers.

This is a time for us to stand up for the American farmer who is having difficulty surviving. Family farmers are having trouble surviving because they cannot get their price and they cannot get access to markets. Both of these are occasioned by the problems brought about by agribusiness and by monopolies in agriculture.

We should stand up for the family farmers and oppose H. Res. 252. We should create policies which enable our family farmers to get those markets in Europe, that we know have belonged to them for so many years, but have been precluded because of the practices of agribusiness.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for bringing this important resolution to the floor in such a timely fashion. I introduced this resolution 2 weeks ago, and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our conference chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for joining me in this effort.

This is a timely effort. It is a discussion we need to have. It is a discussion that, frankly, in the European community has gone on for too long. In October 1998, the European Union did a tremendous disservice to American biotechnology by issuing a ban on the importing of agricultural biotech crops. Although this action was supposed to be a moratorium, it has lasted now for close to 5 years.

In my opinion, this is no longer a moratorium, but a ban which is clearly a violation of Europe's WTO obligations and needs to be reversed as soon as possible.

The damage that this moratorium has done is dramatic, to say the least. For example, since the moratorium went into effect, U.S. corn exports have diminished from a high of 1.56 million metric tons to approximately 23,000 metric tons last year. This has resulted in the loss of close to \$1 billion in corn sales. The tragic thing is that there is no basis, scientific or otherwise, that can justify such an economic hardship on our corn farmers and on other farmers of other products that take advantage of new technology.

On May 13, the administration took the first steps toward rectifying this situation by filing a World Trade Organization case against the European Union over its illegal 5-year moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products. Despite repeated assurances from European officials that the moratorium would be lifted, there is no sign

of any change in policy. In fact, there is ample evidence that this policy will continue.

The position that the European Union and many of its member countries took regarding our efforts to provide food to Africa is also mentioned in this resolution. The idea that starving people would not be allowed to have access to the same kinds of products that American consumers use every day is an idea that is unacceptable.

The Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science, chaired by the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Smith) will be looking carefully at this issue tomorrow, with the Speaker as the leadoff witness.

My colleagues and I introduced House Resolution 252 because we believe that the Bush administration is correct in this area and needs to take the appropriate action on behalf of our Nation's farmers and on behalf of sound science by challenging this moratorium on agriculture and food biotech products.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 252. This bill is not about solving world hunger and it is not about promoting agriculture. What this bill is about is promoting bad policy. This bill goes to the fundamental issues of sovereignty and shifting power from democratically determined public health laws and rules to corporate interests. Ultimately this and chapter 11, the investor state provisions in the North American Free Trade Agreement, in the Singapore and Chilean agreements, probably every other agreement that the Zoellick Trade Representative's office will negotiate, will be used to override all kinds of public health and worker safety laws.

Understand what this is. What we are doing is we are telling the Europeans that they cannot enforce their own food safety laws. The European Union has passed legislation specifically determining what kind of food products, what kinds of food safety laws that they wanted. This resolution is telling them that we have the right in the United States to override what the European Union democratically elected Parliament and democratically determined rules and regulations want to do.

Imagine if the French, the French of all people, or the Germans, came to us and came to the World Trade Organization and said we do not like an environmental law, we do not like a safe drinking water law, a food safety law, that the United States Congress has passed and we want to override it. How dare the French or Germans try to override our public health laws and compromise our sovereignty.

How dare the United States tell the Germans and French and the Poles, new members of the EU and our allies

in the war in Iraq, or anybody else in Europe, how dare we try to override their public health and their public safety laws? Imagine if they did that to us. We have no business saying we know best. We are going to tell you in France, you in Germany, you in Poland, you in England, we are going to tell you what your public safety laws are going to say, what your public health laws are going to say.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to vote no on H. Res. 252.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Agriculture and a good colleague.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

This is an important discussion. Maybe it would be reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to start out trying to explain what is biotechnology?

Gregor Mendel discovered dominant and recessive traits in plants in the mid 19th century. He started taking two quality plants and crossing them to see if you could come out with an improved variety. So we have had cross-breeding, we have had hybrid breeding ever since. Now we have finished gene cataloguing of an agricultural plant called the Arabidopsis, a mustard plant.

But with 25,000 genes, you just took your chances when mixing two plants together. Sometimes the product turned out poisonous or allergenic. Sometimes it was very undesirable for a raft of other reasons.

Now we have the scientific technology to pick out one single gene and decide what characteristics are going to evolve from that gene, and instead of taking your chances by mixing 25,000 or 30,000 genes of two plants, you pick out one gene because you want a certain characteristic. You put it into that other plant and predetermine what is going to happen as a result.

□ 1315

Now, there is a lot of scare of what might happen generations from now. In the discussion of this resolution, it seems to me that we should not be debating whether this is a trade issue. This is now going to be in the hands of the WTO to decide whether or not it is unfair. But everybody, Mr. Speaker, needs to understand, other countries are trying to keep our products out of their country for one reason or another, restricting imports for bio sanitary reasons or anything else they can come up with. And in this case, it appears that they are trying to keep our agricultural products, that we produce more efficiently, out of Europe and Japan and some of these other countries, simply because they do not want it to disrupt the problems of their farmers and they want to protect their markets. We are going to let the WTO decide if it is restraint of trade. But as

we evolve into greater assurance that we are going to have safety, both to human health, to animals, and to the environment, we need to move ahead with this technology.

Look, the possibilities in developing countries are so tremendous. That is why our whip mentioned that the day after tomorrow I am holding a hearing on biotechnology. The Speaker is going to lead off the testimony in that hearing on the potential and safety of biotechnology. We are going to have Rita Caldwell from NSF come to tell us about the implementation of what we put in my NSF bill in terms of working with African scientists, developing products that are going to help their particular country. And if we get into Africa, eventually, science and biotechnology are going to prevail. We are going to have Mr. Natsios, the administrator of AID, say how important it is that we do not restrict this technology for developing countries.

Vote for this resolution and vote to let science, not emotion, rule the future of agricultural biotechnology.

On May 12th, the Speaker of the House and members of Congress joined with the Bush Administration to challenge the European Union's import ban on genetically modified (GM) crops. WTO rules, while allowing countries to reject imports on the basis of health and environmental concerns, require that any such policy be supported by scientific evidence.

However, the EU has refused to process new applications for trade of transgenic food crops since 1998 without even attempting to demonstrate any compelling scientific reasons. It is estimated that over \$300 million annually in U.S. corn exports alone are being lost. Even EU Environment Commissioner Margot Wallstrom has admitted that, "We have already waited too long to act. The moratorium is illegal and not justified."

While the EU stance on GM crops is an unfair economic burden on American farmers, it is also an unjust burden on the world's poorest continent. With approximately 180 million undernourished people, Africa stands to benefit tremendously from GM crops.

The EU is exploiting Africa's dependence on the EU market to stall acceptance of GM crops. For example, with its population literally starving last year, Zambia rejected 23,000 metric tons of U.S. food aid because Europe might reject future Zambian corn exports. EU pressure is even impeding research on new transgenic crop varieties important to bringing Africa closer to sustainability.

The Speaker of the House, USAID Administrator, and leading scientists will testify at my Research Subcommittee hearing this Thursday. We will examine barriers to plant biotechnology in Africa and new government programs supporting partnerships with African scientists in Africa.

The U.S. challenge moves us one step closer to removing unfair barriers that hurt American farmers and deny the people of Africa a tool for combating hunger. Please support H. Res. 252.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and with 1 minute, I will have to be brief. This really is not about biotech. It is about whether global agriculture trade will be conducted under the rules adopted by the countries pursuant to trade agreements.

There is a procedure for evaluating the safety and soundness of agriculture products to be exported into a marketplace. Under the WTO, it requires that measures regulating imports be based on sufficient scientific evidence and that countries operate regulatory approval and procedures without undue delay. Basically, the Europeans have thrown up this effort to keep our product out, and they have not followed the WTO actions in so pursuing this course of action.

That is why the resolution before us commending our President is exactly the right thing to do. We can only participate as a full partner with other nations in trade agreements if people follow the rules. We have rules. The rules are being ignored to keep their markets closed to our exports. We need to pass this resolution.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share in the comments of the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and agree with him. Also, I would ask the Members that are thinking of voting against this, this boils down to be really kind of a moral issue of famine in Africa. I learned about this issue from our former Member, Congressman Tony Hall.

What is happening in Africa, there are 35 million to 40 million people that are basically almost starving to death. In Zambia and Zimbabwe, they have been using this argument, and the people are starving and the genetically modified or biotech foods are in the warehouses. What is taking place is some of our friends, and they are friends in Europe, are using this as a trade mechanism with regard to their economy and their jobs; and as a result of this, people are dying in Africa.

So this is an issue with regard to the economy, but I will not say more important; but I personally believe it is more important. It is an issue of people, particularly in Africa. People living in Ethiopia, there is a famine of biblical proportions. Now, fortunately, the Ethiopian Government is not foreclosing this; but in Zambia they are, in Zimbabwe, Mugabe has it in the warehouses and the people are starving outside, and they cannot eat. Some of the other countries, Uganda is going through the same thing. They have genetically modified banana plants. Their banana industry is falling off, and they are afraid to use it because they are afraid they will not be able to have their exports going in to France.

So this resolution is a good resolution. This also would help us feed the people of the world who are starving. So I would hope everyone would vote for this. And if any Members have any doubts before this vote, they may want to call Tony up in Rome at the Food and Agricultural Organization and get his thinking, because this is a major issue of famine and feeding hungry people, particularly in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 252, but not because of the benefits to U.S. trade or our agricultural industry, but out of concern for the millions of hungry people around the globe. In a world as plentiful as ours, it is unconscionable that women and children still die of hunger.

I have traveled to Africa to witness the devastation of famines, first in 1984 and most recently, earlier this year. I saw women and children who were too weak to feed themselves. Thankfully, relief efforts for the 30 million Africans, whose lives are in peril, are not being complicated by refusals of certain food supplies, as was the case last year in Zambia.

Developing countries need biotechnology to improve crop viability and yield. However, as long as such agricultural products remain unacceptable to European markets, developing countries are likely to continue to reject the very thing they need to bring them to self-sufficiency and beyond.

American agricultural products are among the safest in the world—even Europe's officials admit that. But making a convincing case on the safety of U.S. products is difficult.

Last year, Zambians turned down genetically modified maize from the U.S., fearing that when their agricultural industry recovers, they would no longer be able to sell their products to their main export market, Europe.

In an effort to alleviate this concern, and at considerably increased costs, the U.S. offered a milled version free from any seeds that farmers could plant, thereby protecting Zambia's agricultural sector. Tragically, the Zambian government never accepted the food.

Famine relief and building longer term self-sufficiency in Africa is a global issue that requires a response from all nations. The U.S. has provided leadership through its contribution in 2002 of 51 percent of the food provided by the UN World Food Programme. Europe's combined contribution totaled only 27 percent.

I don't know which saddens me more, knowing that European countries like France have the ability to contribute more to famine relief efforts, but haven't, or knowing the situation is being exacerbated by European opposition to importing biotech agricultural products.

This resolution is an important statement to encourage the Administration in its efforts to challenge the unwarranted moratorium by EU countries on genetically modified agricultural products.

I urge a unanimous vote of support.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 252 supporting the United States' effort to end the European Union's discriminatory trade practices regarding agriculture biotechnology.

Biotechnology is critically important for the future of U.S. agriculture, not

just the farmers in my district. Genetically enhanced crops have increased yields, decreased production inputs, and reduced pesticide usage. In the near future, this technology will allow U.S. farmers to produce healthier, fresher, and more nutritious food products for consumers.

Throughout its lifetime, agricultural biotechnology has been the subject of the strictest testing by USDA, FDA, and EPA prior to consumption, and has made considerable contributions to protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides.

However, amongst this growing climate for innovation, the European Union has continued to pursue a path of opposition. The EU moratorium has cost U.S. farmers almost \$300 million a year in corn exports alone and goes directly against the WTO mandate that the regulation of imports be based on "sufficient scientific evidence." As such, their policies have resulted in a slowdown of development and support of genetically engineered products around the world.

I believe that the EU's opposition to agriculture biotechnology has much more to do with the discriminatory trading practices that they employ, rather than environmental science. I applaud the work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Trade Representative to challenge the EU's moratorium on this technology, and I am happy to lend my support to this important resolution. I urge Members' "aye" votes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and to state my support and urge House support for the administration and its decision to take on the European Union and its discriminatory practices against biotech projects.

Agriculture has changed greatly in recent years. When I was growing up on a farm in Johnston County, the most advanced technology we had was an old tractor. It was a big improvement, though, over the mule and plow that we had had previously.

These days, biotechnology has moved farming to the cutting edge of technology. I have always been and still remain a strong supporter of using biotechnology to benefit American agriculture and our society as a whole. In fact, when I was appropriations chairman in North Carolina's general assembly, I helped fund the establishment of the North Carolina Biotechnology Center, because I could see biotechnology was the science of the future. Consequently, North Carolina has become a leader in the field of biotechnology.

The gains that biotechnology brings to agriculture, efficiency, reduced use

of pesticides, higher crop yields, and healthier products, are well documented. That is why I find it ironic that the continent that gave birth to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment is turning its back on a proven science, despite the increasing amount of evidence as to the safety and effectiveness of this technology.

What is really a shame is that the Europeans' fear of biotechnology is having tragic consequences. The European Union is actually discouraging nations facing food shortages and famine from accepting food aid that may contain biotech products.

The Europeans' actions and attitude regarding biotechnology are, at best, indefensible, and maybe immoral regarding the European Union's rule. I strongly applaud Ambassador Zoellick's work in this area, and I urge the passage of this resolution.

I rise today in support of this resolution to state the House's support for the Administration in its decision to take on the European Union and its discriminatory practices against U.S. biotechnology products.

Agriculture has changed greatly in recent years. When I was growing up on a farm in Johnston County, NC, the most advanced technology we had was a tractor, a big improvement over a plow, a mule. These days, biotechnology has moved farming to the cutting edge of technology.

I have always been and still remain a strong supporter of using biotechnology to benefit American agriculture and our society as a whole.

In fact, when I was appropriations chairman in the North Carolina General Assembly, I helped fund the establishment of the North Carolina Biotechnology Center because I could see biotech was a science of the future. Consequently, my State of North Carolina has prospered as a leader in the field.

The gains that biotechnology brings to agriculture in efficiency, reduced use of pesticides, higher crop yields, and healthier products are well documented.

That's why I find it ironic that the continent that gave birth to The Renaissance and The Enlightenment is turning its back on a proven science, despite the increasing amount of evidence as to the safety and effectiveness of this technology.

And what's really a shame is that the Europeans' fear of biotechnology is having tragic consequences. The European Union is actually discouraging nations facing food shortages and famine from accepting U.S. food aid that may contain biotechnology products.

The Europeans' actions and attitudes regarding biotechnology are indefensible, and according to WTO rules, illegal.

I strongly applaud USTR Ambassador Zoellick for pressing forward with this case against the European Union in the WTO.

We must continue to show the world that biotechnology offers a new Renaissance in agriculture for those willing to reject fear.

I urge the House to pass this resolution, and show our support for a science that offers profound benefits for all of humanity.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, biotech is really important to

the Midwest. Roughly 55 percent of the corn grown in Nebraska and a high percentage of the beans grown in Nebraska are biotech, and roughly \$300 million in corn exports is being blocked by the current boycott.

As has been mentioned by several speakers previously, this boycott is not about safety. It is a tariff, and it is a thinly disguised tariff. The European Union did the same thing in blocking our beef that was fed hormones. The WTO stepped in and said, look, that is nonsense. This is against WTO rules, so it is something that has precedent. So the European Union has simply said, well, we will go ahead and pay the fine; it saves us the money. We will pay \$116 million a year in blocking your beef, and that is essentially what this tariff is doing as well.

Already, people have mentioned several times about the fact that starving people, particularly people in Africa, have had their products blocked; and this is, I think, unconscionable.

Lastly, let me just say in regard to the reduction of pesticides, water use, fertilizer, these are certainly good for the environment. And we hear people all around the country decrying biotech; and yet Brazil, when we were down there a year ago, said they really did not believe in biotech, and yet they are raising 1 million acres of soybeans. So they obviously know it is safe. So usually these are simply tariff barriers. I certainly applaud the resolution, and I urge support of it. It makes a lot of sense.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252. I feel compelled to remind all 280 million Americans once again that we are truly blessed in this country to have the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply at the lowest cost to our people of any country in the world. That has not happened by accident. It has always happened because we have always used sound science, peer-reviewed, in order to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before.

Now, we have repeatedly heard even today the explanation that the European Union maintains its ban on new approvals of biotech products because European consumers are unwilling to accept biotechnology due to safety concerns. That explanation disappoints me.

There are no peer-reviewed, scientific risk assessments that conclude that food products of agriculture biotechnology are inherently less safe than their traditional counterparts. Bio-engineered crops in the United States are rigorously reviewed for environmental and food safety by USDA, EPA, and FDA. Food safety reviews of bio-engineered crops focus on the safe-

ty of the newly introduced trait, on the safety of the whole food, and consider issues including toxicity, allergenicity, nutritional content, and antibiotic resistance.

Our forward-looking regulatory system has not only ensured the safety of our food supply, it has allowed the development of technologies that have improved our food supply and lowered the cost of production. Besides lowering costs, biotechnology has the potential to reduce crop risks and improve food security in developing countries, as we heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) speak about a moment ago. Examples include US-AID projects in Africa to improve production of peas and bananas.

Regulations based on protectionism instead of science have a chilling effect on research and the adoption of biotechnology. When there is uncertainty that a product of biotechnology will be accepted, farmers are reluctant to adopt the product, despite its proven safety and benefits.

I believe that the US and the EU have a responsibility as developed nations to lead by example in developing regulatory systems that not only promote safe food, but also promote a better and more secure food supply.

And I am disappointed that Europe has so far been unable to construct a science-based regulatory system for food that encourage development of new technologies that can benefit developed and developing countries around the world.

The resolution before us today supports our requests for consultations with Europe on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1330

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution and I hope all of the Members of the House will support it. Earlier this year, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I had the opportunity to meet with Pascal Lamy, the European Union Commissioner for Trade, and to strongly make the case that this moratorium that Europe has imposed upon U.S. biotech products should be dropped and a reasonable system should be administered in its place; not what they are currently contemplating, which is a tracing and labeling requirement, which will make it in some instances even harder for us to sell our products into Europe.

I pointed out to them that people have been starving in Africa because of their policies. He took great umbrage at my suggestion that the Europeans were in fact promoting such a policy in Africa, but it turns out that that is exactly the case.

Through the organizations that they hire to distribute their own European food aid in African countries, they have spread the word that if they feed U.S. biotech grapes to their livestock, they will not be able to sell that livestock into Europe. It turns out that the Spanish, who agree with us on this position, by the way, grow thousands and thousands of acres of biotech crops in Spain, feed it to livestock, and sell it all over Europe anyway.

So the European policy on this issue is clearly nothing more than an artificial trade barrier. It is against the interests of their people, their consumers, to have the opportunity to have greater quality foods, foods that have greater vitamin retention, foods that are more environmentally sound, foods that can be grown in places like subSaharan African that are more drought-resistant. All of these things are important for us to promote, and that is what biotechnology does.

I commend the Bush administration for taking this case to the World Trade Organization, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 252. America's farmers and ranchers deserve to have the best technologies available at their disposal and I am hopeful that an end to the EUs illegal and long-standing moratorium on agricultural biotechnology may be near.

Agricultural biotechnology is one of the most promising developments in modern science. This science should be embraced and not banned, for it can help to provide answers to the problems of hunger around the world. It would be a shame if developing countries in Africa continue to deny food aid containing biotechnology because of the antibiotechnology attitudes in Europe. The politicizing of agricultural biotechnology should end so that we can return to providing food aid to the hungry as soon as possible.

I commend the Bush administration for taking this case to the World Trade Organization. The EU moratorium on biotech approvals has been spreading beyond Europe. In the fall of 2002, some famine stricken African nations refused U.S. food aid because it contained biotech corn. These countries were ill informed on the health and environmental impact of biotechnology and were also concerned that their own agriculture exports to Europe would be denied if they accepted the product. Zambia, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe refused United States food aid made of the same wholesome food that Americans eat every day. Zimbabwe and Mozambique eventually accepted United States food aid after making costly arrangements to mill the corn so that African farmers could not grow it. Zambia continues to refuse United States corn.

As noted by the French Academy of Sciences, more than 300 million North Americans have been eating biotech corn and soybeans for years. No adverse health consequences have ever been reported. Many biotechnology products are being developed that will have unlimited benefits to vitamin deficient children. Research continues on a gene to add to rice which will contain more beta carotene, a precursor to vitamin A. Up to half of a million children per year go blind due to

vitamin A deficiency. Another product being developed could also help reduce iron deficiencies, thus reducing anemia among millions of women and children worldwide.

The United States is not trying to force consumers to buy these biotechnology products. Consumer choice is the key and the moratorium is an example of the European government denying their consumers a choice. The moratorium is not based on science, but it is a blatant protectionist trade barrier. American farmers and ranchers are merely asking that their safe, sound and affordable product be allowed on the shelves in Europe.

America's farmers and ranchers produce the safest and most bountiful food supply in the world. Their goal is to share this bounty with those who need it most, while at the same time having access to markets around the world. While United States farmers have utilized many of the new technologies, some farmers are hesitant to use biotechnology because of the moratorium in Europe.

The European Union's (EU) illegal and unscientific moratorium should be lifted and a WTO case against the EU will send a message to the rest of the world that illegitimate, non-science based trade barriers will not be tolerated.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 252.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would also like to thank the leadership of a colleague of mine, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who has been tremendous on this issue.

I do not know why we are telling the World Trade Organization what to do because they do not listen to us anyway. We tried to inform them and advise them on steel tariffs and they did not listen to us. We are not against trade. We understand there is going to be trade. There has always been trade, there always will be trade.

What we are against is shifting the debate from this Chamber, shifting the debate from the Parliament, shifting the debate from the Russian Duma to a bureaucratic organization behind closed doors with no accountability. They are not elected by anybody on the face of this Earth, they are appointed, and they represent the corporate interests. That is the problem.

We are losing our sovereignty in this country, and if we tell the European Union or if we tell another country what they need to do, at what point do they tell us what we need to do? When is it our labor laws, our environmental laws that become exposed?

I think that is the thing that we need to be most focused on is that we are losing our sovereignty. We want strong environmental laws in this country, we want strong labor laws in this country, and the World Trade Organization has proven and consistently tried to undermine those things. We need to fix the system and we need to let the WTO be O-U-T.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chairman of the House Biotechnology Caucus in strong support of House Resolution 252. Approvals for biotech commodities are critical to the future of biotechnology. By filing a complaint with the WTO, the administration has taken the necessary steps to respond to the European Union's moratorium on biotech food products.

The EU moratorium is a clear violation of Europe's WTO obligations. The policy has cost American farmers hundreds of millions of dollars in export sales and seriously hindered the adoption of an enormously beneficial technology. Moreover, the hysteria brought on by the EU policies has begun to spread beyond European borders. It was time to act.

Specifically, the European Union represents a \$1 billion per year market for U.S. soybeans and their products, a \$500 million market for U.S. corn gluten feed, and a former \$300 million per year market for the U.S. commodity corn.

The U.S. lost its commodity corn export business to the European Union in recent years over issues related to the acceptance of biotechnology-enhanced products.

As the U.S. already exports more than one-third of its agricultural production and farm States such as Illinois export more than 40 percent of their agricultural products, it is essential that the EU model for food safety and precaution is stopped before their policy and attitudes towards biotechnology affect U.S. export markets around the world.

Recently, several Illinois farmers returning from Europe concluded that the U.S. needs to take the EU to the WTO over the current EU moratorium on biotech crops.

I commend the administration for their leadership in taking the necessary steps to end this ridiculous moratorium, and urge my colleagues to support this resolution and send a strong signal to the EU and the rest of the world that the U.S. will not tolerate illegitimate, unscientific barriers to U.S. agricultural exports.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of sovereignty. The democratically elected governments of Europe have chosen, with tremendous support and urging by their own people, to urge more study and delay on the massive introduction of genetically modified organisms into their agricultural system. A large majority of Americans would like to see the same testing.

We heard about testing, that this is regulated by the FDA. No, it is not. It is not regulated by the FDA. They said

they have no jurisdiction, and it has been tested by the EPA. No, these things have not been tested by the EPA. It has been tested by the industry, who tells us, do not worry, it is safe. So the peer review tests we heard about and the government regulation that we heard about do not exist for the American people, and certainly not for the European people.

So are we going to turn to this faceless, conflict-ridden bureaucracy, the WTO, and ask it to preempt the laws of the sovereign nations of Europe? Then how about next week, when someone asks it to preempt some of our consumer health and safety or labor or environmental laws? That will happen, we can bet on it.

We heard a lot about Africa. Well, they will accept the food aid if the seed corn is ground up or the wheat is milled. They will take it. They are happy to take it. They just do not want the starving people there to take it out and plant it and begin to have it cross with their traditional crops. So that is not too tough of a thing to accomplish.

There are huge problems in the distribution system, these massively corrupt dictatorships. People of Africa are not being starved because the Europeans have chosen to protect their people and their agriculture against unknown, untested science, unregulated. That is not a true fact.

Let us have the debate about what this is about, which is new corporate interests that want to increase profits. Most of this is about increasing profits. Tell the people in India who have to buy patented seed year after year, or the people in Canada who have been prosecuted because they tried to replant the seed or it crossed into their crops and they have been prosecuted by Montana, that this is about making the world safe for people to not starve, and for the environment and all those things. No, it is, pure and simple, about profits for American industry.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues at stake here, including one that has been mentioned by my colleagues, the gentlemen from Ohio, Mr. BROWN and Mr. RYAN, with respect to the WTO and the fact that it strips all nations of sovereignty. That is an issue that this House inevitably will have to deal with when, at once, legislation should come before us to in effect cancel our relationship with the WTO.

Now, House Resolution 252 falsely argues for a solution to world hunger, but its prime motive is to garner bigger profits for biotech companies looking to dump GE foods on poor countries. This is really about hungry biotech companies, because the basic cause of hunger is money, not food. The facts of

world hunger lead to a much different conclusion.

Currently, 800 million go hungry every day. Malnutrition and related illnesses are the cause of death for 12 million children each year, but a lack of food is not the reason. Enough wheat, rice, and other grains are produced each year to provide 3,500 daily calories per person. So why do so many people go hungry each day? Much of this food goes to those who have the money and the ability to transport it. Food and other farm products flow from areas of hunger and need to areas where money is concentrated, in the northern hemisphere.

While at least 200 million Indians go hungry, in 1995 India exported \$625 million worth of wheat and flour and \$1.3 billion worth of rice, the two staples of the Indian diet. Only one-quarter of the food produced in Ethiopia reaches the market because of the high cost of marketing transactions.

There are hungry kids in this country, Mr. Speaker. What has biotech done for them?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a summary of a report we wrote on biotechnology in the Committee on Science called "Seeds of Opportunity." The total report is available at: www.house.gov/nicksmith/opportunity.pdf.

The report referred to is as follows:

SUMMARY

The Subcommittee on Basic Research of the Committee on Science held a series of three hearings entitled, "Plant Genome Research: From the Lab to the Field to the Market: Parts I-III," to examine plant genomics, its application to commercially important crop plants, and the benefits, safety, and oversight of plant varieties produced using biotechnology. The testimony and other information presented at these hearings and information gathered at various briefings provides the basis for the findings and recommendations in this report.

Almost without exception, the crop plants in use today have been genetically modified. The development of new plant varieties through selective breeding has been improving agriculture and food production for thousands of years. In the 19th century, the basic principles of heredity were discovered by Gregor Mendel, whose studies on inheritance in garden peas laid the foundation for the modern science of genetics. Subsequent investigations advanced our understanding of the location, composition, and function of genes, and a critical breakthrough revolutionized the field in 1953, when James Watson and Francis Crick described the double helix structure of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), the substance of heredity. This ground breaking research set the stage for deciphering the genetic code and led to the rapid advances in practical application of genetics in medicine, animal science, and agriculture.

The development of the science of genetics in the 20th century was a tremendously important factor in the plant breeding programs that have produced the remarkable diversity of fruits, vegetables, and grains that we enjoy today and that provide food security for the poor nations of the world. Traditional crossbreeding has been very useful in improving crop plants, but it is a time consuming process that results in the uncontrolled recombination of tens of thousands of genes, commonly producing unwanted traits that must be eliminated through successive rounds of backcrossing. Improving crops through traditional methods also is subject to severe limitations because of the constraints imposed by sexual compatibility, which limit the diversity of useful genetic material.

With the arrival of biotechnology, plant breeders are now able to develop novel varieties of plants with a level of precision and range unheard of just two decades ago. Using this technology, breeders can introduce selected, useful genes into a plant to express a specific, desirable trait in a significantly more controlled process than afforded by traditional breeding methods.

U.S. farmers have been quick to adopt plants modified using new biotechnology, including commercial crops that resist biologically insect and viral pests and tolerate broad-spectrum herbicides used to control weeds. As our knowledge of plant genetics expands, new varieties of plants with improved nutrition, taste, or other characteristics desired by consumers will become available. The federally-funded plant genome program provides much of the essential basic research on plant genetics required to develop new varieties of commercially important crops through advanced breeding programs.

For over two decades, the application of biotechnology has been assessed for safety. Oversight of agricultural biotechnology includes both regulatory and nonregulatory mechanisms that have been developed over the last five decades for all crop plants and conventional agricultural systems. Federal regulation of agricultural biotechnology is guided by the 1986 Coordinated Framework for Regulation of Biotechnology, which laid out the responsibilities for the different regulatory agencies, and the 1992 Statement on Scope, which established the principle that regulation should focus on the characteristics of the organism, not the method used to produce it. Three federal agencies are responsible for regulating agricultural biotechnology under existing statutes: the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), which is responsible for ensuring that new varieties are safe to grow; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which is responsible for ensuring that new pest-resistant varieties are safe to grow and consume; and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which is responsible for ensuring that new varieties are safe to consume.

Although biotechnology has had an uninterupted record of safe use, political activists in Europe have waged well-funded campaigns to persuade the public that the products of high-tech agriculture may be harmful to human health and the environment. As a result of these efforts, public confidence in the safety of agricultural biotechnology has been seriously undermined in Europe. Many European countries have established new rules and procedures specifically designed to address "genetically modified organisms," and these have

had a detrimental impact on international trade in agricultural products.

The controversy over agricultural biotechnology now has spread to the United States, the world's largest grower of plants and consumer of foods produced using this technology. At the core of the debate is food safety, particularly the possibility that unexpected genetic effects could introduce allergens or toxins into the food supply. The use of antibiotic resistance markers also has been criticized as dangerous to human health. As a result, there have been calls for both increased testing and labeling requirements for foods created using biotechnology.

Environmental concerns also have been raised. It has been suggested, for example, that widespread use of plants engineered with built-in protection against insect and viral pests could accelerate the development of pesticide-resistant insects or could have a negative impact on populations of beneficial insects, such as the Monarch butterfly. It also has been argued that the use of herbicide-tolerant plants could increase herbicide use and that "superweeds" could be developed through cross-pollination between these plants and nearby weedy relatives.

Extensive scientific evaluation worldwide has produced no evidence to support these claims. Far from causing environmental and health problems, agricultural biotechnology has tremendous potential to reduce the environmental impact of farming, provide better nutrition, and help feed a rapidly growing world population. Crops designed to resist pests and to tolerate herbicides and environmental stresses, such as freezing temperatures, drought, and high salinity, will make agricultural more efficient and sustainable by reducing synthetic chemical inputs and promoting no-tillage agricultural practices. Stress-tolerant crops also will reduce pressure on irreplaceable natural resources like rainforests by opening up presently nonarable lands to agriculture. Other plants are being developed that will produce renewable industrial products, such as lubricating oils and biodegradable plastics, and perform bioremediation of contaminated soils.

Biotechnology will be a key element in the fight against malnutrition worldwide. Deficiencies of vitamin A and iron, for example, are very serious health issues in many regions of the developing world, causing childhood blindness and maternal anemia in millions of people who rely on rice as a dietary staple. Biotechnology has been used to produce a new strain of rice—Golden Rice—that contains both vitamin A (by providing its precursor, beta-carotene) and iron. The Subcommittee heard about other research aimed at improving the nutrition of a wide variety of food staples, such as cassava, corn, rice, and other cereal grains, that can be a significant help in the fight for food security in many developing countries.

The merging of medical and agricultural biotechnology has opened up new ways to develop plant varieties with characteristics to enhance health. Advanced understanding of how natural plant substances, known as phytochemicals, confer protection against cancer and other diseases is being used to enhance the level of these substances in the food supply. Work is underway that will deliver medicines and edible vaccines through common foods that could be used to immunize in-

dividuals against a wide variety of enteric and other infectious diseases. These developments will have far-reaching implications for improving human health worldwide, potentially saving millions of lives in the poorest areas of the world by providing a simpler medicine production and distribution system.

Set against these benefits, however, is the idea that transferring a gene from one organism to an unrelated organism using recombinant DNA techniques inherently entails greater risks than traditional cross breeding. The weight of the scientific evidence leads to the conclusion that there is nothing to substantiate scientifically the view that the products of agricultural biotechnology are inherently different or more risky than similar products of conventional breeding.

The overwhelming view of the scientific community—including the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, many professional scientific societies, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Health Organization, and the research scientists who appeared before the subcommittee—is that risk assessment should focus on the characteristics of the plant and the environment into which it is to be introduced, not on the method of genetic manipulation and the source of the genetic material transferred. These risk factors apply equally to traditionally-bred plants.

Years of research and experience demonstrate that plant varieties produced using biotechnology, and the foods derived from them, are just as safe as similar varieties produced using classical plant breeding, and they may even be safer. Because more is known about the changes being made and because common crop varieties with which we have a broad range of experience are being modified, plants breeders can answer questions about safety that cannot be answered for the products of classical breeding techniques.

FDA has adopted a risk-based regulatory approach consistent with these principles and with the long history of safe use of genetically-modified plants and the foods derived from them. Its policies on voluntary consultation and labeling are consistent with the scientific consensus and provide essential public health protection.

Unlike FDA regulations on food, USDA has instituted plant pest regulations, and EPA proposes to institute new plant pesticide regulations, that target selectively plants produced using biotechnology and apply substantive regulatory requirements to early stages of plant research and development. These regulations add greatly to the cost of developing new biotech plant varieties, harming both an emerging industry and the largely publicly-funded research base upon which it depends. Regulations and regulatory proposals that selectively capture the products of biotechnology should be modified to reflect the scientific consensus that the source of the gene and the methods used to transfer it are poor indicators of risk.

In the international area, the United States should work to ensure that access to existing markets for agricultural products are maintained. The United States should not accept any international agreements that endorse the precautionary principle—which asserts that governments may make political decisions to restrict a product even in the absence of scientific evidence that a risk exists—and that

depart from the principle of substantial equivalence adopted by a number of international bodies.

Finally, the administration, industry, and scientific community have a responsibility to educate the public and improve the availability of information on the long record of safe use of agricultural biotechnology products. This is critically important to building consumer confidence and ensuring that sound science is used to make regulatory decisions.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

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

When I first came to this Congress, I was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture. It makes all kinds of sense. The district I represent in California produces about \$4 billion value-added from agriculture. I have been dealing with this issue for more than a quarter of a century.

What we just heard was a total fabrication of reality. We have heard about the green revolution, the attempt to feed more people in the world. In the old days, they used to take a plant, put a slit in it, and graft another portion of the plant onto it. That was science in those days.

There is fundamentally no difference to what we now call biotechnology than understanding the way the world works, and through science improving our ability to produce food to feed people. Everything else is politics. Somehow, large corporations get involved, the desire to sell something to Africa that Africa does not want.

I was in Africa 3 months ago. They pleaded with us to help them solve their problem. The problem is the Luddites in the world today who do not want to recognize science. Anybody who assists the Europeans in their unscientific opposition to wanting to do better with the amount we have is simply attempting to wreak havoc.

Vote for science. Vote yes.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution supporting the Administration's efforts in challenging the European Union's five-year moratorium on biotech products. As an original cosponsor, I congratulate President Bush and Ambassador Zoellick for putting American farmers and sound science first by challenging this illegal trade ban on genetically modified foods before the WTO.

Over the last few years, we have seen country after country implementing protectionist trade policies, like the EU moratorium, under the cloak of food safety—each one brought on by emotion, culture, or their own poor history with food safety regulation.

Simply put, non-tariff protectionism is detrimental to the free movement of goods and services across borders. We all know that free trade benefits all countries. However, free trade will be rendered meaningless if it is short-circuited by non-tariff barriers that are based on fear and conjecture—not science.

As the Representative of the 14th District in Illinois, my district currently covers portions of eight countries, including four of the top 25 corn-producing counties, and three of the top 50 soybean-producing counties in the nation. The State of Illinois is the second-largest producing state of both corn and soybeans in the country. Forty percent of this production currently goes to exports, valued at approximately \$2.7 billion per year.

U.S. agriculture ranks among the top U.S. industries in export sales. In fact, the industry generated a \$12 billion trade surplus in 2001, helping mitigate the growing merchandise trade deficit. It is important to realize that 34 percent of all corn acres and 75 percent of all soybean acres are genetically modified.

And what exactly are we talking about when we say "genetically modified?" The EU would have you believe this is a new and special type of food, questionable for human consumption. In fact, since the dawn of time, farmers have been modifying plants to improve yields and create new varieties resistant to pests and diseases. Why would we want to snuff out human ingenuity that benefits farmers and consumers alike?

The European Union has had an indefensible moratorium on genetically-modified products in place for five years with no end in sight. This is a non-tariff barrier based simply on prejudice and misinformation, not sound science. In fact, their own scientists agree that genetically modified foods are safe. Still, regardless of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, bans on genetically modified products continue to persist and multiply—the worldwide impact has been staggering.

The current EU moratorium on genetically-modified products has translated into an annual loss of over \$300 million in corn exports for U.S. farmers. More disturbing is the recent trend in Africa, where several nations have rejected U.S. food aid because the shipments contained biotech corn. This based solely on the fear that EU countries will not accept their food exports if genetically modified seeds spread to domestic crops.

These actions by our trading partners have consequences. U.S. farmers are already beginning to plant more non-biotech seeds. This trend will increase farmers' cost of production as well as increase the damage from harmful insects. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently approved a corn technology that will allow the commercialization of the first corn designed to control rootworm—a pest that costs U.S. farmers approximately \$1 billion in lost revenue per year. It is absurd to think that farmers would not be able to take advantage of this technology.

Clearly, the long-term impact of these policies could be disastrous for U.S. farmers in terms of competitiveness and the ability to provide food for the world's population. Addressing world hunger is particularly critical when approximately 800 million people are malnourished in the developing world, and another 100 million go hungry each day. Biotechnology is the answer to this pressing problem. Farmers can produce better yields through drought-tolerant varieties, which are rich in nutrients and more resistant to insects and weeds, while those in need reap the benefits.

As you can see, halting or even slowing down the development of this technology could have dire consequences for countries

where populations are growing rapidly and all arable land is already under cultivation. Official WTO action will send a clear and convincing message to the world that prohibitive policies on biotechnology which are not based on sound science are illegal.

Hopefully, the WTO will act quickly to resolve the Administration's case on behalf of American farmers. There's no doubt that the U.S. and American agriculture go into this battle with the facts on our side. We simply cannot allow the free trade of our agriculture products to be restricted by this unfair and unjust moratorium. After all, the price of inaction is one we can no longer afford to pay.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure not because I wish to either support or oppose genetically-modified products. Clearly the production and consumption of these products is a matter for producers and consumers to decide for themselves.

I oppose this bill because at its core it is government intervention—both in our own markets and in the affairs of foreign independent nations. Whether European governments decide to purchase American products should not be a matter for the U.S. Congress to decide. It is a matter for European governments and the citizens of European Union member countries. While it may be true that the European Union acts irrationally in blocking the import of genetically-modified products, the matter is one for European citizens to decide.

Also, this legislation praises U.S. efforts to use the World Trade Organization to force open European markets to genetically-modified products. The WTO is an unelected world bureaucracy seeking to undermine the sovereignty of nations and peoples. It has nothing to do with free trade and everything to do with government- and bureaucrat-managed trade. Just as it is unacceptable when the WTO demands—at the behest of foreign governments—that the United States government raise taxes and otherwise alter the practices of American private enterprise, it is likewise unacceptable when the WTO makes such demands to others on behalf of the United States. This is not free trade.

Genetically-modified agriculture products may well be the wave of the future. They may provide food for the world's populations and contribute to the eradication of disease. That is something we certainly hope for and for which we will all applaud should it prove to be the case. But, again, this legislation is not about that. That is why I must oppose this bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of this measure.

I am a proponent of genetically modified (GM) food, and firmly believe that its continued implementation and use provides a number of important benefits for the American farmer and worldwide consumers. Furthermore, I believe we are legally correct and justified in asking the World Trade Organization (WTO) to impose penalties on the EU for maintaining a moratorium on import permits for genetically modified crops in violation of its rules.

However, I fear that our government's efforts will have the unintended consequence of wreaking havoc on the current WTO trade discussions. As we all know, the U.S. farmer would benefit much more if, in the current Doha

Round of the WTO, the EU nations agreed to slash the generous agriculture subsidy assistance they provide their farmers.

According to a recent Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization that seeks to help governments tackle the economic, social, and governance challenges of a globalized economy, in 2002, the EU provided \$112.6 billion in agricultural subsidies to their farmers. This amount totals approximately 1.3 percent of the EU GDP. Compare this staggering number with that of the United States, which generously provided in 2002 \$90.3 billion (0.9 percent of our GDP) to farmers in the form of agricultural subsidies, and you can easily see why reform of domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization is much needed.

In addition to fighting this important fight on GM foods today, the Administration and Congress need to hold the Europeans' feet to the fire on reforming their domestic agriculture policy and making their country more open to imported goods. The Doha Round was devised to accomplish these two objectives.

Moreover, the U.S.'s policy on GM foods must not just single out Europe. In an article, which appeared in yesterday's *The Wall Street Journal*, many U.S. soybean traders are accusing the Chinese of impeding soybean imports due to the failure of various inspection permits. The article continues by stating, "China last week announced it will extend to April 20, 2004, strict regulations on crops containing genetically modified organisms that had been set to expire September 20th."

Thus, the question that needs to be asked—Is China moving toward closing its borders in perpetuity on import permits for genetically modified crops? Will the U.S. government file a similar petition against the Chinese government? If so, when? If not, why not? After all, under commitments China made when it became a member of the WTO in December 2001, it must open its market to agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do likewise—but I suggest more substantive work be done to reform domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization policies that currently stand in the way of sustainability and prosperity of our farmers.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252. This important resolution expresses the House of Representatives' supports for American efforts within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's unfair trade practices regarding agriculture biotechnology. These trade practices are protectionist and discriminatory, and have been in place the past five years.

In 2001, the United States and other industrialized countries produced almost 109 million acres of genetically modified foods. These foods are modified, safely, to reduce the application of pesticides, reduce soil erosion and

create an environment more hospitable to wildlife. These foods are resilient and can grow in areas often inhospitable to agriculture. Genetically modified foods hold great promise in alleviating hunger in developing areas of the world.

The European Union, acting without scientific basis, enacted a moratorium on genetically modified foods in October 1998. Since then, this moratorium has blocked more than \$300 million annually in American corn exports to countries in the European Union. This action has had a damaging effect on agricultural exports from the United States, particularly from Iowa.

Allow me to describe the devastating effect this action has had on many developing countries in Africa. Earlier this year, I traveled to several nations in sub-Saharan Africa. I met people trying to help themselves with their own hard work, and through the humanitarian efforts of the United States and other nations. Far too many people in Africa depend on food from other countries, and far too many are starving. Genetically modified food could withstand the intolerant climate and harsh growing landscapes common in the area. But because of fear about future exports to Europe, these African nations have held back from a wonderful opportunity to promote agriculture in their own nations. Just last year, humanitarian food aid sent to Africa from the United States was rejected. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong.

Iowa is America's second-largest agriculture exporter, sending \$3.2 billion worth of commodities and value-added products overseas. There is much promise in using biotechnology to change to the face of agriculture. Biotechnology is now being researched to create custom-made pharmaceuticals and renewable ingredients for industrial use. The cities of Waterloo and Davenport in my district are working to make value-added agriculture the driving force of their economic growth. They are making significant investments to reach this end. It is clear that continued research and production is needed to make these investments pay off for these communities and the rest of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, we took a tremendous step forward by granting the President trade promotion authority. As the U.S. begins to negotiate trade agreements with this authority, it is critical we demonstrate that protectionist and discriminatory practices, like those used by the EU, will not be tolerated. The U.S. must now take further action within the WTO. I applaud the President and the U.S. Trade Representative's interest in taking action on this critical issue now. Accordingly, I urge passage of this resolution supporting Administration efforts through the WTO.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I cautiously approach my colleagues' zealous concern about the European Union's long-standing moratorium on agriculture and biotech products. The World Trade Organization agreement does recognize that countries are entitled to regulate crops and food products to protect health and the environment. However, WTO members must have sufficient evidence for their regulations and must operate approval procedures without "undue delay." The EU's current moratorium lacks sufficient justification and at 5 years has reached a point of undue delay.

At the same time, consumers have a right to know what they are eating and the food indus-

try should remain transparent and accountable. I fully support labeling and a comprehensive paper trail that would ensure that consumers are aware when they are purchasing genetically modified ingredients.

I am more cautious than the Bush administration on this issue, but also feel the European Union's moratorium is extreme. I support this resolution in the spirit of fair trade, but urge my colleagues and the administration to not interfere with consumer awareness to be gained by labeling and industry transparency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 252, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. CAMP. 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.

—

RECOGNIZING SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE OF SEQUENCING OF HUMAN GENOME AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR GOALS AND IDEALS OF HUMAN GENOME MONTH AND DNA DAY

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years and expressing support for the goals and ideals of Human Genome Month and DNA Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 110

Whereas April 25, 2003, will be the 50th anniversary of the publication of the description of the double-helix structure of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) in *Nature* magazine by James D. Watson and Francis H.C. Crick, which is considered by many scientists to be one of the most significant scientific discoveries of the twentieth century;

Whereas their discovery launched a field of inquiry that explained how DNA carries biological information in the genetic code and how this information is duplicated and passed from generation to generation, forming the stream of life that connects us all to our ancestors and to our descendants;

Whereas this field of inquiry in turn was crucial to the founding and continued growth of the field of biotechnology, which has led to historic scientific and economic advances for the world, advances in which the people of the United States have played a leading role and from which they have realized significant benefits;

Whereas, in April 2003, the international Human Genome Project will achieve essential completion of the finished reference sequence of the human genome, which carries all the biological information needed to construct the human form;

Whereas the Human Genome Project will be completed ahead of schedule and under budget;

Whereas all data from the Human Genome Project is provided free of charge to the public as soon as it is available;

Whereas the sequencing of the human genome has already fostered biomedical research discoveries that have led to improvements in human health;

Whereas the Human Genome Project has provided an exemplary model for social responsibility in scientific research, by devoting significant resources to studying the ethical, legal, and social implications of the project;

Whereas, in April 2003, the National Human Genome Research Institute of the National Institutes of Health will publish a new plan for genomic research;

Whereas this new plan will establish priorities for the future of genomic research, predict future developments in understanding heredity, and serve as a guide in applying this knowledge to improve human health; and

Whereas the National Human Genome Research Institute has designated April 2003 as "Human Genome Month" in celebration of the completion of the sequencing of the human genome and April 25, 2003, as "DNA Day" in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the publication of the description of the structure of DNA on April 25, 1953: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past one hundred years;

(2) honors the 50th anniversary of the outstanding accomplishment of describing the structure of DNA, the essential completion of the sequencing of the human genome in April 2003, and the development a plan for the future of genomics;

(3) supports the goals and ideals of Human Genome Month and DNA Day; and

(4) encourages schools, museums, cultural organizations, and other educational institutions in the United States to recognize Human Genome Month and DNA Day with appropriate programs and activities centered on human genomics, using information and materials provided through the National Human Genome Research Institute and other sources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 House concurrent resolution 110.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 110, a concurrent resolution recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years

and expressing support for the goals and ideals of Human Genome Month and DNA Day.

This legislation, introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), was unanimously approved by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on April 30 of this year.

□ 1345

April 2003 marked the 50th anniversary of a momentous achievement in biology: James Watson and Francis Crick's Nobel Prize-winning description of the double helix structure of DNA. In addition, this past April we celebrated the culmination one of the most important scientific projects in history, the sequencing of the human genome.

The science and technology of genomics have become the foundation of research and biotechnology for the 21st century. In addition, health care has undergone phenomenal changes, driven in part by the Human Genome Project and accompanying advances in human genetics. While these advances will certainly present a myriad of challenges for policymakers, I feel confident that this information will truly revolutionize the practice of medicine and greatly improve our quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support passage of H. Con. Res. 110.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for his good work and bipartisanship and thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for authoring H. Con. Res. 110.

I rise in support of this resolution and recognize its two major advancements in public health: The 50th anniversary of the discovery of the double helix structure of DNA and the completion recently of the Human Genome Project.

Fifty years ago, Dr. James Watson and Dr. Francis Crick published a structure of DNA. It is likely that neither of these scientists fully understood the enormous impact that their discovery would have on our Nation's public health, from historic advances to disease diagnosis to life-saving medicine to reform of our everyday vocabulary. Their scientific discovery laid the groundwork for another milestone of the evolution of science; that is, the completion of the Human Genome Project ahead of schedule and under budget.

While the investment in this project was modest in some ways by U.S. standards, the return promises to be extraordinary. Doctors will have tools to assess diseases in terms of their causes, not just their symptoms. An entire genome of an organism can be known in a matter of weeks or months,

not years or decades. Scientists will begin to know why some people and not others get sick from certain infections or environmental exposures.

We can only begin to imagine what this means for health care delivery. Clearly, being asked by your family doctor about your family history will take on a whole new meaning. The Human Genome Project will strengthen the roots of innovation, foster tomorrow's breakthrough discoveries: discoveries like that of Dr. Watson and Dr. Crick which offer every person the opportunity of a longer, healthier life.

With genetics and the burgeoning fields of genomics, we have truly moved into a new era. Already friends and loved ones benefit from what we have learned about genetic links to diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, breast and ovarian cancer, colorectal cancer, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington's disease and others. We should not overlook the impact this investment has on the public health infrastructure as whole. When we invest in research, we are also investing in education.

The NIH reports that Ph.D. faculty at U.S. med schools has increased by double digits as a result of the Federal investment in research. These discoveries raise important policy issues, to be sure, like the importance of strong genetic nondiscrimination policies.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the sponsor of this resolution, has introduced legislation to address the potential abuse of genetic information by insurers and by employers. That is a real issue. That is one we absolutely in this body have a duty to address.

Genomics offers exciting opportunities to strengthen our public health system and can take us into a new era of health and health care. I am pleased to be a sponsor of the Slaughter resolution and I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding the legion of talented scientists who significantly contributed to these achievements.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 110, a resolution commending the completion of the sequencing of the human genome and the 50th anniversary of the description of the double helix which makes up the DNA.

As past chairman of the Task Force on Health Care and Genetic Privacy, I think we need to commend the folks at NIH for their outpouring of work. As someone who studied science myself as a former electrical engineer, I stand in awe of the frontier that we are starting to move into with genetics.

As many of us know, genetics is the study of single genes and their effects on human health. Genomics is a relatively new field of scientific research that includes not only the study of single genes but also the functions and interaction of all genes that comprise a genome.

The human genome is a collection of about 35,000 genes that give rise to life. Each gene is made up of a series of base pairs, tiny DNA units denoted by A, C, T, and G. There are about 3.12 billion of these genetic letters. Spanning nearly two decades, the Human Genome Project is the international research effort to determine the sequencing of all these genetic letters or, as we like to call it, a genetic blueprint for humans.

Congress invested significant tax dollars, primarily at the National Institutes of Health, just to advance this project. And we did so here in Congress, because the human genome findings will pave the way for what we hope will be a breakthrough of information on the new ways to prevent and, of course, cure diseases.

I think we are just beginning to see the results of this investment. Just as scientists have decoded the genetic map that defines us as human beings, we will now need to decipher how well the Federal bureaucracy is working to advance this promising area of genomics research.

Genomics research transcends every institute and center at NIH. It has implications for how we study every disease. Two short weeks ago, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a hearing to learn more about genomics research. At that time, members had the opportunity to hear from the leading scientists in the world about this research. We also learned that we are right on track with a new project underway to ensure that our investments at the National Institutes of Health are fully maximized.

As the authorizing committee at NIH, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is conducting an extensive review to determine how well NIH is advancing medical research. All of us have been touched by someone afflicted with a disease.

In my district of Jacksonville, Florida, a collaborative NIH study between the Mayo Clinic and Shands Hospital is leading the charge for screening for the gene that leads to strokes.

Just last year, NIH began its first phase of a clinical trial on a drug compound that has shown promise in addressing the most life-threatening symptoms of ataxia, a heart condition. Because of these answers in sequencing of the human genome, more progress has been made in understanding the underlying mechanism of this disorder than in the previous 133 years.

Research advances like this mean something real to patients. It is the hope that they are looking for when they need all the courage they can muster to fight a debilitating disease.

So today we pay tribute to a major scientific achievement. Let us keep working to speed forward more achievements like this to bring hope to all patients that are suffering from diseases throughout the world.

It is our responsibility to ensure that NIH is held accountable on behalf of our patients. It is our responsibility to remove barriers that unnecessarily delay the incredible progress we are making in improving human health.

We were just beginning. So I encourage all of my colleagues to assist our effort in this great task. I encourage my colleagues to vote for H. Con. Res. 110. It is altogether appropriate for us to pay tribute today to the outstanding accomplishments of our Nation's scientists in this groundbreaking achievement of sequencing the human genome. These same scientists will lead the way with an even bigger project: determining how to translate the outline of the human genome into real public health solutions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon also in support of H. Con. Res. 110 and to recognize what is perhaps the greatest scientific endeavor of the 21st century, the Human Genome Project, which will forever change the way medicine is practiced and research is conducted. Moreover, it has important implications for how we look at and define each other.

The practical consequences of the emergence of this new field are widely apparent. Identification of the genes responsible for certain human diseases, once a staggering task requiring large research teams and many years of hard work and an uncertain outcome, can now be routinely accomplished in a few weeks.

This discovery also holds out new hope for wellness for African Americans and other minority populations. Sickle cell disease was the first genetics disease to be identified but needs more effort and resources devoted towards a cure.

I want to take this opportunity to applaud Howard University's College of Medicine who, just a few weeks ago, announced a partnership with First Genetic Trust, Inc., to develop the first-ever massive data bank of DNA of individuals of African descent. Called the Genomic Research in the African Diaspora Biobank or GRAD Biobank, the data will advance the study of genetic and biological bases for differential disease risk, progression, and drug response.

But beyond deciphering what the human genome will do for science, it gives us new understanding of the molecular processes underlying disease and disease susceptibility, and it opens heretofore unknown doors that take us

beyond treatment to the correction of the origins of disease. This discovery can also be a defining moment in human history for other reasons.

As Dr. Georgia Dunston, the Director of the National Human Genome Center at Howard University, pointed out at our health braintrust meeting a few years ago, this monumental discovery also challenges the current paradigm of race and ethnicity and all that follows from those concepts, because in her words, "The most salient feature of human identity at the sequence level is variation. Human genome sequence variation dispels the myth of a majority."

Anthropologists, Dr. Dunston told us, have estimated that less than 1 percent of the total gene pool code for the phenotypic characteristics, such as eye, hair and skin color, is what is used to classify human populations, in other words, to divide us.

Whether or not African American or Hispanic American, Anglo or White American, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander or Alaskan Native, it turns out that we are 99 percent alike.

So as we celebrate Human Genome Month and DNA Day, in addition to focusing on what this discovery will do to ensure that all populations are knowledgeable about the science underpinning the HGP and have the opportunity to participate in various ways, such as becoming research scientists, research participants and policy-makers, it is also important for everyone to be informed about the Human Genome Project and understand the ethical, legal, and social implications resulting from genetics and genomics research.

Through our continued efforts to educate ourselves, to reach out to our communities, and to communicate our fears, needs, and responsibilities, we as government policymakers have the best opportunity to have genetics and science improve the quality of life for all Americans and make this a better country.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me join in with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for their wisdom in bringing this legislation to the floor, and certainly to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who I enthusiastically join, along with the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) on this important legislative initiative.

H. Con. Res. 110 is a resolution that helps to educate our colleagues but also it speaks truth to the American people. As a member of the House Com-

mittee on Science, we spent many, many hours on the question of the human genome and the Human Genome Project in particular. Recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years and expressing support of the goals and ideals of the Human Genome Month and DNA Day really is a statement about life.

□ 1400

It is a statement about the ability of the new science to be able, Mr. Speaker, to create life where there is none, to create better improved health where that was not a possibility 10, 15 or 50 years ago.

It is crucial as the human genome project achieves its essential completion of the finished reference sequence of the human genome that carries all of the biological information needed that we begin to utilize this project; and one of the challenges that we have in this Congress is the whole question of human cloning. It is important not to equate these projects and this research and human genome work and DNA with the idea of the creation of a human being.

It is important now as we have begun or understand the sequence that we allow this project to grow and to be utilized to help us determine the cures for diseases such as Parkinson's, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, stroke, and, yes, HIV/AIDS. The more we understand about the human being and its makeup, the more we can create a better way of life.

We well know of our renowned fiction character Superman, who is no longer a superhero in real life, who is trying time after time with a number of efforts to find the cure for those who suffer spinal injuries, some of the most devastating injuries that we will face. As we look to the wounded who will be coming home from the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, they will be coming home with major injuries, some continuing to be life-threatening. The greater knowledge of our ability to be able to respond to those kinds of devastating injuries, although they are not by disease but by devastating injuries, physical injuries through weapons, the better off we will be. The more we can find a way to determine and fight against the war against bioterrorism, the better off we will be.

This is an excellent resolution, Mr. Speaker, because it educates my colleagues and educates the public.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), sponsor of this resolution who has showed particular interest in the issue of non-discrimination of genetics.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 110, a resolution that I was pleased to author with my colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN),

the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member.

This resolution recognizes a set of milestones in the history of human scientific endeavors. In April of 1953, two young scientists by the names of James Watson and Francis Crick published an article in the journal "Nature" describing the structure of a molecule known as deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA. In doing so, they opened the doors to an entirely new field of research that explained the information carrying the genetic code and the way it is duplicated, translated, and activated.

This field of research culminated 2 months ago with the announcement that the next generation of scientists had completed a full map of the human genome. Every one of the 3 billion base pairs in a strand of human DNA has been identified. This singular achievement is the result of more than a decade of concerted planning, international cooperation, and single-minded dedication to the cause. It is a scientific accomplishment of the highest order, emblematic of the advances in human knowledge of which we are capable when we work together across all divisions.

When the human genome project was initiated, the technology to carry it through did not exist. It was invented as the research sped along. Congress, to its credit, considered this endeavor worthy of funding and had faith in our scientists' ability to achieve it. It was, therefore, also a stunning example of the vision and good of which our government is capable.

H. Con. Res. 110 expresses the sense of the U.S. Congress that we recognize these achievements for the historical landmarks that they are. The resolution also lends its support to the designation of April as Human Genome Month and April 25 as DNA Day. Furthermore, it encourages schools, museums, cultural organizations, and other educational organizations to recognize the dates with appropriate programs and activities.

Even though the resolution does not specifically do so, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to commend the individual who has directed the human genome projects since 1993, my good friend, Dr. Francis Collins. Dr. Collins began his career as a brilliant scientist, a pioneer in the field of genetics and discoverer of the gene for cystic fibrosis. He has continue his career, however, as a brilliant administrator, a truly remarkable progression.

Under his leadership, the human genome project has been completed under budget and ahead of schedule. Dr. Collins guided and shaped the initiative for a full decade, bringing it to fruition. Our Nation, and indeed, our world, owe him a debt of gratitude.

I am pleased the leadership has agreed to consider this resolution today, and I urge my colleagues to sup-

port it. I would also, however, like to urge the body to take up a far more urgent piece of legislation on the subject of genetics, which is the Genetic Non-discrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act.

The resolution before us today recognizes the immense benefit which the mapping of the human genome may have for us. The Genetic Non-discrimination Act would forestall the darker consequences that could arise through this new technology. We must not allow the potential advances in human health to be stifled because Americans fear that their genetic information may be used against them.

I urge the leadership to take up and pass the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employee Act as quickly as possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his good work on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). He has always been very cooperative. This is an illustration of bipartisanship at work and all the work obviously of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, every day we wake up and are faced with new discoveries. We read about the depths of space that we can only now see with the Hubble Telescope. We learn about tremendous achievement in nanotechnology, like the printing of a Bible that can fit on a pencil eraser. We have been to the moon and back, landed robots on Mars and cured diseases that have plagued mankind for millennia. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in this litany of great achievements one that stands out above all, is to have learned the very vocabulary of life, to have mapped the entire human genome.

I rise today in support of this resolution and to recognize that the sequencing of the human genome is indeed one of the greatest scientific accomplishments of the past one hundred years, indeed of all of history.

But Mr. Speaker, I rise with special pride because of Long Island's unique contribution in the quest to map the genome. Much of the work to sequence the genome took place at Cold Spring Harbor Lab on Long Island, and in particular, by a brilliant scientist I am privileged to know: Dr. James Watson.

Dr. Watson, along with Francis Crick, discovered the structure of DNA. For this accomplishment they shared the 1962 Nobel Prize in Physiology of Medicine with Maurice Wilkins. Their revolutionary concept was that the DNA molecule takes the shape of a double helix, and elegantly simple structure that resembles a gently twisted ladder.

Mr. Speaker, my children learn about the double helix today in science class. We take it for granted. We watch Law and Order and CSI and hear about DNA testing and we go to the doctor to find out if we have a genetic marker for a specific disease.

Yet we almost never stop to think about this phenomenal breakthrough. It is amazing that in fewer than fifty years we have come so far. We should all be very proud that this achievement occurred here in the United States, a

testament to our ongoing strengths, continuing leadership in science and technology.

The human genome provides us with the most basic information of life. What we do with that information is up to us. Dr. Watson and his colleagues have gotten us this far. It is my hope, that through efforts like Human Genome Month and DNA Day, our young people will be inspired to make the great scientific leaps of tomorrow—applying the genetic map to conquering dreaded diseases and improving the quality of life on our planet.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 110, a resolution that I was pleased to author with my colleagues, Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman TAUZIN and Ranking Member DINGELL.

This resolution recognizes a set of milestones in the history of human scientific endeavors. In April 1953, two young scientists by the name of James Watson and Francis Crick published an article in the journal Nature describing the structure of a molecule known as deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA. In doing so, they opened the doors to an entirely new field of research—that exploring the information carried in the genetic code and the way it is duplicated, translated, and activated.

This field of research culminated two months ago with the announcement that the next generation of scientists had completed a full map of the human genome. Every one of the three billion base pairs in a string of human DNA has been identified. This singular achievement is the result of more than a decade of concerted planning, international cooperation, and single-minded dedication to the cause. It is a scientific accomplishment of the highest order, emblematic of the advances in human knowledge of which we were capable when we work together across all divisions.

When the Human Genome Project was initiated, the technology to carry it through did not exist. It was invented as the research sped along. Congress, to its credit, considered this endeavor worthy of funding and had faith in our scientists' ability to achieve it. It was, therefore, also a stunning example of the vision and good of which our government is capable.

H. Con. Res. 110 expresses the sense of the U.S. Congress that we recognize these achievements for the historical landmarks they are. The resolution also lends its support to the designation of April as Human Genome Month and April 25 as DNA Day. Furthermore, it encourages schools, museums, cultural organizations, and other educational institutions to recognize these dates with appropriate programs and activities.

Even though the resolution does not specifically do so, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to commend the individual who has directed the Human Genome Project since 1993: my good friend, Dr. Francis Collins. Dr. Collins began his career as a brilliant scientist, a pioneer in the field of genetics, and discoverer of the gene for cystic fibrosis. He has continued his career, however, as a brilliant administrator—a truly remarkable progression. Under his leadership, the Human Genome Project has been completed under budget and ahead of schedule. Dr. Collins guided and shaped the initiative for a full decade, bringing it to fruition. Our nation, and indeed our world, owe him a debt of gratitude.

I am pleased that the leadership has agreed to consider this resolution today, and I urge

my colleagues to support it. I would also, however, like to urge this body to take up a far more urgent piece of legislation on the subject of genetics: the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act. The resolution before us today recognizes the immense benefit which the mapping of the human genome may have for us. The Genetic Nondiscrimination Act would forestall the darker consequences that could arise from this new technology. We must not allow the potential advances in human health to be stifled because Americans fear that their genetic information will be used against them. I urge the leadership to take up and pass the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act as quickly as possible.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers; and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 110.

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. BROWN of Ohio. 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.

PATSY TAKEMOTO MINK POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Baldwin Avenue in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2030

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

SECTION 1. PATSY TAKEMOTO MINK POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Baldwin Avenue in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, shall be known and designated as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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 Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2030.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of the consideration of H.R. 2030, a bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), that designates the postal facility in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Patsy Mink was a devoted public servant and a friend to all who served here in the House. She was a passionate representative for her Hawaiian constituents for 26 years, despite having to make the 10-hour flight home almost every weekend. For that alone, she deserves commendation.

Congresswoman Mink was a particular advocate of health, education, and civil rights issues during her tenure in the House; but her career was perhaps best known for her tireless work for gender equality. Congresswoman Mink authored the Women's Education Equity Act, and she was a coauthor of the original title IX legislation. She was an esteemed member of the Committee on Government Reform, the committee that just last month passed by voice vote this bill that honors her. I am pleased that this bill has now come up for consideration by the whole House.

Congresswoman Patsy Mink sadly passed away last September 28 during her 13th congressional term. Patsy Mink won her first election to the House in 1964 and only two current Members of this body were first elected earlier. A long congressional career never took the spring out of her exuberant step or the warmth from her caring heart; and even after her passing, her remarkable service in this House for the people of Hawaii and this entire Nation will certainly never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 2030 that honors the life and career of Congresswoman Patsy Mink. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, for introducing this meaningful and important legislation.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), in consideration of H.R. 2030, which names a postal facility after the late Congresswoman Patsy Mink.

H.R. 2030, which was introduced by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE)

on May 8, 2003, has met the committee policy and has been cosponsored by more than just the State delegation. The bill currently lists 115 cosponsors, truly a testament to the accomplishments of our late colleague, the Honorable Patsy Mink, who sadly passed away on September 28, 2002.

Congresswoman Mink was first elected to Congress in 1964 and served until 1976. She took a 14-year hiatus from national politics and returned to her congressional seat in 1990, where she remained unto her death in 2002.

Congresswoman Mink served on the Committee on Government Reform for a year in 1991 before being assigned to the House Committee on the Budget. She returned to our committee in 1999 where she served until her death last year. As a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Reform, Congresswoman Mink was committed to writing important legislation, such as the bill that would increase the mandatory retirement age of law enforcement officials.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Congresswoman Mink fought hard for the rights of women and children. She cosponsored title IX, the Early Childhood Education Act and the Women's Educational Equity Act.

During her last few years in Congress, Congresswoman Mink continued to work on such important issues as immigration, Social Security, and health care. Throughout her brilliant career, the Congresswoman provided the strong voice to those who needed one. Her accomplishments will continue to benefit Americans for generations to come. It is only fitting that we share our gratitude by honoring her in this manner.

I would also urge my colleagues to remember our late colleague as a fighter for children and the working class. I note she would have joined us in our push to bring the child tax credit bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), for honoring Patsy Mink with the postal designation. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for moving this bill to the House floor and Anne Stewart of the gentleman from Hawaii's (Mr. CASE) staff for her hard work.

I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this moment. Therefore, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), the author of this legislation.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues for their very fine comments.

Mr. Speaker, just 9 months ago, in the middle of her campaign for a 13th House term, a campaign which she most certainly would have won resoundingly and, in fact, did win posthumously, the late United States Representative Patsy Takemoto Mink was tragically lost to her beloved Hawaii, this Congress, our country, and our world.

The days, weeks, and months that followed witnessed a massive outpouring of first shock and disbelief, then sorrow and regret and, finally, remembrance and gratitude for this singular life.

As just a few representative examples, we had a deeply moving memorial service in the U.S. Capitol here as well as in the Hawaii State capitol back in Hawaii attended by many of our colleagues here.

This House published a beautiful memorial volume that memorialized the many eulogies given to Mrs. Mink on this floor and a volume for which I want to relay the deep gratitude of the Mink family, husband John, daughter Wendy, brother Eugene.

The students at the University of Hawaii Law School Richardson School of Law, on their own initiative, created and funded the Patsy Mink Memorial Fellowship for the purpose of providing an internship here in the U.S. Congress each year to a person in Mrs. Mink's liking.

□ 1415

I am very proud to say the first Mink fellow, Van Luong, joined my office last week, and she reminds me a lot of Mrs. Mink.

There also were and continue to be a multitude of testimonials on her lasting legislative accomplishments, and I want to leave to the colleagues that come after me to document those one more time because they know better than I do what she accomplished here.

But maybe what struck me the most, when I went out to campaign to take over the representation that she had so well provided to the Second Congressional District in what is still to this day referred to as Patsy Mink's seat, the testimonials from the ordinary people, the people that she touched during her life, the people that she represented, like the longtime friend in Lihue who was sick and who Patsy visited in the hospital just 2 days before she went into the hospital herself; like the taro farmers in Kipahulu on Maui, they wanted to show her their lo'i, and the only way for her to do that was to put on boots and walk out there in a very remote part of our district, and she did that. And the pig hunter in Waimen on the Big Island; he had an issue, and the only way to show her what that issue was was to take her into the forest where he lived. She went.

These testimonials are the testimonials that really count, but they can

really only give testament to the fact that her remembrances are her best legacy. But it is entirely appropriate that we honor her with a more tangible reminder that will serve as a constant physical remembrance of her and cause us to reflect on what she stood for.

So as I talked about this with John Mink after my election, he relayed his wish, later endorsed by others such as the Maui County Council, that the U.S. Post Office at Paia be renamed the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office. I want to tell Members about Paia very briefly. Paia is on the north shore of Maui on the slopes of Haleakala. Near Paia, only about a mile away, is a town called Hamakuapoko. It used to be a thriving plantation village. It is not quite that anymore, a time when sugar and pine were prevalent, and this is where Patsy Takemoto Mink was born in 1927 and was raised in all of the good and not so good of Hawaii in the 1930s and the 1940s, the community where the old Maui High School is located where Mrs. Mink's political career began when she ran successfully for student body president, the first woman to accomplish that position, the first of many firsts along those lines.

In short, this is where she came from, where her values were forged, where her spirit was lit, and it represents the people's traditions and beliefs that she never forgot. This is a fitting memorial for Patsy Takemoto Mink, and I urge my colleagues' full support, and I thank them for further consideration of a great Hawaiian and a great American.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud cosponsor of this legislation here today, a bill to commemorate the remarkable life and tremendous achievements of a woman who served with great distinction in the House of Representatives. To Patsy's friends, to her husband John, her daughter Wendy, and her brother Eugene, I offer my condolences as we remember her today.

Over the past few months, we have all missed the presence of her in our lives, and we know if she was still with us today, Patsy would be fighting for the rights of women and girls through Title 9, and fighting to see that this country lives up to its responsibilities to provide economic opportunity for all Americans, and she would be promoting democratic values and human rights and international cooperation abroad in Iraq and throughout the world.

She leaves a powerful legacy, and I will leave it to others to go on, item by item, but we know she broke down many, many barriers, first for herself and then for others. She left a legacy for millions of working families that she helped lift out of poverty with education and job training programs, ranging from the war on poverty to welfare reform. And she helped a whole genera-

tion of female student athletes for whom she drafted and implemented title IX.

I was proud to serve with Patsy on both the Committee on Education and the Workforce and on the Committee on Government Reform where she gave voice to the voiceless every day that she served. Patsy provided vision, courage and leadership, speaking out on all of the vital issues of the day and inspiring those of us who served with her with her fiery oration and a mastery of education, economic, and labor issues.

Mr. Speaker, she mixed her persuasive powers with the chocolate macadamia nuts that she used to pass out to all. Her memory will long remain here and in Hawaii for another generation of young women and Americans for the work she did.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2030, the legislation to designate a Post Office in Hawaii for Patsy Mink. I know I am not alone in support of honoring our dear friend and former colleague, Congresswoman Patsy Mink.

Mr. Speaker, Patsy Mink fought tirelessly during her career for improved education. Ms. Mink's coalition-building ability for progressive legislation continued during her tenure in Congress. She introduced the first comprehensive Early Childhood Education Act and authored the Women's Educational Equity Act. Patsy was knowledgeable and courageous and she was committed to people. I am certainly proud to have had the opportunity to serve with her and learn from her example. I miss her, and the people of Hawaii miss her, and her colleagues fondly remember her commitment and devotion to public service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2030, legislation to designate a post office in Hawaii as the Patsy Mink Post Office Building. I know I am not alone in support of honoring our dear friend and former colleague, Congresswoman Patsy Mink.

Throughout her career, Patsy Mink was a trailblazer among Asian-American women. Born in Maui in December of 1928, she was encouraged to excel in the world of academia. Her life was a continuous breaking down of barriers: the first woman to be elected to the Territorial House, the first Asian-American woman to practice law in Hawaii, and the first woman of color elected to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there was no hurdle our dear friend Patsy could not overcome. After obtaining her law degree from the University of Chicago in 1951, she decided to open her own law practice when no one was willing to hire her. During this time, getting a job in the legal field for women was very difficult. She seamlessly combined her work, marriage, and life as a new mother.

In 1965, Patsy Mink was elected to Congress and began the first of six consecutive terms in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Patsy fought tirelessly during her career for improved education. Mink's coalition-building ability for progressive legislation continued during her tenure in Congress. She introduced the first comprehensive Early Childhood Education Act and authored the Women's Educational Equity Act.

Patsy Mink was a trailblazer and fighter for her constituents in Hawaii, as well as the rest of the nation. She was a solid supporter of the Congressional Black Caucus and for that I am grateful. As a disciplined and focused advocate for the voiceless, she will be forever etched in our hearts and commitment to this body.

Patsy was a knowledgeable, courageous woman—committed to people. I am certainly proud to have had the opportunity to serve with her and learn from her example. I will miss her, and the people of Hawaii will miss her and her colleagues will fondly remember her commitment, determination, and devotion to public service.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2030 that will designate the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building in Hawaii. I want to thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) for introducing this bill so we may once again pay tribute to an outstanding United States Congresswoman.

I was deeply saddened by the passing of Patsy Mink last year. Working with Patsy has been one of the highlights of my short time in Congress. As the first minority woman elected to Congress, Patsy Mink has always been an inspiration to me as an elected official. I learned firsthand the remarkable work Patsy was doing 30 years ago when title IX was passed, and as a member of the Los Angeles Unified School Board at the time, I was charged with implementing a title IX plan for the Los Angeles Community College system.

Ever since then, I followed Patsy Mink's public service career closely, including her tireless fight on behalf of the Economic Justice and Civil Rights for All. During the 107th Congress, I had the opportunity to work with Patsy in putting together a comprehensive welfare reform program. I was able to spend quality time with her during a trip to Sacramento to collect data on our welfare reform program we had written in California. During the process of putting her legislation together, Patsy never backed down and never compromised on protecting and addressing the needs. Although our efforts were unsuccessful, it was a great honor to work with a true champion for American values and ideas. Thank you, Patsy, for all you have done for all of us.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of an amazing thing that all of

us are coming down to the floor with 1 minute or 2 minutes to try to summarize our feelings about Patsy. I could not possibly even begin to do that. Forty-three years of my life was involved with Patsy when I was a student and supporter of hers, and then as a colleague. To say that the people coming down to this floor loved Patsy, admired her and respected her, hardly does justice to those words.

There will never, ever be another person on this floor like Patsy Mink. When the history of the House of Representatives is written, she will be in the pantheon of heroes, those who exemplify the People's House. If there was ever anyone who embodied what it was that made this country great, someone who came from immigrant circumstances to the highest echelons of government, and never forgot where she came from and who she was and what and who she represented, it was Patsy Mink.

She was more than a friend and more than a colleague. She was a beacon to all of us who serve here hope to be. We all take our oath of office here to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, and we are only here because of the faith and trust of the people in our districts. Never, ever, has anyone upheld better that faith and trust that our constituents have given to us than Patsy Mink. Patsy, you live with us and you live in this House, the people's House, forever.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) for the generosity and attitude that you have brought to this House following such a giant legacy, and of course to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) who has always been a champion on the issues of social justice, alongside his very dear friend, Patsy Mink.

We have been honored by allowing us to have an opportunity to say a few words again about the Honorable Congresswoman Patsy Mink. We were honored to have shared in her home-going service in Hawaii, getting to see her family members and all of her friends. But more importantly, you have given us an opportunity once again to tell America what a champion, what a hero, what an enormous giant of a woman, the first minority woman who served in the United States Congress.

I close simply by saying this is the appropriate honoring. I hope we will honor her more, not only with Post Office buildings, but with legislation commemorating her valiant service. Finally, we would not be here, equal as women and equal as athletes in performance, if it had not been for Patsy Mink, title IX, her love of women's

causes and her love of education. This is an appropriate tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2030 to pay tribute to a great colleague and personal friend, the Honorable Patsy Takemoto Mink. Congresswoman Mink passed away on September 28, 2002, after serving 12 terms in the House of Representatives. She was posthumously re-elected in November 2002 for a thirteenth.

Congresswoman Mink was a remarkable woman in this chamber and throughout her life. Her interest and activism in politics started early, at the University of Nebraska, where she fought and won a battle against race-segregated student housing. After gender discrimination kept her from prestigious medical schools, she was accepted to the University of Chicago Law School. Congresswoman Mink joined the NAACP in the early days of the civil rights movements in the 1960s. She was one of the few Asian American members of the organization. Then, in 1965, Hawaii elected her the first woman of color in Congress.

Congresswoman Mink was an outspoken advocate for women, children, laborers, minorities and the poor. Her visions of bettering this country lead to legislation supporting early childhood education and family medical leave. She also authored and ardently supported the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) bill that provided special protections for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

One of Congresswoman Mink's most significant actions in this House was her role as co-author of the Title IX legislation, prohibiting gender discrimination. Title IX requires equal support for men and women in academics and athletics at any institution receiving federal money. This legislation has affected every school and college campus across the country for the better.

Recently, the Administration has threatened to dismantle Title IX and the progress that has been made to create equal opportunities for women and girls. We have come too far in the struggle for fairness to turn back now. Congresswoman Mink not only helped to create the Title IX legislation but she fought to maintain it. Consequently, after her death, Title IX was renamed the "Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act."

Congresswoman Mink was a fighter. She knew what it was to knock down doors and worked to keep them open for the women who would follow her. She changed the course of history and caused transformation in the lives of millions of men and women, boys and girls. For that reason, it is my privilege to stand in support of this bill to name a post office in her honor.

Many of us have witnessed Congresswoman Mink's fiery style, particularly when she spoke out about social causes. Patsy Mink wanted to see society become more equitable. She worked tirelessly to promote policies that truly addressed the realities of poverty and to promote education that would allow individuals to attain self-sufficiency.

Without question, she was an effective leader. In 1992, McCall's magazine named Congresswoman Mink one of the 10 best legislators in Congress. Recently, in 2002, the National Organization for Women (NOW) named her a "Woman of Vision."

I wish Congresswoman Mink were here with us today, still leading the crusade to help children and the working poor. She would not

stand idly by while those on the other side of the aisle exclude millions of low-income families from the Child Tax credit while giving away tax benefits to the wealthy. In this chamber, we could only benefit from her wisdom and her voice on this issue, to protect the real interests of all Americans, and not simply the wealthy elite.

Congresswoman Patsy Mink is dearly missed, not only as a Congresswoman and friend, but also as a tireless advocate for positive change in this country. We must not lose sight of her vision to promote equity among the differing segments of society.

I support H.R. 2030 to honor Congresswoman Patsy Takemoto Mink. I will work to continue her legacy. I will start now, by working to prevent the Administration from trying to pry open the gaps in equity that Congresswoman Mink worked so tirelessly to close.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2030 authored by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) honoring the late Congresswoman Patsy Takemoto Mink and naming the Post Office in Maui for her.

□ 1430

My association with, and admiration for, Patsy Mink goes back many years to the time that her husband, John, had done some work on Guam. Those of us living in the Pacific islands heard many stories of the legendary Patsy Mink, and it was my good fortune to know her as a friend and a role model. She blazed trails as a woman leader and Pacific Islander that we have eagerly followed and showed us that women can make a huge difference for children and families in our islands. She endorsed my candidacy for Congress just before the November election, 2002. Guam will always remember Congresswoman Patsy Mink, and we will always be grateful for all the causes that she championed on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring her for her service and for being a true inspiration for women throughout the Pacific.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time and thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) for offering this important and very well-deserved tribute.

Patsy Mink was a friend of mine. We worked on many projects together long before I was ever elected to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, our dear departed friend and colleague, Patsy Mink, was a giant. No one among our elected officials stood taller in addressing the needs of the poor, the disenfranchised, and the workers of this country than Patsy Mink.

As the first minority woman elected to the Congress and the first Japanese-American woman admitted to the bar

in Hawaii, Patsy was a pioneer who shattered the glass ceiling, a trailblazer who cleared the path for women and minorities to take their rightful place in all aspects of public life.

As always, had she been here with us, Patsy would be leading the fight to restore the child tax credit for low-income working Americans and to reorient our priorities to protecting the vulnerable, not rewarding the privileged. We Democrats will fight this battle for a child tax credit for low-income working Americans and their children in Patsy's memory and we will not rest until it is won.

While she probably would have been embarrassed by the attention, it is wonderful that this House will take time to honor Congresswoman Mink and her constituents by renaming the post office for her.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here and recognize the many contributions that Patsy Takemoto Mink made to the people of this country, particularly to the girls and women of this country. And I am equally proud that she will be honored by a post office in her home State named after Patsy Mink. I was privileged to serve with Patsy on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce from the beginning of my tenure in 1992. She was my mentor and my friend, and I miss her every day.

Besides being the first woman of color to serve in the House of Representatives, Patsy Takemoto Mink helped craft landmark legislation for girls and women across the country during her 24 years in Congress. In the early seventies, Patsy played the central congressional role in the enactment of title IX, prohibiting gender discrimination by federally funded institutions.

But title IX was not Patsy's only contribution to girls and women of America. Patsy also authored the Women's Educational Equity Act, WEEA. WEEA remains the primary resource for teachers and parents seeking information on proven methods to ensure gender equity in their schools and their communities. In fact, while this Congress is reauthorizing Head Start, I can hear Patsy's passionate and intelligent voice demanding that we not decimate this successful program by block granting any or all of it to the States. Her voice is missed. I hear it in my ears. I hope the people on the other side of the aisle can hear it in their ears so that we will do the right thing.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today also to join with my colleagues in celebrating Patsy Mink. We are going to honor her by naming a post office after her, but she deserves so much more. She was a wonderful human being whom I had a chance to know in my first term here in Congress. She was a warrior, a warrior in the sense that she fought for those who were voiceless. She was a champion for women's rights, equality, civil rights and environmental justice, someone whom I believe will always be remembered in the halls here of Congress. She was a role model not only to women of color but also to the many, many young women who were striving for equality in the sports field, to even the playing field. Today with much honor, I wear a symbol of shattering the glass ceiling. This pin that I am wearing, this brooch, symbolizes women breaking through and challenging and shattering the glass ceiling. Patsy Mink was one of those warriors, someone who was always constantly testing our tenacity, encouraging us as women and new Members here in the House to step forward. She was tremendous in the arguments and debates that occurred on welfare reform. Even though we did not get what we wanted, she was there.

I commend the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), who are paying tribute to her. She is a wonderful individual. I would ask our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the first African American woman on the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am so pleased to have an opportunity to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to celebrate Congresswoman Patsy Mink. As a trial lawyer, I used to litigate equal employment opportunity cases. One of the cases I had involved a school system wherein the women coaches were claiming that they were not paid the same amount of money as male coaches for doing lots of work. I remember doing some research and learning about Patsy Mink. Little did I know that I would ever have the opportunity to serve in the House of Representatives with such a great woman.

Patsy, I want you to know that I am keeping the faith and working on your behalf and working to keep your name in high regard. I hosted previously the NCAA women's volleyball championships in the city of Cleveland back in 1998; but I want you to know that in 2006, your girlfriend will be hosting the NCAA women's basketball finals in the city of Cleveland. I am going to do it in your name and in your support. Thank you, Patsy, for all you do.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Illinois has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Florida if we might be able to use some of the time on her side.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will control an additional 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard speaker after speaker take to the floor and talk about the virtues and attributes of Patsy Mink. To a person, they have all talked about how fiery, how dynamic, how pointed and how relevant she was and how much she meant to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1 minute I cannot possibly do justice to our dear colleague and friend, Patsy Mink. But the other day in Ohio I had an experience; and I said, Patsy, if your amendment had passed, we would not be in this situation where we have hundreds, indeed thousands, of students lined up in our community awaiting admission to nursing school and they cannot be admitted because the Workforce Investment Act does not allow the funds to be used for education for career training, only for storage of people at bottom feeder jobs in this economy. I thought, Patsy, if your amendment had passed, thousands and thousands and thousands of people across this country who are in the unemployment lines, who are unable to advance their careers, would already be in the workforce. I thought, I miss you so much. You tried so hard.

What a great woman. She accomplished so much—Title IX, her leadership here on education issues, the first woman of color ever elected to the Congress of the United States. What an incisive intellect, what an intelligent and persevering woman and someone who made a difference in the lives of people across this country. It is my deepest, deepest privilege to say I support the proposal to name the post office in Hawaii in her name. She is missed every day here. We thank her, and we thank her family for her devoted service to our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) for some further reflections.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my previous remarks that

we were limited in our opportunities to be able to speak about Patsy and I thought perhaps that it might offer an opportunity had we been able to extend our time, and I want to say how much we appreciate that we have had this opportunity to have a few more minutes to do it.

Not everyone may recognize the side of Patsy that was so familiar to us in Hawaii, because obviously we saw her as the dynamo of legislative activity here in Washington. But I think perhaps not everyone recognized or understood until they came to Hawaii and had the opportunity to see from whence Hawaii Patsy came as to what molded her as a person.

For the young people that are here today observing the remarks here on the floor, they may not fully comprehend what it was to be female and Japanese-American and smart and have to try and come up. We take a lot of these things for granted. She was in fact the pioneer, not just in Hawaii but throughout the Nation, for indicating what could be accomplished with those kinds of strikes against her. She turned that adversity into accomplishment. For that reason, if for that reason alone, she stands as the standard for which every young woman and every young man who comes from humble circumstances can aspire. With Patsy Mink, you had someone who was not just a friend, not someone who was just a standard bearer, but you had someone who set the foundation for all those who came after.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader and a longtime friend and associate of Patsy Mink's.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time and for his leadership in bringing this to the floor. I want to commend the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), the author of this legislation, and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). I am pleased to join both of them in honoring Patsy Takemoto Mink.

I rise in support of naming the post office on Maui, Hawaii, as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building. Everyone who knew Patsy or worked with her on a daily basis had his or her day brightened by her presence. With her wonderful family and her magnificent education, Patsy could have led a comfortable life, away from the rough and tumble world of politics. But as has been said of Eleanor Roosevelt, Patsy had a "burdensome conscience." She dedicated her life to helping people and challenging our consciences.

Our colleagues have spoken, as I heard the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) speak, to the obstacles that Patsy Mink had to overcome, as she was the first woman, the first Japanese-American in her law school, in her class; the first Asian-American

woman attorney in Hawaii. She broke so many barriers. She was a pioneer.

□ 1445

As I said, she considered public service a noble calling, and her public service was distinguished by deep patriotism and love of America. She loved America because of our freedoms, which are the envy of the world. She loved America because of its people, whose diversity is the strength of our country. She loved America because of the beauty of our country, which she worked so hard to preserve on the Committee on Resources.

Patsy worked on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and was dedicated to improving the quality of education and the quality of life for children. When Patsy said "It is not right" about something, Members would follow her anywhere.

I had the privilege of speaking at Patsy's funeral service, and I told a story then that I think speaks to how irresistible she was and how she would never take no for an answer and how we were all at the mercy of her smile and the twinkle in her eye.

She had said to me one day, "I need you to come speak in Hawaii at my testimonial dinner, 25 years of service in the Congress." How exciting and honored I was, except it was on the day of my town meeting in San Francisco. It was a Saturday evening for her then.

She said, "What time is your town meeting?"

I said, "It is 10 o'clock in the morning and it lasts 2 hours."

She said, "Fine. You can be on the 1 o'clock to Hawaii."

I said, "I have another town meeting on Sunday."

She said, "Fine. You can be on the red-eye to go back."

So I took the 1 o'clock flight to Hawaii, got there at 5 o'clock, got to the event at 6, left at 9, and was on the 10 o'clock flight home to San Francisco, as Patsy had decided for me. That was sandwiched in between flights to and from Washington, D.C. But there was no way to say no to her, because she had done so much for our country, because she meant so much to all of us. She had championed so many issues. We all loved her, respected her, and miss her terribly.

So I cannot help but think that if Patsy were here today, she would be concerned about the expansion of the child tax credit and saying it is not right for us not to extend it to all the children of our men and women in uniform, as well as our working families in America. I wish she were here today.

I know she would be proud of the representation of Hawaii that is here now, in the person of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), and, of course, her close pal and buddy and former colleague for many years, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Patsy Mink left a powerful legacy. Again, with a twinkle in her eye, her dazzling smile and her wonderful laugh,

Patsy worked her magic on our country, making history and progress along the way. We were all privileged to call her "colleague," and it is an honor to have this building named for the great Patsy Mink, and, important to her family, the Patsy Takemoto Mink Postal Building in Maui, Hawaii.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her remarks and comments.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to express my appreciation to you for your accommodation and to the gentlewoman from Florida. Patsy Mink was a great American, a great representative for this body, and thousands of people all over the world were inspired by her. Long before I became a Member of Congress, I was inspired by Patsy Mink.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in my friendship with the Case family, which includes the recently departed Dan Case, he was a great person in our country and came from a beautiful, magnificent family of leaders, and among them was Dan Case and is Steve Case. But we are blessed in this House for Patsy to have been followed by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE). The Case family is a family I know well, and Hawaii is well represented by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from Hawaii for introducing this important legislation. We all worked with Congresswoman Patsy Mink and respected her. She will always be in our prayers, and her family as well.

I urge all Members to support the adoption of this important resolution.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to come to the podium in support of the measure to honor a truly memorable colleague, the Honorable Patsy Takemoto Mink by naming the post office in Paia, Maui for her.

When I came to Congress as a freshman member, it was so inspiring to serve on a committee with a role model who has made a real mark on our society through her lengthy service in the House of Representatives.

Whenever Patsy took the microphone in the Education and the Workforce Committee, everyone knew that her comments would be principled, measured from the institutional knowledge of years working on persistent issues, and delivered with articulate passion. I admired her penchant for considering strategy—was it better to accept half a loaf this year or wait until next year to try to get the whole loaf. I respected her willingness always to stand up for people who were disadvantaged. Her priorities for education, housing, and health care match mine, and I valued her leadership in keeping that focus clear.

It was an honor for me to join her at this podium on June 19, 2002 in the commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of Title IX. Seldom does one get to join forces with one of the original sponsors of legislation that was not only landmark legislation for our country but was so formative for my children's generation. When I was a local school board member, we had to work hard to change the culture of our society to implement the equality embodied in this bill.

As we all spoke that day of the importance of this legislation, little did we imagine that her influence on the national conscience was soon to end. But, surely, she lived the battle for equal opportunity that Title IX codified.

I am awed by the fact that in 1951 she earned a law degree from the University of Chicago, one of the country's premier institutions. Most of us know that the two women members of the Supreme Court who subsequently earned their law degrees struggled to find openings to practice their profession. She, too, demonstrated that equal opportunity was right for women in a field where women were not well appreciated.

It is important that in addition to practicing law, her skills were valued so that President Carter invited her to serve the executive branch in the Department of State.

Naming a post office in her beloved Maui in her honor will remind us all of the issues which empowered her life—working for children—their education, their homes and their health care. I thank her for showing us the way.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2030, a resolution designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Baldwin Avenue in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building".

Patsy was an outstanding leader, woman, mother, and friend, and I believe that naming a post office after her is a great tribute to a people's champion.

I believe Patsy spoke not only for the forgotten, the disenfranchised, and the poor, but also to the conscience of all Americans. She was my colleague and dear friend who helped lead the charge on providing real reforms that helped all people across the country.

Patsy stood as the standard for all legislators to rise to. Over the span of her career, she was particularly proud of the leading role she played in 1972 during the passage of Title IX of the Federal Education Act. She helped open many opportunities for women, which reflected a long-standing concern for equality, liberty and justice for people.

I also shared her passion for peace and mediation. She once said, "America is not a country which needs to demand conformity of all its people, for its strength lies in all our diversities converging in one common belief, that of the importance of freedom as the essence of our country."

I loved and respected Patsy for her courage and fortitude.

A great woman in Congress, Patsy Mink was brilliant, full of compassion, and passion; always working tirelessly for equal justice, liberty, and the value of a diverse legislative body.

I'm proud to have served beside Congresswoman Patsy Mink and miss her tremendously. I ask that all of my colleagues support passage of H.R. 2030.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2030, the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building offered by Representative ED CASE.

Congresswoman Patsy Mink was a trailblazer who fought for the passage of the Women's Educational Equity Act—landmark legislation. This groundbreaking legislation, Title IX, promoted educational equity and opened the playing fields for millions of girls and women. Patsy Mink stood up and spoke up for girls and women.

She was a member of the Government Reform Committee and I am please that I had the opportunity to work with her. She will be missed but her legacy will continue not only in the naming of this post office but in the legislative policies she supported.

I join my colleagues in honoring Patsy Mink for her service and for being a true role model for women and all Americans.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, in the nine months since we lost the irrepressible Congresswoman Patsy Takemoto Mink, my colleagues and communities across the Nation have celebrated the incredible "firsts" and the numerous battles that Patsy waged on the behalf of Americans who needed a voice in federal policymaking the most.

Congresswoman Mink's record as an advocate for civil rights is unassailable, a crowing achievement being the passage of Title IX of the federal education amendments in 1972. This landmark legislation banned gender discrimination in schools, both in academic and athletics.

She awakened all of our social consciousness through her tireless advocacy, work and dedication; inspiring students, community leaders, political appointees and especially elected officials of the Asian Pacific American communities and beyond.

Anyone who was fortunate enough to have been touched by her life knows that this nation has lost a true warrior in the constant struggle for justice. We will all miss her counsel and guidance, as well as her friendship.

Patsy Mink was there at the beginning of many things. She was born at the time when women and minorities were not given fair opportunities to achieve their dreams. She remains a role model for countless women, as well as those of us from the Asian American and Pacific Islander community.

Though she is not physically present, her spirit and legacy will live on through those of us who believe that the fight for fairness and equity is never over. I find it a very fitting tribute to pass H.R. 2030. This post office located in Paia, Maui will be a constant reminder to us of our great friend Patsy Mink and is the least we can do to ensure her legacy continues.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak in favor of renaming the U.S. Postal Service office in Paia, Hawaii the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building." We do this in honor of the legacy of a pioneering woman and one of the most distinguished and honorable Members of the House of Representatives, my colleague and my friend—Congresswoman Patsy Mink. I am so pleased to have had an opportunity to know her and serve with her.

Without Patsy's leadership, the passage of the hallmark Title IX of the Federal Education Act of 1972 would never have come to pass. Thanks to Patsy's hard work, Title IX created

opportunities for women and girls in athletics and all operations of college and university programs.

I shall remember her as a giant who spoke in gentle but very fierce and deliberate tones, and whose stature allowed her to tower above the crowds. Patsy challenged us all the time with the question "Does it matter whether women are involved in politics?" Her career exemplifies the answer. Her voice is now stilled, but her ideals and the challenges she left for us will forever be etched in our memory.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2030, a bill to designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 120 Baldwin Avenue in Paia, Maui, Hawaii, as the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building." I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii, Mr. CASE, for introducing this bill, and ask all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation to ensure that the people of Hawaii and all those who visit there remember this remarkable woman.

I cannot say enough about Patsy Mink. She was a trailblazer—the first woman of color elected to Congress in 1964, the first Asian-American woman to practice law in Hawaii, the first woman president of the Americans for Democratic Action, the list goes on . . . By the time I was elected to Congress in 1978, she had already won passage of a major piece of civil rights legislation: Title IX expanded opportunities to female student athletes across the United States. Mindful of the beautiful region she represented, Patsy was also fiercely committed to protecting our natural resources and fought to ensure a healthy environment for all Americans. And her work on welfare reform later in her career reflected her fundamental belief that families living in poverty deserve the opportunity to share in the America dream. The country has benefited tremendously from Patsy's dedication to her values and her devotion to social progress. And those who had the privilege to know her benefited from her warmth, kindness, and friendship.

Patsy Mink's unyielding commitment to issues of social justice and equality will be deeply missed in the House, as will her friendship and leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a small token of appreciation for all that Patsy Mink gave to this body, the people of Hawaii, and our great nation. As we remember her today, let us hope that naming this building in her honor will inspire others to follow her example of tireless dedication to public service.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, which designates a post office in Paia, Maui County, Hawaii as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building. Patsy Mink served in the House of Representatives from 1964 to 1977 and again from 1990 to 2002. The world lost one of its greatest citizens, and I lost a good friend when she passed away on September 28, 2002.

One of her greatest legislative accomplishments, she felt, was the passage of Title IX, which led to expanded opportunities for women and girls in athletics and academics. In the last decade of her political leadership, she was a tireless advocate on behalf of poor families, working to promote policies that addressed the realities of poverty. During the 107th Congress, she garnered substantial

support for legislation to provide additional educational opportunities for the nation's welfare recipients. Patsy Mink also helped write environmental protection laws safeguarding land and water in communities affected by coal strip mining.

It is certainly fitting that we acknowledge this outstanding woman's accomplishments by naming a post office in her honor, and I thank Representative ED CASE for his stewardship of this bill. Patsy Mink's life of public service spanned six decades, beginning in 1956 when she was elected to the Territorial House in Hawaii. In 1964 she was elected to the House of Representatives and was one of the early opponents of the Vietnam War. President Jimmy Carter appointed her as assistant secretary of state for oceans, international, environmental and scientific affairs from 1977 to 1978, and she served as the national president for Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) from 1978 to 1981. Following her tenure as ADA president, she returned to politics, serving on the Honolulu City Council, and in a 1990 special election, she regained her Congressional seat.

Patsy Mink was an exemplary role model for women and minorities, and it is a pleasure and an honor to pay homage to a cherished colleague, who is no longer here, but certainly not forgotten.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2030, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service in Paia, Maui, Hawaii as the Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building. Patsy served as my mentor, my teacher, my advisor and most importantly, my friend. Congresswoman Mink was a woman of courage and determination who wore the mantle of leader with ease.

Born to immigrant parents in Hawaii, Patsy developed an appreciation for education at a young age. She obtained a Bachelor's degree from the University of Hawaii and, as we all know, it was Patsy's intent to attend medical school upon completion of her bachelor's degree. However, Patsy never realized this dream as none of the 20 medical schools to which she applied would accept women.

Not one to stand idly by, Patsy decided to attend the University of Chicago's Law School. Upon graduating from law school, Patsy returned to Hawaii where she became the first Asian-American woman to practice law in Hawaii. This was just one of many firsts Patsy would accomplish.

Congresswoman Patsy Mink was the first woman of color elected to Congress and introduced the first comprehensive Early Childhood Education Act. Most notably, Patsy was a co-author of Title IX of the Higher Education Act, an Act which has played a pivotal role in expanding women's educational and sports opportunities in colleges and universities throughout our country.

Patsy also faced life's hardships with dignity, integrity and honor. I believe it is only fitting that we now honor Patsy by designating the U.S. Postal facility in Paia, Maui in her name. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2030.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2030, a bill to designate a post office in Paia, Maui, Hawaii in honor of dear colleague and friend, Patsy Mink.

Congresswoman Mink was an advocate, mentor, and inspiration for Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. Mrs. Mink was the first Asian American woman elected

to Congress, and she served the APA community as chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus. She blazed trails for many of us, and encouraged students, community leaders, and APA elected officials to get involved with the legislative process.

Mrs. Mink's career in public service was defined by her commitment to giving a voice for those who needed it most. A prominent member of Congress, she worked tirelessly on behalf of women and minorities, focusing on issues such as civil rights, education, the environment, and poverty.

I am honored to have served with her, both in the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and in the Education and Work Force Committee. Her endless dedication to public service was a guiding example to all of us. Above all, I will miss her friendship.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2030.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, just nine months ago, in the middle of her campaign for a thirteenth House term, which she most certainly would have won resoundingly and in fact did win posthumously, the late United States Representative Patsy Takemoto Mink was tragically lost to her beloved Hawai'i, this Congress, our country, and our very world.

The days, weeks, and months that followed witnessed a massive outpouring of first shock and disbelief, then sorrow and regret, and finally remembrance and gratitude for this singular life.

As just a few examples:

A deeply moving memorial service was held in our Hawai'i State Capitol, graciously attended by many of Mrs. Mink's colleagues from this House, including now-Minority Leader PELOSI and Education and the Workforce Ranking Member MILLER, and thousands of grateful citizens of Hawai'i and beyond;

This House published a beautiful memorial volume containing the many eulogies delivered by Mrs. Mink's colleagues on this House floor, and I want my colleagues to know how deeply grateful the Mink family—husband John, daughter Wendy, brother Eugene—are for that gesture; and

The students at the University of Hawai'i Richardson School of Law, on their own initiative, created and funded the Patsy T. Mink Memorial Fellowship for the purpose of providing an internship here in our Congress each year to a person in Mrs. Mink's making; the first Mink Fellow, Van Luong, joined my office last week and, you know, she reminds me of Mrs. Mink.

There also were and continued to be a multitude of testimonials on her lasting legislative accomplishments. My colleagues that will follow me and know of her exploits in this arena can tell this story best.

But perhaps what struck me most amidst this outpouring were the simple testimonials I heard, as I sought election to what is still referred to as "Patsy Mink's seat," from the ordinary people out across Hawai'i's great Second District; the people she represented and lived for, like:

The longtime friend in Lihu'e on Kaua'i, who Patsy, herself sick, visited in the hospital there just days before she herself was admitted;

The taro farmers in Kipahulu, Maui, about as remote a place as there is in Hawai'i, who asked Patsy to come and see their problem personally, and she did, donning boots and walking through their lo'i; and

The pig hunter in Waimea on the Big Island; he was concerned that she understand an issue and the only way, he thought, was to show her the issue up in the forest; she went.

These testimonials, of course can never replace Patsy Mink, although they do demonstrate that our remembrances of her are her own best legacy. But it is entirely appropriate that we all provide a more tangible reminder of her life and times, a memorial that will serve as a constant physical reminder that will cause us to reflect on what she stood for.

And so, as I talked about this with John Mink after my election, he relayed his wish, also endorsed by others such as the Maui County Council, that the U.S. Post Office at Pa'ia, Maui be renamed the "Patsy Takemoto Mink Post Office Building." And when you understand Pa'ia where it is and what it represented to Patsy Mink, you understand how entirely appropriate it is that we take this action.

Pa'ia is a town on the north shore of Maui, on the slopes of Haleakala, a town built on sugar and pineapple. It is located about a mile from what was once the thriving plantation village of Hamakua Poko, a village of immigrants of Japanese, Portuguese, Filipino and other origins; a village where Patsy Takemoto was born in 1927 and raised in all of the good, and not so good, of Hawai'i and our country in the 1930s and 1940s; a community in which bonds were deep but needs were great. It is also the community in which the old Maui High School was located, the school where Mrs. Mink's political career began when she was elected its first woman student body president, the first of many such firsts, and from which she graduated in 1944 as valedictorian and went on to the incredible life she led.

In short, Pa'ia is where this great American was born, where her values were forged, where her spirit was lit. And it represents, both physically and figuratively, the peoples, traditions, and beliefs that she never ever forgot.

There is no more fitting memorial to Patsy Takemoto Mink than that she be remembered by us all here in her hometown. For the Mink family and Hawai'i, I thank my 115 co-sponsors. I thank Chair DAVIS and Ranking Member WAXMAN for moving this bill through the committee so quickly, I thank those who came here to speak, and for Hawaii I thank this House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2030.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CESAR CHAVEZ POST OFFICE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 925) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1859 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, as the "Cesar Chavez Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 925

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

SECTION 1. CESAR CHAVEZ POST OFFICE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1859 South Ashland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, and known as the Pilsen Post Office, shall be known and designated as the "Cesar Chavez Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Cesar Chavez Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) 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 on H.R. 925.

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.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 925, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), redesignates this postal facility in Chicago, Illinois, as the Cesar Chavez Post Office Building.

This legislation deals with an American civil rights advocate. Cesar Chavez grew up as a migrant agrarian worker after being born in Arizona in 1927. As a young adult he became involved in the Community Service Organization and ultimately rose to the position of general director in 1958.

Four years later, Cesar Chavez left the CSO to join with some of his fellow wine grape pickers and form the National Farm Workers Association. This organization was active in acquiring service contracts from major growers in California. His ambition led him to merge the National Farm Workers Association with the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee of the giant labor umbrella organization, the AFL-CIO. The upshot group became called the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

In 1972, Cesar Chavez's organization became a member union of the AFL-CIO and he was named president. In this role, Cesar Chavez's influence only expanded, and he coordinated activities on agricultural issues.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his stands in support of workers, in support of their wages and their rights, and the difference he has made in the lives of all current and future workers. His advocacy has led to countless

agreements between business and labor on a variety of important issues.

So my colleague from Illinois wants to name this post office for labor leader Cesar Chavez, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support passage of H.R. 925.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 925, legislation redesignating a postal facility after Cesar Chavez, a fighter for dignity, human rights, and livable working conditions.

H.R. 925, which was introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), on February 26, 2003, has met the committee policy and has been cosponsored by the entire Illinois delegation.

Cesar Estrada Chavez, the founding leader of the first successful farm workers union, was born on March 31, 1927, near Yuma, Arizona, the second of six children. Cesar began working as a migrant worker when the family lost their land during the Depression. When he was 11 years old, the Chavez family followed the crop picking and moved to California, living in the trucks they drove.

Although working in the fields and attending school was difficult, if not impossible, Cesar managed to do both and graduated from the eighth grade. Shortly afterwards, he joined the Navy. After his tour of duty, he began teaching Mexican farm workers to read and write so that they could take the test and become American citizens. This activity marked the beginning of Cesar's efforts to improve working conditions for migrant workers.

Cesar Chavez founded the National Farm Workers Association in Delano, California, and in 1965 joined an AFL-CIO union strike against Delano Table and Wine Growers. This successful 5-year strike led supporters to the United Farm Workers, a national group of unions, churches, students, minorities and others. It became affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

Cesar continued organizing workers, strike after strike. And he produced results. Farm workers gained collective bargaining rights and under union contracts enjoyed higher pay, health care and pension benefits.

In 1984, Cesar called for another grape boycott, to protest the pesticide poisoning of grape workers and their farmers.

Cesar Chavez passed away at the age of 66 on April 12, 1993. Before he died, he received the Aztec Eagle, Mexico's highest award given to people of Mexican heritage who have made major contributions outside of Mexico. On August 8, 1994, President William Clinton posthumously awarded Mr. Chavez the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in America.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the legacy

of Cesar Estrada Chavez, and urge swift passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her work on the consideration of this bill today. I would like to also thank all of the staff members who worked tirelessly in making this possible, and specifically I would like to thank my good friend Danielle Simonetta and Michael Layman from the majority side for all of the work they have done in making this bill. And I say to Danielle specifically that my daughter sends her good wishes. She is doing better, and she is real excited about Cesar Chavez and the opportunity for the action that we can afford his life here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate today the life and legacy of Cesar Chavez and to recognize his passion for empowering workers and for defending the rights of the disadvantaged.

The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 925, would designate a United States Postal Service facility at 1859 South Ashland Avenue in my district as the Cesar Chavez Post Office. The facility would serve as a permanent tribute and a lasting reminder of the selflessness and self-sacrifice that embodied Chavez's life and work.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time a legislative body has paused to honor Cesar Chavez, and it is my hope it will not be the last. The more buildings, the more streets, the more stamps and the more parks that are designated, the more we can keep Cesar Chavez's principles, his passion and devotion alive, and the more we will be able to encourage others to continue the unfinished business that Cesar Chavez left behind, to take up his fight and his causes and to make similar sacrifices in the name of justice and dignity.

Throughout history, there have been few individuals that have done more, that have fought harder or sacrificed as much to ensure dignity and decency for all workers than Cesar Chavez. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy called him one of the heroic figures of our time.

Cesar Chavez remains a champion to working people around the world and an inspiration to generations of Latinos, both here in this country and abroad, and his accomplishments are an enduring symbol and a shining example of what one man can achieve in the fight for fairness.

Cesar Chavez stood up to the biggest, the most well-financed and the strongest corporate growers. He fought for farm workers who spent countless hours doing our Nation's most arduous and strenuous work.

□ 1500

He defended men and women crippled by despair and deplorable working con-

ditions, so that they too could have a say in the fight for reasonable and respectable wages. Chavez fought for the most basic and the most fundamental and the most essential rights for workers. He fought so that growers would not spray pesticides while workers were in the fields. He fought so that they could have a clean water system and decent housing. And his actions and hard work were vital in achieving better pay for migrant farmers, to banning child labor abuses, and to mitigating the proliferation of sexual harassment of women workers.

Cesar Chavez's courage and his character helped strengthen the farm workers movement, and his principles of nonviolence continue to play an important role in the quest for social justice and human rights and for a world without prejudice or injustice.

Mr. Speaker, for everyone who has ever fought for fairness, Chavez is a model and a true mentor. Because he refused to let bigotry and bias go unchallenged, workers are better protected and represented today. Because he refused to respond to discrimination and intolerance with silence, we live in a better and more inclusive America.

According to Chavez, "The truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness, is to sacrifice ourselves for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others."

At the time those eloquent words were articulated, Chavez was too weak to speak them himself. He was fasting in protest of violence against workers, and his speech had to be read by someone else.

Throughout his life, Chavez never relented, he never backed down, and he never wavered from his commitment to nonviolence. When he passed away in 1993, more than 50,000 people attended his funeral to pay homage and their respects to a man who fought so fearlessly, so tirelessly for those not always heard or even seen in our society.

A reporter wrote, "During the vigil at the open casket on the day before the funeral, an old man lifted a child up to show him the small, gray-haired man who laid inside. 'I am going to tell you about this man some day, he said.'"

The legislation we are discussing today would ensure that countless others remember to tell their children about this man, about his life, his lessons, and his legacy. It will also help educate tomorrow's leaders about the characteristics that they should appreciate, about the achievements that they celebrate, and about the types of individuals that they should emulate.

Mr. Speaker, in the year since his passing, Chavez has been awarded many of our Nation's highest honors, including the 1994 Medal of Freedom. And the passage of this legislation, I believe, would serve as another important and lasting testament to the outstanding work of Cesar Chavez.

At the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Chavez said, "The con-

sciousness and pride that were raised by our union are alive and thriving inside millions of young Hispanics who will never work on a farm." And we must work to keep that consciousness and pride alive in future generations. We must work to keep the consciousness and pride alive as we advocate for a new generation of immigrant workers.

Every time someone in my community drops off a letter, goes to buy a stamp, or passes by the post office, they will be able to remember Cesar Chavez's life, remember his accomplishments, appreciate his vision and, ideally, summon the strength to embody his teaching in their daily activities. It will also serve as a focal point in a vibrant and growing Pilsen community and as a reminder of the challenges we face today.

Mr. Speaker, Cesar Chavez gave workers everywhere a reason to believe and a reason to dream. He inspired them, with his desire and discipline, to stand together and to do better and to reach farther. And in doing so, he gave so many the courage and the strength to fight for equity and equality.

That is why I urge the passage of this important legislation.

In ending, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friends again, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and my dear friend, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who I know when we finally get this legislation approved will be standing with me in inaugurating this wonderful new post office for Cesar Chavez.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have any additional requests for time, but I yield myself such time as I may consume to note that I was pleased to have the opportunity to be in the company of Cesar Chavez on several occasions, at rallies, demonstrations, marches, and on picket lines, even in Chicago where there were no farms. It is an excellent way of remembering the great contributions that he has made.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), my good friend, for introducing this measure, and I urge all Members to support the adoption of this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 925, a bill to designate a U.S. Post Office in Chicago, IL the "César Chávez Post Office." I can think of no one more deserving of such an honor than the great civil rights leader, César Chávez. I want to commend my colleague, Representative GUTIERREZ, for his leadership in bringing this legislation before the House and I am proud to join him as an original cosponsor.

César Chávez was an organizer, an activist, a protestor, a farm worker, a peace-lover, a father, and a son. Raised in a family of farm workers forced to migrate throughout the Southwest, Chávez was led by his compassion, his ability to inspire others to action, and

his deep sense of fairness and equality to organize and establish what is today the United Farmworkers of America. Because of his efforts, many farm workers today enjoy higher pay, family health coverage, pension benefits, and other contract protections. While we still have a long way to go in giving farm workers the fair pay and healthy work conditions they deserve, César Chávez laid the foundation toward accomplishing those important goals.

César Chávez understood what it took to create a movement and he dedicated every part of his life to setting an example and leading the way. As a child and young man, he experienced firsthand the harsh working conditions of farm workers—the long hours, poverty wages, harassment, and abuse—as well as the limited access to education and health care. Understanding and addressing the roots of the problem, Chávez was able to make a lasting and significant impact. He conducted voter registration drives and campaigns against racial and economic discrimination. He led boycotts and pickets and hunger strikes. His nonviolent methods echoed those of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi. He showed us all how critical it is to organize people, to unify them for a cause, and to help them believe in themselves and their ability to make a difference.

César Chávez continues to be an example for us today. He taught us that “Si se puede,” or “Yes we can.” We can—and we must—help those with no voice, help those who are discriminated against, help those who are taken advantage of, and help those who live in poverty and are struggling to survive. If César Chávez were alive today, I am sure he would still be leading the fight for fairness and equality for workers and their families. We must not let his legacy die; we must not let his great strides forward become giant steps backward. We must continue to work for what is right. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 925.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with my colleagues to honor the enduring legacy of Mr. Cesar Estrada Chavez.

Mr. Chavez was born of humble beginnings in 1933 near Yuma, Arizona. Early in life, Mr. Chavez was forced to recognize the harsh realities of racism that all too often plagued communities of color. After his family's home and land were taken from them, Mr. Chavez knew first hand what it meant to be the victim of gross injustice. Yet despite this and similar experiences of discrimination, Mr. Chavez was not deterred. He often said that, “the love for justice that is in us is not only the best part of our being but also the most true to our nature.”

In 1945, Mr. Chavez joined the U.S. Navy and served in the Western Pacific during the end of WWII. After completing his military service, Mr. Chavez returned to his roots, working and laboring in the fields. By day Mr. Chavez picked apricots in an orchard outside of San Jose; by night he was actively involved in galvanizing voter registration drives. In 1952, Mr. Chavez was a full time organizer with the Chicago-based Community Service Organization (CSO). Not only did he coordinate voter registration drives, but he battled racial and economic discrimination against Chicano residents and organized new CSO chapters across California and Arizona as well.

In 1962, Mr. Chavez moved his wife and eight young children to California where he founded the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA). Cesar Chavez founded and led the first successful farm workers' union in U.S. history. In 1968, Mr. Chavez conducted a 25-day fast to reaffirm the United Farm Workers commitment to nonviolence. The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy called Cesar Chavez “one of the heroic figures of our time”, and actually flew to be with Mr. Chavez when he ended his fast.

In 1991, Mr. Chavez received the Aguila Azteca (The Aztec Eagle), Mexico's highest award presented to people of Mexican heritage who have made significant contributions outside of Mexico. Mr. Cesar Chavez passed away on April 23, 1993, at the age of 66. At the time of his death he was the president of the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO. On August 8, 1994 Cesar became the second Mexican American to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the United States. The award was presented posthumously by then president, Bill Clinton.

Given the immense and innumerable contributions that Mr. Cesar Chavez has made to our society in advocating for the rights and causes of the working poor, I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting affirmatively that the U.S. Postal Service Facility located at 1859 Southland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois be designated at the “Cesar Chavez Post Office”.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 925.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2143, UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 263 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be

confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 263 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. This is a fair, structured rule that merits the House's approval.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

This rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying H. Res. 263. It provides that the amendments printed in the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated by the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

This rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

With respect to the underlying legislation, H.R. 2143, I want to acknowledge the efforts of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, in bringing this important bill to the floor today. This rule we have before us today will give the House the opportunity to consider

H.R. 2143 and three additional amendments made in order under the rule.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 263 is a structured rule that will give the full House an opportunity to work its will on the major issues it raises, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we can move on to consideration of the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me this time.

The Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act has the potential to eradicate illegal Internet gambling by disallowing merchants from accepting credit card, debit card, or other bank-sanctioned transactions as payment for online wagering.

Mr. Speaker, because online gambling has grave societal consequences, I support this legislation that aims to eradicate it. As the "crack cocaine" of gambling, Internet betting often leads to severe personal and family hardships, including debt, bankruptcy, foreclosed mortgages, and divorce.

Although I am pleased that three amendments were made in order, I find it especially disappointing and frustrating that the Pombo amendment will not be debated today.

The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) presented an amendment that would have treated Indian tribes on a par with State governments. The interests of the Native American people, a community that has been disenfranchised for all of their history, should always be heard and, in this case, should have been debated.

The price of Internet gambling can be measured best in terms of the human costs. As we debate the pros and cons of this act, the most important question we should be asking is, What does Internet gambling cost our children, and is this a price we are willing to pay?

Mr. Speaker, we are debating a bill that has the potential to stop the gambling with our future, because Internet gambling hurts children. I have learned of one young man that racked up debts of \$70,000 and was kicked out of his house because he was stealing from his family, and of another teen who blew his tuition and 3 days after his father repaid it, he withdrew from his courses, demanded a refund, and spent the refund on gambling. Stories like these are innumerable.

The American Psychiatric Association is so concerned about the increase in youth gambling, primarily on the Internet, that it recently issued the following statement: "In virtually all studies of the rates of gambling problems at various ages, high school and college-aged individuals show the highest problem areas."

The APA says the increase in problems among young people can be at-

tributed, in part, to the ease with which they can gamble on the Internet, where there are no enforceable restrictions on age.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to help reduce the extent of existing illegal Internet gambling in the United States; and I support it as it is presently constituted, with hopes of continuing revision.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking minority member on the committee of jurisdiction, and I am pleased that we forestalled a suspension proposal here and that we do have a chance to debate some of the amendments. I will talk about that bill in due time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I did want to note today, though, and I guess I may need the Parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker. I know under our rules it is forbidden to speak ill of the Senate and from time to time people get exasperated and they speak ill of the Senate and they are duly chilled.

But the question I have, Mr. Speaker, is, is it permissible to speak well of the Senate? Is it within the rules to lavish on the Senate the praise they deserve for passing the child tax credit bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order to characterize the Senate in any way.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. In any way. Well, I regret my inability to give credit where credit is due. I was hoping that an example recently given would be followed in this side of the Capitol; but I will abide by the rules, though as foolish as I think this particular rule is, and not comment on the Senate.

□ 1515

I will, though, have to say that the refusal of the Republican leadership in the House to allow the House to vote on a proposal that would extend to hard-working, low-income people financial relief after all of the financial relief we have given to people in the upper brackets is truly distressing.

I know there has been an effort on the House floor to portray our interest in providing a tax credit to people, and let us be clear, we are talking about here people who work. They work very hard. They work at jobs that are not very pleasant, and that, by definition, are not well paid. Many of them have families.

It is true that because they work hard at jobs that this society has devalued in many cases they do not pay much or any income tax. They do, however, pay a significant percentage of their income in taxes. They pay the Social Security tax and the tax on Medicare. They pay the withholding tax.

For many of them because there are no exemptions from that, there are no deductions, they pay the full thing no matter how many children they have, no matter how many other expenses they have. For some of those people this is a larger percentage of their income paid in tax than is paid by many wealthier people. That reduction will be further.

What this House says is, no, they get no relief out of this bill comparable to what others get. It is unworthy of this House to say that to these hardworking people struggling to provide for their children when the Republicans have said, in the tax bill, this looks like \$350 billion, but we are going to convert it into hundreds of billions more.

A bill is going to be introduced that would cost a total of \$10 billion, or would expend \$10 billion; but it would be neutral revenue-wise to help these low-income people. We are told we cannot do that.

When there was a parliamentary situation that the President confronted, and he was told he could only get \$350 billion in tax relief over the next 10 years, he said that he did not think people should be for such a little bitty piece of tax relief. So \$350 billion is a little bitty. We are asking for a very small percentage of that little bitty for the poorest, hardest-working people in this country.

The Republican leadership, I can understand in the core Republican philosophy that they would say no to these people, but to refuse to allow the House of Representatives to vote on it seems to me unpardonable. We are just asking, okay, let it come to the floor. Let us have a debate. Are they so afraid that their resistance to helping these low-income people is so out of sync with the American people that they will not let it come forward?

I hope we will see that bill on the floor fairly soon.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to actually speak on the underlying bill and the rule in support of both of those, and, as well, if I could take the opportunity to speak against one of the amendments.

I am from New York's 20th Congressional District, the home of Saratoga, New York. We like to say it is the home of horse racing. It certainly is the home of the oldest flat track in the Nation, the proud home of Funny Cide, the winner of the Kentucky Derby and the Preakness.

While we are a little less jubilant today than we were, maybe, a couple of days ago, we are still very bullish on the whole idea and the whole horse racing industry.

I am also the cochairman of the Congressional Horse Caucus. I want to talk a little bit about how important this rule is and this underlying bill is to horse racing and the horse racing industry. U.S. horse racing is regulated

by Federal and State laws. It is in fact the most highly regulated form of entertainment sports initiative in this Nation.

The specific concerns expressed by many in this Congress about offshore international wagering, the integrity of operators, the identity of the participants, consumer fraud, and money laundering are not an issue as it relates to horse racing. Horse racing is a \$34 billion domestic industry, along with the agribusinesses that it supports. It is critically important not just to the economy of my district but through vast regions throughout the Nation.

The underlying bill respects existing Federal and State gambling law. It does not make any unlawful gambling lawful; it does not make any lawful gambling unlawful. It does not override any State prohibitions or requirements. It does not expand or contract wagering. It simply maintains the status quo with respect to the underlying substantive law on gaming.

There will be an amendment later today brought forward sponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONYERS) that would prohibit State license activities and represents a broad overuse and abuse of Federal power.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for bringing this rule forward. I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), for recognizing the importance of this underlying legislation and how important, critically important, it is to vast areas throughout the Nation.

I want to ask my colleagues to support both this rule and to support the underlying legislation and oppose the so-called Sensenbrenner-Cannon-Conyers amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this rule. This bill requires U.S. credit card companies and other financial entities to develop reasonable policies and procedures to identify and block financial transactions made in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

Online gambling can have a severe impact on family life. It can be done anonymously easily from someone's home and requires little more than a computer and a credit card. We know the dangers of online gambling: lost savings, excessive debt, bankruptcies, foreclosed mortgages.

This is an important issue that we discuss today. Equally important as an issue is the restoration by the House of the child tax credit to 6.5 million families that have been in fact left behind, families of 12 million children which

are taxpaying families, Mr. Speaker, who deserve tax relief. They have bills to pay, mouths to feed, children to take care of. With the economy continuing its slide downward, they do not know where their jobs will be the week after next.

Let me be clear: as has been indicated, these families do pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes, sales taxes. They may not know week to week whether their next paycheck is forthcoming; but they know that if it does, that 8 percent will come off the top on the first dollar earned.

So we should not be kind of lulled or fooled into thinking that these families do not pay any taxes, because they pay a greater share of their income in taxes than a corporation like Enron did in 4 of the last 5 years. Just because these families do not have a powerful lobby, we must be their lobby in this institution. We must lobby for their hard-earned money and not take it from them.

Before we consider bills like the Internet gambling bill, this House should take up the other body's child tax credit legislation. The White House has said that the House should take up this bill, and if we do, that the President will sign our bill.

This is not a partisan issue; this is an issue of values, of character. Each individual, those of us who serve in this marvelous institution, come here to do the right thing. This reflects doing the right thing, and also it reflects what our national character is all about.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, though I support this underlying bill, I also support the motion for the House to take from the Speaker's table, agree to, and pass the Senate amendment on the child tax credit. It is time the House votes to extend the full \$1,000 tax credit to the families of 12 million children, just like 25 million other families in America. Quite simply, it is the right thing to do. We should meet that July 1 deadline when others will be getting their tax cut.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

Mr. Speaker, illegal Internet gambling, that is something that many Americans do not know much about. They have not heard much about it until they look at their credit card and there is \$4,000 or \$5,000 worth of charges on their credit card because their son off at a university, or even their 14-year-old son, has gotten their card, gone in his bedroom, got on the Internet, and began to gamble.

Harvard University Medical School, the University of Connecticut, newspapers all over this country have looked at this problem. They estimate that as many as 5 million of our youth, as well as compulsive, what they call "pathological gamblers," are gambling on the Internet today.

This is basically a new phenomenon. In 1997 it was first brought to our attention when groups came before the Congress and asked that we do something about it. At that time, there were about 24 sites offshore, and it is estimated at that time that anywhere from \$50 million to \$300 million being bet.

In 2001, an Internet gambling bill was killed by this Congress, despite the urging of groups as diverse as Major League baseball, the NCAA, the NFL, various faith-based groups, and the AARP, because AARP represents a lot of grandparents whose grandchildren are becoming addicted to gambling in these sites, and they urged us to act.

In 2001, and again in 2002, this Congress began to argue not about illegal Internet gambling, but they began to attach amendments to this bill that would make lawful gambling unlawful or unlawful gambling lawful. Everybody wanted to improve their position. Some Members wanted to eliminate certain types of lawful gambling. Others wanted to create lawful exceptions to what was illegal gambling in this country. These bills continued to go down.

Today, we are not faced with a situation where we have a half a dozen sites and maybe \$10 million of gambling on these sites; we are faced with a situation where we have \$6 billion a year bet on these sites, \$6 billion. That we know. We also know that there are somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 sites offshore.

What else do we know about these sites? We know that they are untaxed. Not one dime of tax is collected. We know they are unsupervised. In fact, we do not know the identity of these people, except in two cases when the FBI prosecuted them and found out. The reason they prosecuted them is because they were laundering money. We found out they were money-launderers.

We do know, because the FBI has reported it, that organized crime is heavily invested in these sites, and they believe that organized crime controls these sites. We know that.

We know some other things about these people. We know they are not good people. We know they link these sites with pornographic sites, and we know some of these sites specifically target preteens. When they go on those sites, they also get a pop-up that exposes them to pornographic sites. We know that because various organizations have come before us and over the last 3 years testified that our youth, our preteens, are being led into addictive gambling.

The University of Connecticut, Harvard University, The New York Times, all of them have exposed this problem; but this Congress continues to take the occasion when these bills come up to try to have a turf fight on gambling.

In fact, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) will offer an amendment which is another turf fight. Senators have said that if the Cannon amendment is attached that this bill will be

killed in the Senate. So we again have a choice to make: Do we want to continue to let this industry grow, a mob-run industry? Do we want to continue to not know who these people are? Do we want to continue, in the words of a professor at Harvard University, to allow what he calls the "crack cocaine of gambling" to take hold in America?

□ 1530

Do we want to continue to do that or do we want to vote down the Cannon amendment and vote up this legislation?

One final thing that I would like to remind this body. There is a trial that went on last week in Florida. Adrian McPherson, Adrian McPherson was Mr. Football in the State of Florida. He was also Mr. Basketball in the State of Florida. Imagine such a talent, both the best high school football player, the best high school basketball player, and he went to Florida State University. And what do we know from the testimony last week? We know that he, and this is according to testimony, he has not been convicted, but we know this: We know he has been suspended from the team; not suspended, but he has actually been thrown off the Florida State team. We know he has been accused of going in a business and stealing checks from that business. We know that he is accused of going to a grocery store and bouncing a number of checks. We know that he is facing time in jail. We know that if he is convicted in the trial that he will be going through in the next month or two, that he will be banned from organized college athletics for life.

And all because what? The accusations, the testimony is he became addicted to Internet gambling, and he had massive debts and that is why he went out and stole these checks. But that young man and his family have been devastated. Florida State University has spent over a million dollars investigating this case.

What if 3 years ago this Congress had quit fooling with these turf battle Cannon-type amendments and adopted this legislation? I wonder if this young man would be taking the field for Florida State? I wonder if we had listened to the NCAA when they testified before our committee 3 years ago when they said, please take action, do something; when the NCAA warned us 2 years ago in testimony that we are going to have a scandal one day because illegal Internet gambling is making it very difficult for us to protect the integrity, the integrity of this sport.

There was one Gallup poll which said that 25 percent of college athletes today are betting on the Internet on sports, and most of those are betting on their own teams, and almost all of them were betting on college sports. What are we going to do? Are we going to continue to stand by while families are broken apart?

This morning I was on C-SPAN and when I got off, a man from Georgia

called and said, I support this legislation. He was asked why. He said, I am a compulsive gambler. And he said, If I have to go 50 miles or 100 miles to gamble, I feel like I can keep that under control. But, he said, If it is in my home, if it is in my bedroom, if it is on my computer, I have a difficult time handling that. That man was saying to us: Take action.

In a few minutes we will get an opportunity to do two things. We will get an opportunity to do what the National Governors Association, in a letter dated yesterday, has urged us to do. We will do what the attorney generals, when they urged us, the Attorney Generals Association usually says, hands off, let the States handle it. But the Attorney Generals Association has said do something about this, we cannot.

When the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Southern Baptists, we received a letter, Focus on the Family have written us, different faith-based groups; when even major league baseball says there is a growing problem, it is time to take action. If we do not, there will be other Adrian McPhersons. There will be other lives ruined. There will be families broken up. There will be children addicted to gambling. Because if there is one thing these illegal Internet gamblers know is, they know that our children are fascinated with and very literate on the computers. They use the computers.

We have seen the statistics. The average teenager is on the computer 20, 30 hours a week. We hear incredible numbers, and what do they enjoy doing as much as anything? Sports. You combine the computer with sports and you get what the Harvard Medical School said is an explosive, the crack cocaine, as I said earlier, of gambling. Let us take action before any more lives are ruined. We have had suicides. We have had at least five suicides.

Let us take action. Let us vote down these killer amendments and let us vote up this legislation, and let us finally take action.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), a new Member, new in the sense that this is his first term; however, he has distinguished himself in many ways among freshmen and all of us.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and I have a motion to the House to take from the Speaker's table and pass the Senate amendment to the Child Tax Credit.

This body continues to refuse to address the problem that we have created. Extending the child tax credit to low-income working families is the right thing to do, and we should do it today. The Senate has already passed and the President is calling for it now.

Now, I have heard people say that those who did not vote for the tax cut should not be complaining about the way it turned out. Well, I supported

the tax cut. I was 1 of only 4 Democrats to vote for it from day one, and I stand by that vote today. But by neglecting to provide the child tax credit to the low-income families, we have made a drastic mistake. We need to correct that now. These are hardworking people who pay taxes, too, and they deserve relief like everyone else.

Because of our actions, in Louisiana 1 out of every 4 families is being told that their children are not as valuable as other kids. That is wrong. We have the power to easily correct that mistake. Instead, we are playing games.

Now, last night I joined with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) to introduce an exact replica of the Senate bill that has already passed. If they wanted, the House leadership could bring up our bill today and we could send it to the President.

The time for playing games is over. We made a mistake and we need to correct that today so that all working families can receive the needed relief when the checks go out next month.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker inform us of how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my very good friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak against the rule, and it is not because I am against the underlying bill. It is because, Mr. Speaker, hardworking families need a break more than anyone else in this country and hardworking families are the ones that are bearing the brunt of this weak economy. But for some reason the Republicans leadership feels that the privileged few are more important than the 12 million children who are left out of the Republican tax cut and that Internet gambling is more important to discuss today than our children. And that is just plain wrong.

Voices across the country are speaking out in great numbers. It is overwhelming what we are hearing in our offices. And it must be overwhelming what the administration is hearing about supporting increasing the child tax credit and making it permanent, especially for those 12 million children who were left out of the recent tax package, because President Bush is finally urging the House to follow suit with the other body, saying that he wants to sign legislation that will restore tax credits for lower-income families and put the majority party's bad decision behind him.

Why is the Republican leadership in the House dragging its feet when we can help American families now?

Let us hold off on debating issues, even though we agree with them, like the underlying bill we are talking about, Internet gambling. Let us hold off on those issues until all working families are provided the benefits of the child tax credit. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, while it is imperative that we swiftly extend the child tax credit to lower-income families, it absolutely should not be part of a broad package that extends even more benefits to the wealthy.

We must pass a clean bill that solves the injustice that has been done to these hardworking families. Our priority must be the 12 million forgotten children, not more tax breaks for the rich, not debate about Internet gambling, not anything except giving the tax breaks to those hardworking families.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my good friend.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, not only because I believe the House should finally address the child tax credit, but also because the Committee on Rules refused to include an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) to allow American Indian tribes to operate Internet gambling sites on their reservations, the very action the overall bill gives to the States. Without the inclusion of this amendment, Indian tribes are unfairly singled out and cannot reap the same benefits States will receive if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in calling on the Republican leadership to follow the Senate's lead and immediately approve legislation that will provide a child tax credit to 12 million children, children Republicans left out of their bill last month. Included among these 12 million children are the children of U.S. military families.

A report out last week showed nearly 1 in 5 children of active duty U.S. military families will not benefit from the increased tax credit because their parents earn too little to qualify.

Mr. Speaker, it appears the only Republicans who do not fully comprehend the huge mistake they made in their tax bill are my Republican colleagues here in the House. Last week the Senate passed a bill. Yesterday the President's press secretary said his advice to the House Republicans is to pass it, to send it to him so he can sign it. And yet House Republicans continue to fight against common fairness.

Just today in an AP story that I will quote, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, it "ain't going to happen."

"DeLay said the House will not pass the Senate's bill. Instead, it will use the child tax credit as a bargaining chip to encourage the Senate to pass bigger tax cuts favored by the House."

And I have a quote of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), "What we are interested in is real solid tax relief for those who are paying taxes," he said.

So the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), on behalf of the House leadership, continues to stop the child tax credit from becoming law for these 12 million working families.

Now, let me point out that these workers do pay Federal taxes; 7.65 percent of their earnings go to pay for Social Security and Medicare. These hardworking parents also pay State and local taxes as well. An analysis released earlier this year by the New York Times found that families pay 14 percent of their income.

These people pay taxes and they deserve the child tax credit, too. Pass the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), my good friend.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I support the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Online gambling has a huge impact on individuals and families. But I am not supporting the rule because we have not been able to bring up the child tax credit. I went to the Rose Garden today for the celebration of Leave No Child Behind. And they were celebrating all of the States having plans and about what they were going to do about education and how they were going to move forward. And I supported that plan.

But today we are leaving children behind, 12 million children. These are children whose parents earn \$6, \$7, \$8, \$9, \$10, \$11, \$12 an hour. These are people that get up every morning, every noon, every afternoon, whatever their shift is. They go out and work hard, and yet they were denied the child tax credit.

□ 1545

It is time that we change that. The time is now. When I saw the quote from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) that said there are a lot of other things that are more important than that, referring to the child tax credit, I wanted to say to the gentleman, say it isn't so, say it isn't so. We need to pass this and get on with our business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this unlawful Internet funding prohibition act and in support of the Sensenbrenner-Conyers amendment.

I oppose this bill as a strong defender of tribal government, a strong advocate for tribal sovereignty, a strong believer in fairness and equity. I state, a strong believer in fairness and equity.

This bill does not treat solvent tribe governments with the same level of respect it does States. Section four of this bill provides for a carve-out for States that allows States to license Internet gaming operations for lottery, horse track, and corporate gambling operations.

Although the bill grants States with this exception, it does not provide tribal governments with the same exception. Have we not learned that it is wrong to treat our Native American brothers and sisters as second class citizens? One would think that we would know better.

Let me be clear, I will not be standing here today in opposition to this bill if tribal governments were treated equal, if tribal governments were treated equal.

I do not disagree with the principle behind this legislation, but I disagree with the effects on Native Americans and their economy. H.R. 2143 gives an unfair advantage to private gaming enterprises, and it treats tribal governments and their industry as inferior.

Just when we think that the centuries of mistreatment and discrimination are ending, something like this comes up or shows up. Once again, Congress is trying to put tribal government at a disadvantage. Once again, Congress is trying to put tribal government at a disadvantage; and once again, I will stand up and defend the sovereignty of our tribal governments. I will stand up and make sure that our government lives up to its responsibility, lives up to their responsibility.

Gaming provides the financial resources the tribes need to survive and bring economic development to their people. It provides resources. The tribal governments need to provide health, education and hope for their people. It is the livelihood of our Native American brothers and sisters.

I will not stand by and watch Congress put tribes behind the eight ball once again.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2143 and "yes" on the Sensenbrenner amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), my classmate and good friend, former Secretary of State of the State of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can take the Senate tax bill off the Speaker's table for immediate consideration.

On May 22, this House passed a bill that gives a tax break of \$93,500 to the average millionaire in our country. As Republicans rushed towards the Memorial Day recess, Vice President CHENEY cut a deal that left working, tax paying families out of the child tax credit expansion. That is right, \$93,500 for millionaires, not one cent to working lower-income families.

As the tax bill advanced in the House, I joined my colleagues and sent out three Dear Colleagues alerting Members of all parties to the fact that it left low-income, working, tax-paying families out in the cold by denying them marriage penalty relief under the earned income tax credit.

Republicans knew they were making low-income Americans wait years for the same benefit that they would offer more affluent families right now. Republicans of the House knew that their leadership and knew that the Bush White House had stuck it to low-income families again by denying them relief under the child tax credit, \$93,500 to millionaires and not one cent to lower-income working families. Republicans knew that the bill they supported offered that \$93,000 to millionaires and was a slap in the face to millions of tax-paying, working American families.

Democrats believe simple fairness demands that we act immediately to remedy the injustice; but the majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), says we will not do it, not while he is the Republican leader. He says there are a lot of other things that are more important than that. The majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), says we do not need to rush through this. Remember, \$93,500 for millionaires, not a cent for lower-income working families.

We had to rush to give millionaires this \$90,000 tax break; but when it comes to tax breaks for working tax-paying families, Republicans need time to think it over. While Republicans have left working families out in the cold by refusing to advance tax fairness legislation, they have moved on other bills.

For example, since that May 22 date, since Republicans were rushing out of town for the Memorial Day recess, Congress has renamed Federal buildings and post offices, congratulated baseball star Sammy Sosa, commemorated the 20th anniversary of National Tourism Week, and made it easier to clear bank checks. There is nothing wrong for any of those bills. I voted for all of them. But was any of them more important than helping 12 million children who were intentionally left behind by the Bush-Cheney-DeLay-GOP tax bill? Was any one of them more important, any of those pieces of legislation more important than helping 3.7 million working, low-income, tax-paying families whose marriages this House said were not worth as much as the marriage of their bosses? Not by a long shot, not in the wake of a tax bill that gives \$93,000 to millionaires, not one cent to tax-paying working families.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can take the Senate tax bill off the Speaker's table.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule; and my amendment will provide that as soon as the House passes this rule, it will take from the Speaker's table and immediately consider the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1308, which restores the refundable child tax credit that was removed from the recently passed Republican tax bill.

Let me make very clear to my colleagues in the House that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. A "no" vote will allow the House to vote on H.R. 2143 and on the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1308 as well. However, a "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House from voting on this badly needed tax package to provide real relief to America's working families.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can send this bill to the President today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I would just like to point out in the light of the conversations we have heard today that by definition a tax credit is a credit against income taxes paid. People who are left out supposedly were people who do not pay income taxes and do not get a credit because there is no place against which to lay that credit. I am sorry that we are turning the income tax system into a welfare program, but it appears that we are about to do that.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. Defeating the previous question allows us to discuss H.R. 2286 introduced by Congressman RANGEL to grant the Child Tax Credit to the thousands of needy families wrongfully ignored by the Republican majority.

When the conference report on the Republican tax cut was finished, the dividend tax cut got bigger and tax credits for working families got smaller. It is unconscionable that we are willing to sacrifice Child Tax Credits for the poorest in our society, so that we can give more money to the wealthiest.

Six and a half million families in this Nation earn \$10,500 to \$26,625 per year. If we do not pass a child tax credit for these families, 19 million children will be ignored. In my home State of California, nearly 1.3 million families alone, will not receive a child tax credit under the Republican's plan. These families need tax relief.

By not passing a child tax credit, 250,000 kids of active duty military families, many of whom are right now fighting overseas, will be ignored. Military families need tax relief.

Our economy is in desperate need of stimulation. Unemployment across the Nation has risen to 6.1 percent. The Hispanic unemployment rate alone is currently at 8.2 percent. America's families are suffering. They need immediate relief from the burden of a weak economy.

During this time of economic downturn we must not leave out those who are working harder for less pay or those who have recently joined the ranks of the unemployed. It is time to put working families back into the equation. America's families need our help. They need a child tax credit.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 263—RULE ON H.R. 2143: THE UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1308) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end certain abusive tax practices, to provide tax relief and simplification, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and a single motion that the House concur in each of the Senate amendments shall be considered as pending without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—222

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Bereuter
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Biggart
Bachus	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Baker	Bass	Bishop (UT)
Ballenger	Beauprez	Blackburn

Blunt Greenwood
Boehrlert Gutknecht
Boehner Harris
Bonilla Hart
Bonner Hastings (WA)
Bono Hayes
Boozman Hayworth
Bradley (NH) Hefley
Brady (TX) Hensarling
Brown (SC) Hobson
Brown-Waite, Hoekstra
Ginny Hostettler
Burgess Hulshof
Burns Hunter
Burr Hyde
Burton (IN) Isakson
Buyer Issa
Calvert Istook
Camp Janklow
Cannon Jenkins
Cantor Johnson (CT)
Capito Johnson (IL)
Carter Johnson, Sam
Castle Jones (NC)
Chabot Keller
Chocola Kelly
Coble Kennedy (MN)
Collins King (IA)
Cox King (NY)
Crane Kingston
Crenshaw Kirk
Cubin Kline
Culberson Knollenberg
Cunningham Kolbe
Davis, Jo Ann LaHood
Davis, Tom Latham
Deal (GA) LaTourette
DeLay Leach
DeMint Lewis (CA)
Diaz-Balart, L. Lewis (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M. Linder
Doolittle LoBiondo
Dreier Lucas (OK)
Duncan Manzullo
Dunn McCotter
Ehlers McCreery
Emerson McHugh
English McInnis
Everett McKeon
Feeney Mica
Ferguson Miller (FL)
Flake Miller (MI)
Foley Miller, Gary
Forbes Moran (KS)
Fossella Murphy
Franks (AZ) Musgrave
Frelinghuysen Myrick
Gallegly Nethercutt
Garrett (NJ) Neugebauer
Gerlach Ney
Gibbons Northup
Gilchrest Norwood
Gillmor Nunes
Gingrey Nussle
Goode Osborne
Goodlatte Ose
Goss Otter
Granger Oxley
Graves Paul
Green (WI) Pearce

NAYS—196

Abercrombie Carson (IN)
Ackerman Carson (OK)
Alexander Case
Allen Clay
Andrews Clyburn
Baca Conyers
Baird Cooper
Baldwin Costello
Ballance Cramer
Becerra Crowley
Bell Cummings
Berkley Davis (AL)
Berman Davis (CA)
Berry Davis (FL)
Bishop (GA) Davis (IL)
Bishop (NY) Davis (TN)
Blumenauer DeFazio
Boswell Delahunt
Boucher DeLauro
Boyd Deutsch
Brady (PA) Dicks
Brown (OH) Dingell
Brown, Corrine Doggett
Capps Dooley (CA)
Capuano Doyle
Cardin Edwards
Cardoza Emanuel

Pence Peterson (PA)
Petri Petri
Pickering Pickering
Pitts Pitts
Platts Platts
Pombo Pombo
Porter Porter
Portman Portman
Pryce (OH) Pryce (OH)
Putnam Putnam
Quinn Quinn
Radanovich Radanovich
Ramstad Ramstad
Regula Regula
Rehberg Rehberg
Renzi Renzi
Reynolds Reynolds
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
Royce Royce
Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS) Ryun (KS)
Saxton Saxton
Schrock Schrock
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
Sessions Sessions
Shadegg Shadegg
Shaw Shaw
Shays Shays
Sherwood Sherwood
Shimkus Shimkus
Shuster Shuster
Simmons Simmons
Simpson Simpson
Smith (MI) Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX) Smith (TX)
Souder Souder
Stearns Stearns
Sullivan Sullivan
Sweeney Sweeney
Tancredo Tancredo
Tauzin Tauzin
Taylor (NC) Taylor (NC)
Terry Terry
Thomas Thomas
Thornberry Thornberry
Tiahrt Tiahrt
Tiberi Tiberi
Turner (OH) Turner (OH)
Upton Upton
Vitter Vitter
Walden (OR) Walden (OR)
Walsh Walsh
Wamp Wamp
Weldon (FL) Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA) Weldon (PA)
Weller Weller
Whitfield Whitfield
Wicker Wicker
Wilson (NM) Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wolf Wolf
Young (AK) Young (AK)

Jackson (IL) Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee
(TX) (TX)
Jefferson Jefferson
John John
Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH) Jones (OH)
Kanjorski Kanjorski
Kaptur Kaptur
Kennedy (RI) Kennedy (RI)
Kildee Kildee
Kilpatrick Kilpatrick
Kind Kind
Kleczka Kleczka
Kucinich Kucinich
Lampson Lampson
Langevin Langevin
Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
Lee Lee
Levin Levin
Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
Lipinski Lipinski
Lofgren Lofgren
Lowey Lowey
Lucas (KY) Lucas (KY)
Lynch Lynch
Majette Majette
Maloney Maloney
Markey Markey
Marshall Marshall
Matheson Matheson
Matsui Matsui
McCarthy (MO) McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY) McCarthy (NY)
McCollum McCollum
McDermott McDermott
McGovern McGovern
McIntyre McIntyre
McNulty McNulty
Meehan Meehan

Cole Cole
DeGette DeGette
Eshoo Eshoo
Fletcher Fletcher
Gephardt Gephardt
Gordon Gordon

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1615

Messrs. MARSHALL, WEINER, SCOTT of Georgia and RODRIQUEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 158, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—259

Aderholt Aderholt
Akin Akin
Bachus Bachus
Baker Baker
Ballenger Ballenger
Barrett (SC) Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD) Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX) Barton (TX)
Bass Bass
Beauprez Beauprez
Bereuter Bereuter
Berry Berry
Biggart Biggart

Bilirakis Bilirakis
Bishop (GA) Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT) Bishop (UT)
Blackburn Blackburn
Blunt Blunt
Boehrlert Boehrlert
Boehner Boehner
Bonilla Bonilla
Bonner Bonner
Bono Bono
Boozman Boozman
Boswell Boswell
Boyd Boyd

Sanchez, Loretta Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders Sanders
Sandlin Sandlin
Schakowsky Schakowsky
Schiff Schiff
Scott (GA) Scott (GA)
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
Serrano Serrano
Sherman Sherman
Skelton Skelton
Slaughter Slaughter
Snyder Snyder
Solis Solis
Spratt Spratt
Stark Stark
Stenholm Stenholm
Strickland Strickland
Stupak Stupak
Tanner Tanner
Tauscher Tauscher
Taylor (MS) Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Towns Towns
Turner (TX) Turner (TX)
Udall (CO) Udall (CO)
Udall (NM) Udall (NM)
Van Hollen Van Hollen
Velazquez Velazquez
Visclosky Visclosky
Watson Watson
Watt Watt
Waxman Waxman
Weiner Weiner
Wexler Wexler
Woolsey Woolsey
Wu Wu
Wynn Wynn

Henger Henger
Houghton Houghton
Lantos Lantos
Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
Rush Rush
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)

Tierney Tierney
Toomey Toomey
Waters Waters
Young (FL) Young (FL)

Cantor Cantor
Capito Capito
Cardin Cardin
Cardoza Cardoza
Carter Carter
Case Case
Castle Castle
Chabot Chabot
Chocola Chocola
Coble Coble
Collins Collins
Cox Cox
Crane Crane
Crenshaw Crenshaw
Crowley Crowley
Cubin Cubin
Culberson Culberson
Cunningham Cunningham
Davis (AL) Davis (AL)
Davis (CA) Davis (CA)
Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom Davis, Tom
Deal (GA) Deal (GA)
DeMint DeMint
Deutsch Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L. Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M. Diaz-Balart, M.
Dooley (CA) Dooley (CA)
Doolittle Doolittle
Dreier Dreier
Duncan Duncan
Dunn Dunn
Ehlers Ehlers
Emerson Emerson
English English
Everett Everett
Feeney Feeney
Ferguson Ferguson
Flake Flake
Foley Foley
Forbes Forbes
Fossella Fossella
Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen
Gallegly Gallegly
Garrett (NJ) Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach Gerlach
Gibbons Gibbons
Gilchrest Gilchrest
Gillmor Gillmor
Gingrey Gingrey
Goode Goode
Goodlatte Goodlatte
Goss Goss
Granger Granger
Graves Graves
Green (WI) Green (WI)

NOES—158

Abercrombie Abercrombie
Ackerman Ackerman
Alexander Alexander
Allen Allen
Andrews Andrews
Baca Baca
Baird Baird
Baldwin Baldwin
Ballance Ballance
Becerra Becerra
Bell Bell
Berkley Berkley
Berman Berman
Bishop (NY) Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer Blumenauer
Boucher Boucher
Brady (PA) Brady (PA)
Brown (OH) Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine Brown, Corrine
Capps Capps
Capuano Capuano
Carson (IN) Carson (IN)

Hoekstra Hoekstra
Hostettler Hostettler
Hulshof Hulshof
Hunter Hunter
Hyde Hyde
Isakson Isakson
Israel Israel
Issa Issa
Istook Istook
Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee
(TX) (TX)
Janklow Janklow
Jefferson Jefferson
Johnson (CT) Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL) Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC) Jones (NC)
Keller Keller
Kelly Kelly
Kennedy (MN) Kennedy (MN)
King (IA) King (IA)
King (NY) King (NY)
Kingston Kingston
Kirk Kirk
Kline Kline
Knollenberg Knollenberg
Kolbe Kolbe
LaHood LaHood
Latham Latham
LaTourette LaTourette
LaTourette LaTourette
Leach Leach
Lewis (CA) Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY) Lewis (KY)
Linder Linder
LoBiondo LoBiondo
Lucas (OK) Lucas (OK)
Manzullo Manzullo
McCotter McCotter
McCreery McCreery
McHugh McHugh
McInnis McInnis
McIntyre McIntyre
McKeon McKeon
Mica Mica
Michaud Michaud
Miller (FL) Miller (FL)
Miller (MI) Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary Miller, Gary
Moran (KS) Moran (KS)
Moran (VA) Moran (VA)
Murphy Murphy
Musgrave Musgrave
Myrick Myrick
Nethercutt Nethercutt
Neugebauer Neugebauer
Ney Ney
Northup Northup
Norwood Norwood
Nunes Nunes
Nussle Nussle
Ortiz Ortiz
Osborne Osborne
Ose Ose
Otter Otter
Oxley Oxley
Pascrell Pascrell
Paul Paul
Pearce Pearce
Pence Pence
Peterson (PA) Peterson (PA)

Clay Clay
Clyburn Clyburn
Conyers Conyers
Cooper Cooper
Costello Costello
Cummings Cummings
Davis (FL) Davis (FL)
Davis (IL) Davis (IL)
Davis (TN) Davis (TN)
DeFazio DeFazio
DeGette DeGette
Delahunt Delahunt
DeLauro DeLauro
Dicks Dicks
Dingell Dingell
Doggett Doggett
Doyle Doyle
Emanuel Emanuel
Engel Engel
Etheridge Etheridge
Evans Evans
Farr Farr

Petri Petri
Pickering Pickering
Pitts Pitts
Platts Platts
Pombo Pombo
Porter Porter
Portman Portman
Pryce (OH) Pryce (OH)
Putnam Putnam
Quinn Quinn
Radanovich Radanovich
Ramstad Ramstad
Regula Regula
Rehberg Rehberg
Renzi Renzi
Reynolds Reynolds
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI) Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen Ros-Lehtinen
Ross Ross
Royce Royce
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI) Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS) Ryun (KS)
Sandlin Sandlin
Saxton Saxton
Schrock Schrock
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
Sessions Sessions
Shadegg Shadegg
Shaw Shaw
Shays Shays
Sherwood Sherwood
Shimkus Shimkus
Shuster Shuster
Simmons Simmons
Simpson Simpson
Skelton Skelton
Smith (MI) Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX) Smith (TX)
Souder Souder
Stearns Stearns
Sullivan Sullivan
Sweeney Sweeney
Tancredo Tancredo
Tanner Tanner
Tauzin Tauzin
Taylor (NC) Taylor (NC)
Terry Terry
Thomas Thomas
Thornberry Thornberry
Tiahrt Tiahrt
Tiberi Tiberi
Turner (OH) Turner (OH)
Turner (TX) Turner (TX)
Upton Upton
Vitter Vitter
Walden (OR) Walden (OR)
Walsh Walsh
Wamp Wamp
Weldon (FL) Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA) Weldon (PA)
Weller Weller
Whitfield Whitfield
Wicker Wicker
Wilson (NM) Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wolf Wolf
Wu Wu
Young (AK) Young (AK)

Fattah Fattah
Filner Filner
Ford Ford
Frank (MA) Frank (MA)
Frost Frost
Gonzalez Gonzalez
Green (TX) Green (TX)
Grijalva Grijalva
Gutierrez Gutierrez
Hastings (FL) Hastings (FL)
Hinche Hinche
Hoeffel Hoeffel
Holden Holden
Holt Holt
Honda Honda
Hooley (OR) Hooley (OR)
Hoyer Hoyer
Inlee Inlee
Jackson (IL) Jackson (IL)
John John
Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH) Jones (OH)

Kanjorski	Millender-	Sanders
Kaptur	McDonald	Schakowsky
Kennedy (RI)	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Kildee	Miller, George	Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kind	Moore	Serrano
Klecza	Murtha	Sherman
Kucinich	Nadler	Slaughter
Lampson	Napolitano	Snyder
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Solis
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Spratt
Lee	Obey	Stark
Levin	Olver	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Stupak
Lipinski	Pallone	Tauscher
Lofgren	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Lowey	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Lynch	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Majette	Peterson (MN)	Towns
Maloney	Pomeroy	Udall (CO)
Markey	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Matsui	Rahall	Van Hollen
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Velazquez
McCollum	Reyes	Visclosky
McDermott	Rodriguez	Watson
McGovern	Rothman	Watt
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wexler
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Woolsey
Menendez	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Carson (OK)	Gordon	Smith (WA)
Cole	Houghton	Tierney
DeLay	Jenkins	Toomey
Eshoo	Jantos	Waters
Fletcher	Larson (CT)	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1623

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida changed her vote from "aye" to "no." So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2003 for rollcall votes 252 and 253, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present, on rollcall vote No. 252, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote No. 253, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2143.

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

There was no objection.

UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2143.

□ 1625

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill today. There are going to be several amendments offered. One amendment will be offered as if it is an antigambling amendment. In essence, the amendment will actually bring this bill down. Fifteen years ago, there was gambling in two States, Nevada and New Jersey. Once we in this country moved to what we call convenience gambling, we have seen an increase in crime, corruption, domestic violence, physical abuse, and many other bad things that we Republicans and Democrats do not want to see. The ultimate in what is called "convenience gambling," meaning that you do not have to go very far to gamble, is Internet gambling where you can sit in your own family room in your bathrobe on a rainy weekend and literally go broke in about 24 hours.

There will be an amendment offered that will be sort of viewed as maybe some of the pro-family groups are for it. Let me say I have a letter to the gentleman from Alabama signed by the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, the Family Research Council, the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, and the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches headed by former Democratic Congressman Bob Edgar who served here for many years.

I would ask you, do not support the amendments that will weaken this bill. Internet gambling is beginning to be very corrosive in our society. We have a chance to deal with Internet gambling in the Bachus bill that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and other Members of the House have put forth. I rise in strong support of the bill. I think this is an opportunity to get control of Internet gambling and to do it in a way that is constructive and positive.

I ask my colleagues, one, support the bill on final passage; but, lastly, do not support any amendments that may ap-

pear on the surface to be good but what will in essence bring down this bill and thereby mean that Internet gambling will never be controlled. Five to 7 percent of the young people in our country are addicted to gambling.

□ 1630

As Internet gambling becomes easier and easier, that addiction rate goes up.

So I hope Members will oppose the amendments that will really bring the bill down, and on final passage do something to help this country, to help the young people, to get control of it, to get control and regulate Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, legislation needed to prevent the use of credit cards, checks, or electronic funds transfers for unlawful Internet gambling. It will be of vital assistance in curbing illegal Internet gambling.

This legislation states in the findings section that: "the National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent them."

As the author of the legislation which established the commission, I am pleased to see that one of its most important recommendations may indeed become law. The spread of Internet gambling means that people can now gamble at the workplace and their homes, around the clock. The unchecked progress of Internet gambling must be curbed.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission report went on to state that gambling can breed bankruptcy, divorce, domestic violence, and physical and emotional problems. Even suicide has been linked to gambling. Often times, even school-aged children—who have never gambled before—are lured into on-line gambling.

H.R. 2143 will establish an enforcement structure that will let federal regulators set up regulations which will limit the acceptance of bank instruments such as credit cards for use in illegal Internet gambling, reducing the chance for gambling to gain a further foothold in our society.

Before I close, let me share with you a story. Donna Kelly, a mother of a 12-year-old daughter and a 7-year-old son developed a gambling problem. At one time there were 13 warrants for her arrest for writing bad checks. Gambling had so wrecked her life that she saw only one option: suicide. Two days before Thanksgiving, she tried to kill herself. She failed, and was placed in a mental hospital. Mrs. Kelly spent Thanksgiving in a mental hospital because of her gambling problem.

Her daughter asked her afterwards, "Momma, why did you try to kill yourself? Do you not love me anymore?" This is the human dimension to gambling. This story illustrates why it is so important to vote for this bill. When you cast your vote today, remember the many lives ruined by gambling, and remember the family members left devastated by their loved ones gambling activities.

Internet gambling is a vast and growing enterprise which can serve as an avenue for money launders and terrorist funding. Gambling also involves great social costs. This bill will reduce access to the medium of the Internet as another forum for inducing people to

gamble. I urge Members to vote for this legislation.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
House of Representatives, Financial Services
Committee Member, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BACHUS: As a diverse bipartisan coalition of family and faith-based organizations, we are very concerned with the effects of gambling on our society and the well-being of young people and families. We write to strongly support the passage of H.R. 2143, To Prevent the Use of Certain Bank Instruments for Unlawful Internet Gambling, and for Other Purposes. Internet Gambling is already against the law in all 50 states, yet offshore gambling interests continue to operate without any accountability and are available in every state by utilizing the Internet. We urge you to support H.R. 2143 and reject any amendment or proposal which would weaken the bill or hinder its enforcement according to current federal law.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report presents a disturbing and devastating picture of the effect of gambling on families. Some critical points to consider in the report as it relates to Internet gambling are:

Gambling costs society \$5 billion a year in societal costs including job loss, unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, poor physical and mental health, and problem or pathological gambling treatment, bankruptcy, arrests, imprisonment, legal fees for divorce, and so forth.

Because the Internet can be used anonymously, the danger exists that access to Internet gambling will be abused by underage gamblers, our children and youth.

The high-speed instant gratification of Internet games and the high level of privacy they offer may exacerbate problem and pathological gambling.

Lack of accountability also raises the potential for criminal activities, which can occur in several ways. First, there is the possibility of abuse by gambling operators. Most Internet service providers hosting Internet gambling operations are physically located offshore; as a result, operators can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes. Furthermore, gambling on the Internet provides an easy means for money laundering. Internet gambling provides anonymity, remote access, and encrypted data. To launder money, a person need only deposit money into an offshore account, use those funds to gamble, lose a small percent of the original funds, then cash out the remaining funds. Through the dual protection of encryption and anonymity, much of this activity can take place undetected.

Computer hackers or gambling operators may tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit. Unlike the physical world of highly regulated resort-destination casinos, assessing the integrity of Internet operators is quite difficult.

Please support H.R. 2143 and reject the spread of a predatory industry, which is contrary to the well-being of individuals and all of society.

Sincerely,

Christian Coalition of America, Concerned Women for America, Family Research Council, General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, National Council of Christians.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. I thank

the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for all of the hard work he has done on this particular piece of legislation, for working with me and the rest of the subcommittee.

This bill is really about enforcing what is already illegal activity. I have had several people come up to me and say, well, what does this bill really do? What this bill really does, it takes what is already illegal, it makes nothing more illegal or nothing less illegal, it takes what is already illegal and tries to enforce that law.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, for the opportunity to manage the debate for the Democratic Caucus. He and I do not see eye to eye on this legislation, but I appreciate and respect the fact that we agreed to disagree, and I welcome healthy debate on the topic of illegal Internet gambling.

I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2143, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services in March. Actions taken recently by the Committee on the Judiciary served to weaken this bill in such a way as to throw into question whether the bill would still adequately preserve the Federal law and protect States rights when it comes to regulating Internet gambling. Today's legislation will reduce that uncertainty by moving forward with the financial services-related provisions of H.R. 2143, which would serve as a core purpose of the bill to shut off that financial spigot to the illegal offshore casino sites.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a minute about what that financial spigot looks like. It is currently around \$6 billion a year. None of that contributes to the United States economy. There are between 1,500 and 2,000 offshore Internet gambling sites. Unlawful Internet gambling is a scourge of our society. It not only leads to crime, but in many cases it is run by criminal enterprises. By shutting off the funding flow, we will go a long way toward shutting down these illicit enterprises.

The Committee on Financial Services and all of the members, the ranking member and the chair, have worked diligently over the last few years with industry groups and civic organizations to strengthen the measure and to build support for its enactment. We consulted with financial services companies to improve the bill, recognizing current industry practices and protecting firms from liability for refusing to honor restricted transactions.

The policy rationale for this legislation is very simple: Offshore Internet gambling is already deemed illegal. By continuing to allow the financing of illegal Internet gambling, we are stating that we are not serious about enforcing the law. Worse, the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Department of State have all stated that Internet gambling can be exploited to launder money for such groups as drug dealers,

organized crime and terrorist organizations.

Now is the time to close the loophole that allows illegal Internet gambling to still exist in the United States.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN). I understand he has an inquiry about this legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to engage the chairman in a brief colloquy and say that I commend him for his very important work on this legislation, which I strongly support.

As the chairman is aware, there are legitimate businesses Ohio and elsewhere that provide legal, skill-based Internet games, such as Monopoly and Boggle. Is it the gentleman's understanding that H.R. 2143 is not intended to apply to these games of skill that are played, created, or distributed over the Internet and which do not involve the risk of something of value?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. It is intended to apply to gambling, which is primarily determined by chance, rather than the skill of one of the players over the other.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chair. As we know, several States and the District of Columbia have State lotteries that fund education and other State needs. In these States, the lotteries operate under a strict set of State rules.

Is it the gentleman's understanding, again, that H.R. 2143 is not intended to prohibit the use of electronic fund transfers, ACH transactions, checks or other bank instruments to pay for lottery play within the boundaries of a State within which the lot is located?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so long as it is legal within that State, that is correct.

Mr. PORTMAN. Again, I commend the chairman for his good work on this legislation. I hope he can beat back the amendments.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I both commend and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the full committee, who has been instrumental in bringing this legislation to the floor.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today, H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Funding Prohibition Act, represents the culmination of many hours of deliberation and hard work on the part of members and staff of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the former chairman of the

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, has led a determined battle to cut off the financial lifeblood of the unlawful Internet gambling industry, and the battle has been joined with vigor by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, and the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been a staunch advocate in the committee's efforts to stop this illegal activity. I want to commend both of them for their strong leadership.

Support for our committee's efforts to stop the money flow to illegal gambling sites has been nearly universal, from family and religious groups, to anti-gambling groups, from professional sports to college athletics, from major players in the banking and credit card industries, to law enforcement and Internet service providers.

Mr. Chairman, it would be far easier and far quicker just to list who does not support such efforts. That would, of course, be the illegal Internet gambling industry itself and the "wannabes" waiting in the wing for some sign that the Federal Government will roll over and sanction Internet gambling. They have launched an all-out effort at obfuscation and mischaracterization in hopes of defeating this bill and perpetuating their obnoxious activities.

Six years ago Internet gambling was nearly nonexistent. Indeed, the Internet itself was just coming into its own. Sadly, just as nature abhors a vacuum, so do criminals, and it was just a matter of time before gambling sites began cropping up offshore, beyond the reach of U.S. regulators and law enforcement.

Seeing their opportunity, they multiplied unchecked, gobbling up victims in the United States who represented the most vulnerable in our society: children, college students, and problem gamblers. Enticed by pop-up ads that promised untold riches, these victims yielded up their credit card numbers and other valuable personal financial information to an unregulated criminal element that could use that information as it chose.

All of the privacy hawks in this Chamber need to listen to this plea. The Committee on Financial Services has heard testimony from the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI that Internet gambling serves as a haven for money launderers, and unregulated offshore gambling sites can be exploited by terrorists to launder money. FBI Director Mueller, in testimony before our committee, cited Internet gambling as a substantial problem for law enforcement. That view has been reinforced by the Financial Action Task Force, an international body that seeks to combat money laundering, which stated in a 2001 report that some member countries had evidence that criminals were using Internet gambling to launder their illicit funds.

For the record, let us make clear what the bill does and what it does not

do. It does require the Federal functional regulators to establish regulations to limit the acceptance of U.S. financial instruments, such as credit cards, for use in unlawful Internet gambling transactions. By so doing, it cuts off the financial lifeblood of the illegal Internet gambling industry.

It does not, and I point out, it does not expand gambling in any way, shape, or form. Why would we want to do that? Those who claim otherwise are either not telling the truth, or they simply do not get it.

The bill's provisions kick in only, and only, where a regulator determines that an illegal activity has taken place and relies on Federal and State law current at that time to guide in that determination.

Let me be crystal clear: H.R. 2143 protects the right of States to regulate gambling within their borders. It neither expands nor limits gambling beyond what is allowed under existing Federal, State and Tribal law.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2143 represents legislation at its best. It is a directed approach to a serious problem. It will give regulators an important new tool to fight unlawful Internet gambling, and will protect families throughout America. It deserves the support and vote of every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to point out that this legislation is intended to address funding of illegal Internet gambling, not to regulate general purpose communications networks that may be used in isolated instances to transmit funds. The terms "networks" and "participants in networks", used in section 3(c) and in the definition of a "Designated Payment System" in section (4)(3), are intended to refer to payment networks, such as funds transfer networks, not to general purpose telecommunications or Internet networks. Thus, this bill would not regulate the provision of Internet connectivity or frame relay service to an electronic funds transfer network, but would regulate the operation of the funds transfer network itself.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all compliment my good friend, the gentleman from the other half of Birmingham, Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), for his leadership on this issue.

I take up where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) left off. This is a very well-conceived piece of legislation. I speak from the perspective of someone who spent 5 years as a Federal prosecutor.

When I started out as a Federal prosecutor, we did not hear a whole lot of about gambling, frankly, from a lot of the people who crossed my desk. By the time I left, gambling had become the means of choice for disguising large sums of money being moved back and forth by drug dealers.

It goes without saying that in this age of Internet access, a lot of children

are finding their way to a lot of things that parents do not know that they are finding, and one of them is Internet gambling.

This is a positive bill. I will note that some people have raised concerns about how financial institutions would go about enforcing it, how they would go about policing and enforcing the various mechanisms contained within it. And I will note for those who raised those concerns that this legislation only requires financial institutions to develop adequate policies and procedures for identifying and blocking gambling payments.

Most of the credit card industry and most of the financial services industry have said they can easily take on this burden. It is a burden that they regularly assume in policing all kinds of transactions.

I do want to address one line of amendments that I do expect will come before the House today, and it deals with the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin that refers to one very specific section of the bill. Right now this bill would exclude from its coverage "any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized from a State."

That is an important provision, for a very simple reason. As many of my colleagues well know, a number of States in this country permit various forms of pari-mutuel betting. We may not like that, we may not engage in it, but there is not one of us in this institution who questions that it is the right of a State to determine what is gambling and what is not gambling. It is the right of the State of Alabama to decide and the right of our legislature to decide if we are going to recognize pari-mutuel betting or not.

If this amendment, which I believe is well-guided, were to be enacted, it would fundamentally change the purpose of this bill, because what it would do, very simply, is it would prevent a State from accepting pari-mutuel betting or any other forms of gambling that have been recognized, frankly, and declared as permissible by State law.

We talk a lot about States rights in this institution, and both parties now have picked up that mantra. It is in the interests of States rights if we decide that States can decide what is legal and what is not illegal. So I would urge my colleagues to reject the stream of amendments that would take away the States' ability to decide what is valid inside their own house.

So I close, Mr. Chairman, by saying this is well constructed, bipartisan legislation of the kind, frankly, that our committee regularly and routinely produces.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose my chairman of the full committee, but I am doing it today. What

I am saying today is consistent with what I have said previously about this bill. We reported the bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security without the Cannon amendment. The Cannon amendment was added in full committee and comes back to us today when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENBRENNER) submits his amendment subsequently.

The amendment, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, will strike the provision of the bill that states that the term "bets or wagers" does not include any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized by a State. This provision is duplicative of the actual definition of "unlawful Internet gambling," which is defined as a bet or wager that is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law.

□ 1645

I am told, Mr. Chairman, and I think the gentleman from Louisiana has corroborated this, that some groups feel that this is a carve-out from the prohibition set forth in the bill. I believe that those groups who so declare are misinterpreting current law and, with or without this provision, we still have to contend with the prohibitions of the Wire Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Sensenbrenner amendment will pretty well remove the muscle from the arm of States' rights. I believe that the language that the Sensenbrenner amendment seeks to strike simply preserves the ability of States to regulate gambling, and that is where I think the regulatory issue should arise.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), our ranking member.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, where are the libertarians when we need them? What we have before us is the Inconsistency Act of 2003. Rarely has a bill come forward which is in conflict with as many principles as Members of this House have professed. In the first place, we have the question as to whether or not we should substitute the government's opinion for individuals' choices.

Now, there are ills in this world against which people should be protected. There are economic injustices, there are environmental problems, there are criminal elements who would prey on people. I spend all of my energy trying to protect people against things done by others, whether forces of nature or individuals, that would harm them. I envy my colleagues who have more energy than I. I do not have enough left to protect people against themselves. This is an example of our deciding that we cannot trust adults to decide what to do with their own money.

Now, if we were talking about someone who was being forced to gamble at

gunpoint, I am with you. If there are people who are being coerced into putting down a bet, let us protect them. But if an individual has gone out and earned his or her money and decides he or she wants to gamble, why in the world is it anybody in this building's business?

So we, first of all, have this inconsistency with the principle of let us keep big government off our backs. I do not myself gamble. I do not like to see my money go when I do not have any control over it, and so I do not gamble. And other people who are opposed to gambling, I do not always hold myself out as an example, but I will in this case. Be like me: do not gamble. But if other people want to put a bet down, mind your own business.

Now, there are people for whom this is enjoyable. I do not understand why we should cast aspersions on them. And it is true, some people will abuse it. There are a minority of people who will abuse this. But the notion that we prevent adults from making their own choices with their own money, to do things which have no harmful effect on anyone else, because a minority of people will abuse them is, of course, a very dangerous principle. There are people who drink too much. There are people who go to too many movies. There are people who do a lot of things in excess that most of us do in moderation. Ban the excess, if you want to; deal with the consequences of the excess. This is a violation, though, what we are doing now, of the fundamental principle: leave people alone.

There is another principle that I have heard: the sanctity of the Internet. We are told that we should not interfere with the Internet. Indeed, this House has refused to cooperate with State governments; now, many of them are in terrible fiscal crises, cutting back on health care, laying off public safety officials, but we will not cooperate with them in collecting sales taxes from people who buy things over the Internet in competition with local communities, and they lose tax revenue. But we say, oh, no, we cannot touch the Internet, unless it is being used for something people here do not like. That is basically what is involved here.

We have, and there is an interesting conjunction here of liberals and conservatives. Conservatives do not like it, some of them because I read from some of the very conservative groups that it is immoral to gamble. I am often baffled by their morality, and I do not understand why it is immoral to gamble. I am struck by so many of my liberal friends who do not want people to gamble. Indeed, gambling is, to many liberals, what sex-oriented literature is to conservatives. They do not like it, so they do not want anyone else to do it. There are people who do not like gambling; then do not gamble. But why use the law to prevent other people from doing it?

Now, I know they say, well, but this is not just making it illegal; this is

doing this, that, and the other. But let us cut right down to it. This is being put forward by people who do not like gambling and want to make it harder to gamble, and their principle of keeping government out of private choices, forget about it; their principle of being able to use the Internet without interference, forget about that; and their respect for financial institutions, forget about that.

Now, they say children will abuse it. I understand that. That is a serious effort. I am prepared to cooperate in efforts to try to protect children, although we should know that the major protection of children ought to be their own parents. This is protecting children, forgetting about any parental role; but that is another principle that is a problem. You cannot, in my judgment, sensibly, in a society like ours, make it illegal for adults to do things because there is a possibility that some young people will do them when they should not. Let us work on ways to prevent children from doing this sort of thing.

Gambling is a perfectly legitimate human activity. There are people who enjoy it. There are people who find that it engages them. I do not think they ought to be anesthetized on the floor of the House, but being anesthetized, I guess a lot of people do not pay a lot of attention to what we say. No real harm there. But when you take the law of the United States and you now put further criminal penalties here and further restrict people, I think we are making a very grave error.

So I hope Members who have talked about States' rights, who have talked about individual liberty being protected from an overreaching government, who have talked about not stifling the Internet and its creativity, will think about one of those things when you come to vote on this bill and vote it down.

I thank the gentlewoman for managing this time and yielding this time to me. I am the senior minority member, but since the majority of members of my committee, in a temporary lapse from their usual good judgment, supported this bill; I did not think it was appropriate for me to be the manager.

But I do hope that individual freedom, a distrust of overreaching government, a respect for the rights of State and local jurisdictions, and a respect for the Internet will count for something when we vote.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman that this bill is not about opposing legal gambling. This bill is about opposing mob activity, criminal activity. The FBI says that organized crime is behind these Internet sites. This is about the unsupervised, illegal, untaxed Internet gambling. Illegal, offshore.

We talk about adults. These sites specifically target preteenaged children; and as the University of Connecticut has shown us, it is becoming a problem for many of our teenagers. They are becoming addicted to it, and they then turn to crime. This is about protecting Americans from crime that arises from these sites, specifically from these sites.

In the gentleman's own State, Dr. Schaffer, Harvard Medical School, likened illegal Internet gambling to crack cocaine, and he said, "It is changing the gambling scene as crack cocaine changed the drug scene." We have all seen the scourge of crack cocaine. We have seen how it has ruined our country, ruined our youth. We have seen Adrian McPherson, a young man with a lot of promise, a star quarterback, a Mr. Basketball in the State of Florida, Mr. Football, we have seen him on trial, accused of Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, this is simply about enforcing the laws of this country and protecting our youth. We take the animals of the field, the one thing they do is they protect their youth. If dogs, cats, rabbits, any animal, if they protect their youth, at least we can rise to that level and above that level and protect the youth of our country.

Finally, as the NCAA said when they urged us to adopt this legislation for 5 straight years, "Illegal Internet gambling is destroying the integrity of college sports and we have scandals in the making." Let us put an end to it; let us put an end to it now. Let us vote for this bill. Let us vote for the Kelly amendment. Let us vote against the Cannon amendment, which is a poison pill, as we all recognize, any of us who have studied the issue at all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who has conducted extensive hearings on this matter.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the intention of this legislation. Section 4, subsection 2(E)(ix), exempts transactions with a business licensed or authorized by a State from the definition of "bets or wagers" under the bill.

Some parties have raised concerns that this could be read broadly to allow the transmission of casino or lottery games in interstate commerce, for example, over the Internet, simply because one State authorizes its businesses to do so. I want to make clear that this exemption will not expand the reach of gambling in any way. It is intended to recognize current law that allows States jurisdiction over wholly intrastate activity, where bets or wagers, or information assisting bets or wagers, do not cross State lines or enter into interstate commerce.

The exemption would leave intact the current interstate gambling prohibition such as the Wire Act, Federal prohibitions on lotteries, and the Gam-

bling Ship Act, so that casino and lottery games could not be placed on the Internet. Is that correct?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman's assessment of the intent is accurate. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join us in standing against illegal Internet gambling. These Web sites are extremely destructive, and it is time we put them out of business.

We all know that illegal money transfer has funded terrorism in this Nation. We need to dry up terrorism's money. Anyone who cares about their personal safety and the safety of the people in this Nation needs to vote for this bill.

This legislation will bar Internet gambling access to the U.S. financial services network by preventing the use of credit cards, wire transfers, or any other bank instrument to fund gaming associations.

Representatives of the offshore casino industry have tried to make the case that Internet gambling is a harmless activity that can easily be brought under control by Federal regulation; but, unfortunately, that is not true on many fronts. It is technologically impossible to create safeguards that will regulate Internet gambling. That means anyone with access to a credit card, including children, can access these sites. Anyone who is a terrorist with a credit card can transfer money this way.

As the FBI closes down on other money-laundering schemes, more illicit funds are expected to move through Internet gambling sites. To stop terrorism, we must dry up their access to funding.

□ 1700

This legislation will help that. The bottom line is, Internet gambling is illegal, and according to the Department of Justice and the FBI there is no effective way to regulate it. The only way to stop it is to cut off the financial flow to the illegal Internet casino industry, which is precisely what this legislation before us does.

Finally, there has been a lot of misinformation spread about this legislation in the past few weeks. Let me be very clear, this legislation does not change current law by defining what is legal or illegal; it simply ensures that we have a mechanism to enforce illegal activity under the Federal law.

Reasonable people can disagree on offering a separate amendment to the committee which makes it absolutely crystal clear that we are not changing anybody's law regarding Internet gambling. I believe that the base text

speaks for itself. But if it needs to be clarified, my amendment makes it absolutely clear: The legislation does not change any law currently in place, Federal, State, or tribal, governing gambling in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the legislation that will give law enforcement an important new tool to fight crime and protect our families in the United States.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat like a skunk at the church picnic, but I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote against this senseless and useless piece of legislation.

I know something about gaming and gaming law. I was a gaming attorney for many years before I came to the United States Congress, and I represent Las Vegas. This bill, in spite of what its sponsors say, will not stop illegal Internet gaming, and, if passed, it will have serious unintended consequences.

This legislation, let me reiterate, will not stop Internet gaming. It exists today. There are over 1,600 gaming Web sites offshore already. Americans are playing online now. But instead of playing on well-regulated sites, they are placing wagers on the existing 1,600 offshore unregulated sites which have no requirement to verify the identity, the age, the background, or the location of the person placing the wager.

In most cases, there is no regulation of offshore sites. A child can place a wager on these offshore sites, a compulsive gambler can place a wager on these sites, and there is no guarantee that players will receive their winnings from these offshore sites.

My good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), speaks of mob influence and speaks of protecting children from gambling. There is not one thing in this legislation that will remedy any of the problems that he speaks of.

Let us not be foolish enough to believe that this bill will stop people from gambling online. Despite efforts by every credit card company in the United States to prohibit the use of their financial instruments for Internet gaming, the General Accounting Office predicts that the offshore Internet gaming industry will continue to grow to a \$4.2 billion industry in 2003 with a growth rate of 20 percent per year. Passing this bill will do nothing to impede that growth. Online gaming is here to stay.

If these unregulated and unscrupulous offshore sites continue to flourish, the integrity of the legal gaming industry is also at risk. Instead of prohibiting online gaming, we should be closely examining online wagering to see if it can and should be regulated and taxed as a legal business. No one knows the answer to this, but it might turn out that it may be the only effective way to stop illegal online wagering

and the problems it creates. H.R. 2143 would cut off this option, and we should not pass it.

For those people that are so worried about funding of terrorists, let us have our so-called Saudi allies and our moderate Arab allies, let them stop the money they are flowing into the terrorists, and not kid ourselves to think that stopping online Internet gaming is going to do the trick for us.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, major league baseball, the National Football League, and the NCAA all endorse this legislation. We could have no better representative than the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), who many of us still think of as Coach OSBORNE of the Nebraska Cornhuskers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for this legislation. I support H.R. 2143.

As the chairman mentioned, I spent most of my life working on a college campus. I can attest to the fact that Internet gambling is really hitting our college campuses very hard, because all you have to do is have a computer and a credit card and you are in business. Almost all students have this, so we see an explosion of gambling on the college campuses. Many student athletes are becoming heavily involved. I think someone mentioned earlier a quarterback from Florida State.

The reason that the NCAA, the NBA, major league baseball, all of these organizations are against it, is that once a student athlete becomes heavily indebted, there are really only a couple avenues he can take to get out of the problem. One is to cooperate with gamblers. Another is to shave points. So it tremendously compromises the athletic scene.

According to a 1997 study by Harvard Medical School, students show the highest percentage of pathological gambling. To say that students are not involved is simply inaccurate. For some, as has been mentioned earlier, gambling releases endorphins, much like crack cocaine, so this is a highly addictive activity.

Our society is becoming increasingly dependent on gambling. Individuals try to get out of poverty by winning the lottery or hitting the jackpot. States try to cure economic woes through lotteries and casinos.

Internet gambling does not fix the problem; it makes it worse. Internet gambling provides no useful goods or services. It usually is linked to organized crime. It often results in divorce, suicide, theft, and poverty. It siphons money that would otherwise be spent to buy food, clothing, appliances, housing, and thus hurts the economy. Above all, it hurts our families and it hurts our children.

Please support H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the comments of the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY). I think she gave a really good argument why we should pass this bill. It may not do everything that we want it to do, but right now offshore gambling is illegal.

What we are trying to do in this bill is very simple. It is to shut off the financial spigot. Will it stop it totally? Probably not. Will it make a dent? I certainly hope so. But unless we can shut off that financial spigot, nothing will happen, and it will just continue to grow and take that money out of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas, (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I thank her for her leadership and for her work.

Mr. Chairman, we know that unregulated Internet gambling does hurt. I also believe we as Members of Congress want to do the right thing. I would encourage that we look at the idea of the expanded study of this question to make the right decisions.

I would also like to offer a comment on what I believe will be a very helpful amendment that I will have the opportunity to expand on as we go into the amendments on this legislation.

It is important to note that 8 percent of children under the age of 18 in America have a serious gambling problem, as opposed to a 3 percent number of adults. That is, of course, a distinctive difference between those children under the age of 18.

I would hope that my colleagues would look upon an amendment that hopefully answers that question and provides some of the comparable legislation that was allowed in the Children's Protection Act that dealt with protecting children from accessing pornography on the Internet by utilizing a credit card.

My amendment will allow the use of a credit card in the instance of legal Internet gambling so that it will prevent or prohibit or stop or inhibit 18-year-olds, or those under 18, from using the credit card to access Internet gambling.

What it will do is the fact that a credit card, one, requires one to be at least 18 to secure one. Then, of course, it has a purchasing coding system to alert parents of unauthorized charges. Then it records the information on the charge. These are all ways of providing that extra door, that extra fire door to prevent those youngsters from accessing Internet gambling.

I hope my colleagues will listen to the debate. I expect to listen to the debate so we in Congress can do the right thing, so we can do it together, and do it on behalf of the American people.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise to register my very, very strong support for this bill, and my opposition to the Cannon amendment; not that I oppose the intent of the Cannon amendment, but simply because that is likely to be a poison pill for this bill and result in its immature death. Let me ask a few questions.

Does gambling cause any social good in this country? The answer is absolutely not. It creates a great many social problems but provides no social good.

Does it help when we assess taxes on it? Does that not provide some good? It may salve our conscience a bit, but it certainly does not overcome the problems that arise from gambling.

Is gambling addictive? Yes, without doubt. I can recount an example that was just told me a few weeks ago by one of my constituents, where a gentleman who had been reasonably well off had to go into bankruptcy because his wife had become addicted to gambling. She had very carefully hidden it from him. She had taken out credit cards which he did not know about. The accumulation of debt from her gambling addiction drove them into bankruptcy.

Does gambling attract crime? Yes. Terrorism? Yes. Why? Wherever there are large amounts of cash available with minimal accounting standards, as we have with Internet gambling, we are going to attract crime. We are going to attract terrorism.

What is the worst form of gambling? Internet gambling. It is easy, it is convenient, it is anonymous, and we can do it from our own homes or from a public library or any of a number of other places. It is very tempting for any addicted gambler to use Internet gambling, and use it surreptitiously when necessary, to cover the fact that he or she is addicted.

I very strongly support this bill. I hope the Congress will approve it, that the Senate will approve it, that the President will sign it, and it will become law.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) have been fighting this issue and offering legislation for some time. This legislation actually appropriately would bear their names. I commend the gentleman from Virginia. I think no one has done more than he and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for his leadership

on this issue. He has been fighting this for a long time, and I appreciate his efforts to bring forth this legislation.

I am pleased to support it, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, because it is an important first step in the fight against Internet gambling. It hits illegal gambling institutions where it hurts the most: their pockets. By shutting off the financial lifeblood of this illegal industry, this bill will help to starve out unlawful Internet gambling sites and in the process close off opportunities for money launderers, terrorists, and organized crime.

Gambling on the Internet has become an extremely lucrative business. The Internet gambling industry revenues grew from \$445 million in 1997 to an estimated \$4.2 billion this year. Furthermore, industry analysts estimate that Internet gambling could soon easily become a \$10 billion a year industry.

The problems with Internet gambling are many. The instant access to online gambling is particularly disturbing. This illegal activity is available to adults and children alike with the simple click of a mouse.

In addition, the social problems associated with traditional forms of gambling have increased with the proliferation of Internet gambling. Online gambling results in more addictions, more bankruptcies, more divorces, more crime, the cost of which must ultimately be borne by society.

I do believe that more needs to be done in the fight against Internet gambling, including creating stiffer criminal penalties for violators and updating the Federal Wire Act to make it clear that it covers new technologies such as the Internet.

□ 1715

However, H.R. 2143 is an important first step in this fight and I am pleased to support this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and others, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who have helped to lead this effort. This is a great opportunity for us today and I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for it.

The CHAIRMAN. For the record, the Chair announces that the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) has yielded to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) 8 minutes, reserving 4 minutes for herself.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH). Many fine things have been said about the gentleman, that he and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) have been fighting this issue, this problem, and have really brought it to our attention, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I commend him.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a great credit to the gentleman from Ala-

bama's (Mr. BACHUS's) leadership. Also, as indicated, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) have worked on this for years, and I am very grateful for their support.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as it comes before the floor today is, frankly, not as comprehensive as I would have liked. It would have been better if the Committee on the Judiciary had updated the Wire Act. It would have been better if we had been more precise in allowing certain law enforcement ties to the financial system. Nevertheless, this is a very credible first step to slowing the growth of Internet gambling.

The issue has been raised on the floor, and I think it is worthy of serious review, the question of is this an individual issue, a libertarian issue or is it a social issue?

I believe very firmly that it is far more than a libertarian issue. We ignore gambling at our peril. It is simply not good for the American economy to send billions of dollars overseas. It is not good for American national security to allow Internet gambling to provide the ideal basis for money laundering, for narco-traffickers and for terrorists. But most of all it is not good for the American family.

Anyone that gets hooked on Internet gambling or any form of gambling, but particularly Internet which is gambling alone, will lose virtually all of their assets. Anyone that gets hooked will, in all likelihood, lose their family. Divorce is a serious element of the gambling problem. In very many cases the extraordinary circumstance of suicide is contemplated by gamblers that get this as a virtual disease.

It is a libertarian myth that only the individual, only the gambler is affected. Its effects spill over to the financial systems. When there are losses, everybody else has to pay higher interest rates. They spill over to the social welfare system where people have to pick up the costs of broken lives. It spills over to the economy where suffering has to be picked up elsewhere; and they spill over into national security concerns.

Internet gambling serves no social purpose whatsoever. It is a danger to the American family. It is a danger to the American society. It is a danger to the security of the United States. It should be ended, and this is a credible beginning.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, how many more speakers does the gentleman have?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, we have 2 more.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, it has become very apparent to me after listening to this debate that the supporters of this bill not only oppose the Internet gaming, they are opposed to any form of gaming whatsoever. They speak of gaming and they speak of addiction and crime and drugs and suicide.

Well, I grew up in Las Vegas. Las Vegas has 1.5 million residents; 37 million visitors come to our community every year to enjoy our entertainment, and our wholesome family entertainment, I might add.

I grew up in Las Vegas. I represent the good people of Las Vegas who depend on the gaming industry for their livelihood. My father was a waiter when I was growing up. He worked in one of these casinos that you disparage so handily.

Let me state what Las Vegas means to me. On a waiter's salary my father was able to put a roof over our heads, food on the table, clothes on our backs, and two daughters through college and law school. That is not so bad on a waiter's salary. And the reason he was able to do it was because of the strong economy that the gaming industry created.

Las Vegas to me is churches and synagogues and families and Saturday soccer and proms at this time of year and graduations and hopes and dreams and aspirations to millions of people that come to Las Vegas and the 1.5 million people that live there.

And, quite candidly, the people in this Chamber ought to be ashamed of disparaging a community like Las Vegas that I daresay lays shame to all of your own. So please be careful when you speak of my community and the major industry that takes care of the people that live there and provides good educations, good economy, good living conditions, and a quality of life that is the envy of the rest of the United States of America.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for their efforts here.

I want to disagree with the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for a moment. I used to be an FBI agent. And the old saying "It takes money to make money" is as true for organized crime as it is for any other business in America. This is not about Las Vegas. This is about offshore entities; Russian organized crime establishing offshore sites to develop low-cost/high-revenue venues where they can do two things: A, make a tremendous return on their investment; and B, launder money. And they are not laundering money that they have earned by betting or working in legitimate businesses. They are laundering money that they obtained illegally from drug sales, from prostitution rings, from pornography rings, from street gang street tax, from street

taxing businesses who are trying to operate in New York and Miami and Los Angeles.

These are exactly the kinds of activities that this bill will at least attempt to put a tool in the toolbox to stop. The FBI already has several cases today involving organized crime using Internet gambling to launder money. They use this money and turn it around to do pretty awful things, not only in America but now internationally. And they have become very, very sophisticated at how they get there.

It would be sticking our heads in the sand if we do not stand up and say we will not tolerate organized crime using the Internet to negatively influence our communities and our business community all across America.

This is dangerous, dangerous stuff. And to compare this to soccer games in Las Vegas is both naive and short-sighted. I would encourage the gentleman to understand where we seek to go and the very types of people we seek to stop with this bill.

I would also take this opportunity to urge this body to reject the Sensenbrenner and Cannon amendment. We are very, very close here today to taking one step closer to knocking organized crime off their feet. That is a poison pill that may slow that endeavor.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I have the right to close. I do intend to close.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman through with his speakers?

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, we have no other speakers, but I do wish to close.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to remind people this is not about legal gambling. This is about illegal gambling. This is about offshore casinos. This is about illegal Internet gambling.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. And I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for all of the hard work, and it has taken more than 1 year that they have worked on this.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to turn this debate into an oversimplification, but I want to remind this entire Chamber that this bill does not in any way prohibit Internet gambling. The bill does not make Internet gambling illegal. This bill quite simply takes Internet gambling that is already illegal, such as offshore gambling, and prohibits financial institutions from funding those transactions. The best way to put it is that this bill will actually enforce existing law, which is something I believe that we all agree on is in this country's best interest.

Finally, I would like to share a couple of quick facts that sum up my sup-

port for this legislation. First, a study released by the American Psychiatric Association concluded that about 20 percent of children-oriented online game sites featured Internet gambling advertisements, 20 percent. Does that make any sense? Offshore illegal Internet gambling sites are advertising to our children and we are not shutting down these offshore illegal Internet gambling sites? That does not make sense to me.

Second, the FBI and the Department of Justice have linked, without question, offshore Internet gambling to organized crime, money laundering and identity theft. Offshore illegal Internet gambling has been linked to organized crime and terrorism and we are not going to shut it down? That does not make sense to me.

It is time to enact legislation that empowers our law enforcement officers to become tough on the existing laws and to put illegal Internet gambling sites out of business once and for all.

Please support H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has tried mightily, Members of this Congress, to pass legislation to protect our children from this organized criminal activity. And it is a criminal activity. To equate this with the lawful supervised gambling in Las Vegas is simply to miss the point.

The fact is the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) said, We do nothing in this bill to make unlawful what is lawful or make lawful what is unlawful.

What we do say is that where there is this criminal activity which is causing such heartbreak and such sorrow and such destruction and really a crime wave in this country, that it is time to put an end to it.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has for years strived to bring the conscience of this Congress to this issue. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for years has brought this issue to our attention. They want stronger measures. I would like stronger measures, I will admit that, but we have to be practical.

We have to get what we can get. And what was the Cannon amendment killed this legislation in the past, and it will be brought up and they will attempt to kill this legislation. I hope that is not the case. I hope that we do not vote for the Cannon, now Sensenbrenner amendment, and again postpone facing this issue.

When it gets to the point that MasterCard, American Express, Visa, and Discover are all urging this Congress to take action to stop the illegal use of their networks, and they have written letters endorsing this legislation that every Member of this Congress has gotten, and they have said it

will be an effective tool to stop the use of our credit cards to this illegal activity, when Citibank, when Morgan Stanley, when the largest banks in this country say give us the regulations, give us the framework to stop this, it is about time that we move.

We have talked about major league baseball, the NFL, and I think that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), more skilled than any of us in college sports, he is the longtime football coach of the Nebraska Cornhuskers, when he says this is undermining the integrity of the sport, it is time for us to take action.

It is time for us to quit this turf fighting where someone tries to expand gambling and someone else tries to limit gambling, and to come forward with a bill to address this, what the FBI calls "mob-drive, crime-controlled activity."

□ 1730

When we started this debate, some 4 or 5 years ago, we had less than a half a dozen sites, less than \$300,000 being used. Today, the number of addicted gamblers in this country has grown by 5 million, a great number of them starting in their preteen or early teenage years.

It is time this Congress acted. It is time this Congress rejected the Sensenbrenner amendment in a few minutes and voted for this legislation. If it does not, we are going to be dealing with a \$20 billion industry or \$30 billion industry, and it is bad enough today when we do not know who these people are. They are unregulated. We do not even know where the money that is earned, how much of that money is finding its way back to Washington; but it is a pretty strong indication when we have one so-called faith group that battled for this legislation until a few weeks ago and suddenly turned around 180 degrees and suddenly opposed this legislation; and we find from a California paper that a few years ago they, in fact, took gambling money to fight on behalf of the gambling industry.

The National Council of Churches has written us today, the National Governors Association. The Fraternal Order of Police has urged us to take action to accept no amendments other than the Kelly amendment. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association has written us. They have urged us to take action.

Mr. Chairman, the house is on fire and it is time for this body to wake up and to take action and to protect the youth of this country and the compulsive gamblers.

I close with one fact, and that is from the University of Connecticut Health Center, an extensive survey that said 74 percent of those who have used the Internet to gamble have serious problems with addiction, and many of those have resorted to criminal activities to pay for the habit. On the other hand, those that engage in legal gambling, they find only a third as many have become permanently addicted.

We have a wave in this country which Dr. Schaffer at Harvard Medical School compares to a cocaine epidemic in gambling, a crack cocaine epidemic; and in a few minutes, each one of us will decide to end this addiction and this heartbreak and this threat to not only our sports programs in this country but to our fabric as a Nation, or we will decide to vote for the Cannon amendment and, again, kill this legislation and put it off.

I urge all the Members to take a strong stand against the killer amendments that will be offered, a strong stand for this legislation. Join with the credit card companies, the financial institutions, the many church groups in this country, law enforcement officers, National Governors Association, Attorneys General Association. If there is ever a clear vote in this House, this should be the vote. If there was ever a unanimous vote in this House, this should be the vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by and opposed to the increasing reliance of government on gambling. We are seeing more evidence of its destructive power, even as the current financial crisis is driving more States to expand their gaming operations.

Gaming has been one of the tools that has enabled Native Americans to regain some economic footing after centuries of neglect, abuse, and broken promises. While this is not my favorite tool for their economic development, I do not favor treating tribal interests differently than we do for other private and State-sponsored gaming. The State exemptions in this bill violate that fundamental principal by regulating tribal gaming differently from State gaming, which is unfair and ultimately an unwise precedent.

I am opposed to illegal offshore betting and I would be happy to regulate internet gambling. I stand ready, if we can ever breach the wide array of vested interests to support legislation that does restrict gaming without singling out Native Americans for unequal treatment. This bill falls short of that mark, and I will not support it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2143 limits the ability of individual citizens to use bank instruments, including credit cards or checks, to finance Internet gambling. This legislation should be rejected by Congress since the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to ban or even discourage any form of gambling.

In addition to being unconstitutional, H.R. 2143 is likely to prove ineffective at ending Internet gambling. Instead, this bill will ensure that gambling is controlled by organized crime. History, from the failed experiment of prohibition to today's futile "war on drugs," shows that the government cannot eliminate demand for something like Internet gambling simply by passing a law. Instead, H.R. 2143 will force those who wish to gamble over the Internet to patronize suppliers willing to flout the ban. In many cases, providers of services banned by the government will be members of criminal organizations. Even if organized crime does not operate Internet gambling enterprises their competitors are likely to be controlled by organized crime. After all, since the owners and patrons of Internet gambling cannot rely on

the police and courts to enforce contracts and resolve other disputes, they will be forced to rely on members of organized crime to perform those functions. Thus, the profits of Internet gambling will flow into organized crime. Furthermore, outlawing an activity will raise the price vendors are able to charge consumers, thus increasing the profits flowing to organized crime from Internet gambling. It is bitterly ironic that a bill masquerading as an attack on crime will actually increase organized crime's ability to control and profit from Internet gambling.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2143 violates the constitutional limits on Federal power. Furthermore, laws such as H.R. 2143 are ineffective in eliminating the demand for vices such as Internet gambling; instead, they ensure that these enterprises will be controlled by organized crime. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. While I support the bill, I am disappointed that the legislation could not be further refined to satisfy the concerns of the Native American gaming community. I firmly believe that in its final form, any legislation must clarify the absolute legality of Native American gaming.

Last Congress, in response to 9/11, the Financial Services Committee passed significant new legislation curbing money laundering. During the course of hearings on the legislation, law enforcement testified that Internet gambling sites are often used for money laundering purposes by drug dealers and potentially by terrorists. As I've often said, criminals are like other business people in that they go out of business if you limit their money. This legislation will give law enforcement important new tools to cut off money laundering.

I also support the legislation because I fear that the explosion of the Internet and the access that young people have to it in their homes and schools creates an opportunity for them to fall victim to online gaming. The best way to keep young people from getting hooked on gambling is to limit their access to it. There is good reason that U.S. casinos do not permit individuals under 21 years of age from entering the premises.

While I support the bill, I am concerned that the concerns of the Native American gaming community have not been fully satisfied. Gaming has raised standards of living and provided economic development money to the Native American community that was missing for too long. Congress must not do anything to imperil gaming as a source of much needed jobs and commerce to reservations. I look forward to working with the Native American community on this issue going forward.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, you might remember a failed experiment the U.S. government tried in the 1920s called Prohibition. Today, Congress is rushing to pass a similar ill-conceived prohibition of Internet gambling. Gaming prohibitionists believe they can stop the millions of Americans who gamble online by prohibiting the use of credit cards to gamble on the Internet. Just as outlawing alcohol did not work in the 1920s, current attempts to prohibit online gaming will not work, either. Let me explain why.

In addition to the problems I addressed earlier, this bill lacks a number of important pro-

tections. It does not require that the businesses getting the special exception be licensed for Internet gambling, any kind of license will do. It does not require that these businesses keep minors from gambling as a condition of the license. It does not even require that these businesses limit the amount that can be gambled to protect problem gamblers.

And what about lotteries? Family values conservatives fight the lotteries in State after State. They say that there is no greater evil than State-sponsored gambling. The Justice Department said in their testimony that this bill would "absolutely" allow Internet gambling on lotteries.

This is not just my interpretation of this bill. The Free Congress Foundation, led by conservative activist Paul Weyrich, says this bill expands gambling. The Traditional Values Coalition, led by the Reverend Lou Sheldon, says this bill expands gambling. The United States Justice Department says this bill expands gambling.

And while many powerful gambling interests receive an exemption, less favored interests get the short end of the stick. Native Americans became more tightly regulated than the horse racing industries. It is unfair and unjustifiable public policy.

Instead of imposing an Internet gambling prohibition that will actually expand gambling for some and drive other types of Internet gambling offshore and into the hands of unscrupulous merchants, I believe Congress should examine the feasibility of strictly licensing and regulating the online gaming industry. A regulated gambling industry will ensure that gaming companies play fair and drive out dishonest operators. It also preserves State's rights.

The rules should be simple: if a State does not want to allow gambling in its borders, a licensed operator should exclude that State's residents from being able to gamble on its website.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1223, the "Internet Gambling Licensing and Regulation Commission Act." The bill will create a national Internet Gambling Licensing and Regulation Study Commission to evaluate how best to regulate and control online gambling in America to protect consumers and prevent criminal elements from penetrating this industry. In addition, the Commission will study whether the problems identified by gambling prohibitionists—money laundering, underage gambling, and gambling addictions—are better addressed by an ineffective ban or by an online gaming industry that is tightly regulated by the States.

Until now, Republicans and Democrats have stood together against those who wanted to regulate the Internet, restrict its boundaries, or use it for some special purpose. Except in the narrow areas of child pornography and other obvious criminal activities, Congress has rejected attempts to make Internet Service Providers, credit card companies, and the technology industry policemen for the Internet. We should not head down this road now.

Attempts to prohibit Internet gambling in the name of fighting crime and protecting children and problem gamblers will have the opposite effect. Prohibition will simply drive the gaming industry offshore, thereby attracting the least desirable operators who will be out of the reach of law enforcement. A far better approach is to allow the States to strictly license

and regulate the Internet gambling industry, to foster honest merchants who are subject to U.S. consumer protection and criminal laws.

There are many different concerns with this bill, some of which I just mentioned. These concerns range from doubts about the desirability of having government regulate the personal behavior of competent adults to the fact that the bill, under the guise of banning Internet gambling, actually enables some favored gambling industries on-line. There are concerns about the bill's fundamental unfairness to native American tribal governments, and concerns about the precedent of deputizing financial institutions to regulate the Internet. For all of these concerns, I urge you to vote, "no" on H.R. 2143.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 2143 is as follows:

H.R. 2143

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Internet gambling is primarily funded through personal use of bank instruments, including credit cards and wire transfers.

(2) The National Gambling Impact Study Commission in 1999 recommended the passage of legislation to prohibit wire transfers to Internet gambling sites or the banks which represent them.

(3) Internet gambling is a major cause of debt collection problems for insured depository institutions and the consumer credit industry.

(4) Internet gambling conducted through offshore jurisdictions has been identified by United States law enforcement officials as a significant money laundering vulnerability.

SEC. 3. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO PREVENT PAYMENTS FOR UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal functional regulators shall prescribe regulations requiring any designated payment system to establish policies and procedures reasonably designed to identify and prevent restricted transactions in any of the following ways:

(1) The establishment of policies and procedures that—

(A) allow the payment system and any person involved in the payment system to identify restricted transactions by means of codes in authorization messages or by other means; and

(B) block restricted transactions identified as a result of the policies and procedures developed pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) The establishment of policies and procedures that prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system in connection with a restricted transaction.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—In prescribing regulations pursuant to subsection (a), the Federal functional regulators shall—

(1) identify types of policies and procedures, including nonexclusive examples, which would be deemed to be "reasonably designed to identify" and "reasonably designed to block" or to "prevent the acceptance of the products or services" with respect to each type of transaction, such as, should credit card transactions be so

designated, identifying transactions by a code or codes in the authorization message and denying authorization of a credit card transaction in response to an authorization message;

(2) to the extent practical, permit any participant in a payment system to choose among alternative means of identifying and blocking, or otherwise preventing the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system or participant in connection with, restricted transactions; and

(3) consider exempting restricted transactions from any requirement under subsection (a) if the Federal functional regulators find that it is not reasonably practical to identify and block, or otherwise prevent, such transactions.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH PAYMENT SYSTEM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—A creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, meets the requirement of subsection (a) if—

(1) such person relies on and complies with the policies and procedures of a designated payment system of which it is a member or participant to—

(A) identify and block restricted transactions; or

(B) otherwise prevent the acceptance of the products or services of the payment system, member, or participant in connection with restricted transactions; and

(2) such policies and procedures of the designated payment system comply with the requirements of regulations prescribed under subsection (a).

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall be enforced by the Federal functional regulators and the Federal Trade Commission under applicable law in the manner provided in section 505(a) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(2) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In considering any enforcement action under this subsection against any payment system, or any participant in a payment system that is a creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting service, or a participant in such network, the Federal functional regulators and the Federal Trade Commission shall consider the following factors:

(A) The extent to which such person is extending credit or transmitting funds knowing the transaction is in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

(B) The history of such person in extending credit or transmitting funds knowing the transaction is in connection with unlawful Internet gambling.

(C) The extent to which such person has established and is maintaining policies and procedures in compliance with regulations prescribed under this subsection.

(D) The feasibility that any specific remedy prescribed can be implemented by such person without substantial deviation from normal business practice.

(E) The costs and burdens the specific remedy will have on such person.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) RESTRICTED TRANSACTION.—The term "restricted transaction" means any transaction or transmittal to any person engaged in the business of betting or wagering, in connection with the participation of another person in unlawful Internet gambling, of—

(A) credit, or the proceeds of credit, extended to or on behalf of such other person (including credit extended through the use of a credit card);

(B) an electronic fund transfer or funds transmitted by or through a money transmitting business, or the proceeds of an electronic fund transfer or money transmitting service, from or on behalf of the other person;

(C) any check, draft, or similar instrument which is drawn by or on behalf of the other person and is drawn on or payable at or through any financial institution; or

(D) the proceeds of any other form of financial transaction as the Federal functional regulators may prescribe by regulation which involves a financial institution as a payor or financial intermediary on behalf of or for the benefit of the other person.

(2) BETS OR WAGERS.—The term "bets or wagers"—

(A) means the staking or risking by any person of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game subject to chance, upon an agreement or understanding that the person or another person will receive something of greater value than the amount staked or risked in the event of a certain outcome;

(B) includes the purchase of a chance or opportunity to win a lottery or other prize (which opportunity to win is predominantly subject to chance);

(C) includes any scheme of a type described in section 3702 of title 28, United States Code;

(D) includes any instructions or information pertaining to the establishment or movement of funds in an account by the bettor or customer with the business of betting or wagering; and

(E) does not include—

(i) any activity governed by the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(47) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) for the purchase or sale of securities (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(10) of such Act);

(ii) any transaction conducted on or subject to the rules of a registered entity or exempt board of trade pursuant to the Commodity Exchange Act;

(iii) any over-the-counter derivative instrument;

(iv) any other transaction that—

(I) is excluded or exempt from regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act; or

(II) is exempt from State gaming or bucket shop laws under section 12(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act or section 28(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

(v) any contract of indemnity or guarantee;

(vi) any contract for insurance;

(vii) any deposit or other transaction with a depository institution (as defined in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act);

(viii) any participation in a simulation sports game or an educational game or contest that—

(I) is not dependent solely on the outcome of any single sporting event or nonparticipant's singular individual performance in any single sporting event;

(II) has an outcome that reflects the relative knowledge and skill of the participants with such outcome determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of sporting events; and

(III) offers a prize or award to a participant that is established in advance of the game or contest and is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of any fees paid by those participants; and

(ix) any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized by a State.

(3) DESIGNATED PAYMENT SYSTEM DEFINED.—The term "designated payment system" means any system utilized by any creditor, credit card issuer, financial institution, operator of a terminal at which an electronic fund transfer may be initiated, money transmitting business, or international, national, regional, or local network utilized to effect a credit transaction, electronic fund transfer, or money transmitting

service, or any participant in such network, that the Federal functional regulators determine, by regulation or order, could be utilized in connection with, or to facilitate, any restricted transaction.

(4) **FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL REGULATOR.**—The term “Federal functional regulator” has the same meaning as in section 509(2) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(5) **INTERNET.**—The term “Internet” means the international computer network of interoperable packet switched data networks.

(6) **UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING.**—The term “unlawful Internet gambling” means to place, receive, or otherwise transmit a bet or wager by any means which involves the use, at least in part, of the Internet where such bet or wager is unlawful under any applicable Federal or State law in the State in which the bet or wager is initiated, received, or otherwise made.

(7) **OTHER TERMS.**—

(A) **CREDIT; CREDITOR; AND CREDIT CARD.**—The terms “credit”, “creditor”, and “credit card” have the meanings given such terms in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act.

(B) **ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.**—The term “electronic fund transfer”—

(i) has the meaning given such term in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act; and

(ii) includes any fund transfer covered by Article 4A of the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

(C) **FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.**—The term “financial institution”—

(i) has the meaning given such term in section 903 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act; and

(ii) includes any financial institution, as defined in section 509(3) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.

(D) **MONEY TRANSMITTING BUSINESS AND MONEY TRANSMITTING SERVICE.**—The terms “money transmitting business” and “money transmitting service” have the meanings given such terms in section 5330(d) of title 31, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 108-145. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. KELLY

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mrs. KELLY:

Page 13, after line 2, [page and line numbers refer to H.R. 2143, as introduced on May 19, 2003] insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. COMMON SENSE RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

No provision of this Act shall be construed as altering, limiting, extending, changing the status of, or otherwise affecting any law relating to, affecting, or regulating gambling within the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly support the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, which seeks to cut off the lifeblood of illegal Internet gambling. As we consider this important legislation, I am offering an amendment to clarify the intent of the legislation and to specifically address concerns raised by those who oppose the bill.

Over the last few weeks, there has been a lot of inaccurate and misleading information spread about H.R. 2143. Let us be clear about that, though. This legislation does not change current law by defining what is legal or illegal. It simply ensures that we have a mechanism to enforce illegal activity under the Federal law; but because reasonable minds can disagree, I offer this amendment in an abundance of caution to put concerns to rest that this legislation changes existing law. It does not.

My amendment adds a straightforward section to the bill entitled “Common Sense Rule of Construction” to ensure that there are no carve-outs, no loopholes, no new powers created by any section of H.R. 2143. The amendment clearly states in one sentence that this legislation does not change any law, Federal law, State law or tribal law, governing gambling in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation that will give law enforcement an important new tool to fight crime, stop terrorism, and to protect families across America.

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time otherwise reserved for the opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am supportive of the gentlewoman from New York’s (Mrs. KELLY) amendment. I think it is a great idea that she came up with to make very clear what this bill does and does not do.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, this is one of the simplest amendments I have ever offered on the floor of this Chamber. In one sentence this amendment says the legislation does not change any law governing gambling in the United States of America. It makes clear that the legislation simply seeks to cut off the financial flow to the unlawful Internet casino industry. It guarantees there are no carve-outs in the bill, no loopholes, no new powers created by any section.

I cannot understand why anyone would oppose this amendment unless they want to change current law to open up loopholes for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we put the crooks out of business. We have got to stop the drain of the money-laundering system that terrorists can access. I ask for an emphatic “yes” vote on this amendment and an emphatic “yes” vote on the final passage of this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 7, strike line 3 [page and line numbers refer to H.R. 2143, as introduced on May 19, 2003] and all that follows through line 6 (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs and any cross reference to any such subparagraph accordingly).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2143 to protect minors from the dangers of Internet gambling. This amendment removes credit card transactions from categories of prohibited financial transactions under the bill. The purpose of removing credit cards from the list of prohibited financial transactions is that credit cards have built-in mechanisms that protect children from the dangers of Internet gambling. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2143.

A study released by the American Psychological Association finds that pathological gambling is more prevalent among youth than adults. Between 5 and 8 percent of the young Americans and Canadians have a serious gambling problem, compared to 1 to 3 percent of adults. Let me repeat that again, Mr. Chairman. Between 5 and 8 percent of young Americans and Canadians, young people, have a serious gambling problem compared to 1 to 3 percent of adults. The study went on to say that with gambling becoming more accessible in U.S. society it will be important to be able to intervene in children

and adolescent lives before the activity can develop into a problem behavior.

Many Internet gambling sites require bare minimum information from gamblers to participate. Security on bets placed over the Internet has proven ineffective; and unlike traditional regulated casinos, Internet operators have no demonstrated ability or requirement to verify a participant's age or identification. Also, an Internet gambling site can easily take a person's money, shut down their site and move on. My amendment will allow the use of credit cards to provide the protections that many Internet gambling sites do not.

As H.R. 2143 is presently drafted, no betting or wagering businesses may knowingly accept credit cards, proceeds of credit, electronic fund transfers, moneys transmitted through a money-transmitting business or a check or similar draft in connection with another person's participation in unlawful Internet gambling.

Allowing credit cards to be used in Internet gambling transactions helps to protect minors. Credit cards, unlike the other methods of payment prohibited in H.R. 2143, provide safeguards to help to ensure minors do not engage in Internet gambling. For example, acquiring a credit card requires the individual to verify he or she has reached the age of 18. Credit cards are an effective method of verifying age because minors are not issued their own accounts. Credit card companies may also conduct a background or credit check to confirm the individual is of age. The procedures help to deter minors from using credit cards to gamble.

In fact, in previous legislation passed by Congress to protect children from harmful Internet sites, credit cards were used as a deterrent in the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, COPPA. Congress specifically allowed the use of credit cards as a method of age verification in order to restrict access by minors to Web sites containing adult material. Does it not seem logical for Congress to follow its own logic? By prohibiting the use of credit cards, H.R. 2143 ties the hands of law enforcement agencies and Federal regulatory agencies like the FTC to ensure sufficient control to identify minors who may attempt to gamble online.

There are also transactional safeguards available from credit card companies that will help prevent Internet gambling by minors. For example, several of the major credit card companies have a coding system that tracks the type of merchandise that is being sold by a merchant. The coding system alerts the credit card company and the credit card owner of purchases and charges that are not typical. For example, if a child steals his parent's credit card and makes several bets on an Internet gambling Web site, the coding system will recognize the new purchases, alert the credit card owner, who in turn can take necessary steps to stop the gambling by the minor.

Just about a year ago, we rewarded credit card companies with respect to a new bankruptcy bill on the issue of credit card debt. Here we can utilize credit card companies to do something effective and good to protect our children.

Mr. Chairman, the age verification and merchandise tracking safeguards provided by credit cards are not sufficient alone to cure the problem of minors engaging in Internet gambling. I know that. However, these safeguards are a step in the right direction, and they will prevent some minors from using the Internet gambling Web sites that remain, even in spite of this bill. If we pass this legislation without this amendment to H.R. 2143, we will eliminate the one proven method of effectively preventing children from accessing Internet gambling Web sites.

For these reasons, I ask that my colleagues enthusiastically join me in amending H.R. 2143 so that credit cards can be used and thereby protect children, America's children, 8 percent of whom are engaged or addicted to gambling from those activities and access to Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to H.R. 2143 to protect minors from the dangers of Internet gambling. This amendment removes credit card transactions from categories of prohibited financial transactions under the bill. The purpose of removing credit cards from the list of prohibited financial transactions is that credit cards have built in mechanisms that protect children from the dangers of Internet gambling. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment to H.R. 2143.

A study released by the American Psychological Association finds that pathological gambling is more prevalent among youths than adults. Between five and eight percent of young Americans and Canadians have a serious gambling problem, compared with one to three percent of adults. The study went on to say that with gambling becoming more accessible in U.S. society, it will be important to be able to intervene in children's and adolescent's lives before the activity can develop into a problem behavior.

Many Internet gambling sites require bare minimum information from gamblers to participate. Security on bets placed over the Internet has proven ineffective. And unlike traditional regulated casinos, Internet operators have no demonstrated ability or requirement to verify a participant's age or identification. Also, an Internet gambling site can easily take a person's money, shut down their sites, and move on. My amendment will allow the use of credit cards to provide the protections that many Internet gambling sites do not.

As H.R. 2143 is presently drafted, no betting or wagering businesses may knowingly accept credit cards, proceeds of credit, electronic fund transfers, monies transmitted through a money-transmitting business, or a check or similar draft, in connection with another person's participation in unlawful Internet gambling.

Allowing credit cards to be used in Internet gambling transactions helps to protect minors. Credit cards, unlike the other methods of payment prohibited in H.R. 2143, provide safeguards that help to insure that minors do not

engage in Internet gambling. For example, acquiring a credit card requires the individual to verify he or she has reached the age of 18. Credit cards are an effective method of verifying age because minors are not issued their own accounts. Credit card companies may also conduct a background or credit check to confirm the individual is of age. The procedures help to deter minors from using credit cards to gamble.

In fact, in previous legislation passed by Congress to protect children from harmful Internet sites, credit cards were used as a deterrent. In the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act ("COPPA") Congress specifically allowed the use of credit cards as a method of age verification in order to restrict access by minors to websites containing adult material. By prohibiting the use of credit cards, H.R. 2143 ties the hands of law enforcement agencies and federal regulatory agencies like the FTC to ensure sufficient controls to identify minors who may attempt to gamble online.

There were also transactional safeguards available from credit card companies that will help prevent Internet gambling by minors. For example, several of the major credit card companies have a coding system that tracks the type of merchandise that is being sold by a merchant. The coding system alerts the credit card company and the credit card owner of purchases or charges that are not typical. For example, if a child steals his parents' credit card and makes several bets on an Internet gambling website, the coding system will recognize the new purchases, alert the credit card owner, who in turn can take the necessary steps to stop the gambling by the minor.

Mr. Chairman, the age verification and merchandise tracking safeguards provided by credit cards are not sufficient alone to cure the problem of minors engaging in Internet gambling. However, these safeguards are a step in the right direction and they will prevent some minors from using Internet gambling websites. If we pass this legislation without amendment, H.R. 2143 will eliminate the one proven method of effectively preventing children from accessing Internet gambling websites. For these reasons, I propose that H.R. 2143 be amended so that credit cards can be used by betting and wagering businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

□ 1745

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and I introduced this legislation, and I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) probably said it best when he described the Jackson-Lee amendment as gutting the bill by removing from it the major source of financing for illegal Internet gambling, and that is credit cards.

What this entire legislation is about is about cutting off the money, because these illegal Internet gamblers are not

offering a public service, they are making money. They are, in fact, making a killing. It is all about money, and the way we address it is by cutting off the money. Removing credit cards from the financial instrument covered under the bill is tantamount to saying we are only going to pretend to address the problem of illegal Internet gambling.

No one should seriously contend that children are not now gambling over the Internet using credit cards in too many instances. How difficult is it to borrow, with or without permission, mom or dad's credit card and gamble over the Internet. College kids are doing it every day; teenagers are doing it every day. How difficult is it for a thief to obtain someone else's credit card number to gamble over the Internet? They steal blank checks, they cash worthless checks, and they steal credit cards, all to feed their addiction. A slew of identity theft cases have hit this country in recent months. Many of those may, in fact, have been driven by this very addiction.

This is a damaging amendment designed to turn a very strong enforcement bill into a weak shadow of itself. I strongly urge a no vote on it. I would like to close by reading a letter from MasterCard because we are told they already have everything they need to do in doing it, and this is a letter to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

"I am now writing to communicate MasterCard's strong support for appropriate measures to combat illegal Internet gambling. In particular, we commend the efforts of you and your colleagues on H.R. 2143. This legislation will build on the rules developed by MasterCard and enable MasterCard to block branded payment card transactions in connection with Internet gambling. These rules have been extremely effective in impeding the use of U.S.-issued MasterCard branded payment cards for Internet gambling transactions. MasterCard believes that H.R. 2143, introduced by Congressman SPENCER BACHUS, would establish a workable framework for combating illegal Internet gambling. We are committed to working with you and your colleagues to further refine and pass this legislation as Congress seeks to provide a legislative solution to this important problem."

MasterCard, Discover, American Express, Visa, the Nation's largest banks, Household Finance, Morgan Stanley, I could go on and on, have all endorsed this legislation because it will work. It will not cut off everything, but the bill as presently constituted covers money orders, it covers e-cash, it covers wire transfers, but it also covers credit cards and it must cover credit cards to be a comprehensive approach.

As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) said and as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has said, there are more effective things we could do, and hopefully we will to them, but both of them have strongly endorsed this legislation as a first step.

I urge this body to defeat this amendment, defeat the poison pill that will be offered next and vote on final passage of this bill without these killer amendments.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House report 108-145.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

Page 9, line 22, after the semicolon, insert "and".

Page 10, line 17, strike "; and" and insert a period.

Page 10, strike lines 18 and 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of my time be yielded to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and that he may yield blocks of that time as he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that has been the subject of much name-calling by the proponents of this bill. I ask the membership to look at the amendment. It strikes the carve-out that the authors of this bill put in to exempt horse racing, dog racing, State lotteries and other forms of gambling from the proposed regulations of this bill.

I believe that Internet gambling should be eliminated; but to have a carve-out for horses and dogs and lotteries and jai lai, and Lord knows what else, means that people will be able to use the Internet and use their credit cards to place bets and lose a lot of money.

No, if Internet gambling is addictive, we ought to close the loophole, because minors and others can lose just as

much money on horses and dogs and lotteries and jai lai as they can lose on other forms of Internet gambling. I strongly urge support of this amendment. This is a loophole that is big enough to drive a truck through. By passing the amendment, we close the loophole.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and in support of the base bill before us. The bill before us effectively achieves its purpose, to prevent people from using credit on illegal gambling activities, particularly offshore Internet sites.

But if this amendment should be adopted, we might as well just call this bill the "Horse Racing Prohibition Act" because it will literally kill that entire industry. The intent of the amendment is not to prevent illegal activity, rather it is intended to make current legal activities illegal.

If the language regarding State license domestic wagering were eliminated or changed, this legislation would not simply prohibit credit in connection with Internet gambling, it would restrict the day-to-day wagering activities of millions of horse racing fans by limiting financial clearing transactions with domestic wagering facilities. As a result, this would severely curtail simulcast wagering and personal account wagering on any horse race.

Not surprisingly, over 80 percent of the amount bet on horse racing is wagered at locations other than where the race is run. The result of this amendment, should it pass, would be catastrophic to the \$34 billion racing/horse breeding industry, especially to the States that rely on it for tax revenue and the 500,000 full-time jobs it supports.

In Kentucky alone, there are 460 thoroughbred farms, 150,000 horses, 8 tracks and 52,000 jobs which add \$3.4 billion directly to the State's economy. On top of this, the U.S. horse racing industry is already one of the most highly regulated industries in the country, governed by both Federal and State laws.

States like Kentucky have highly sophisticated systems in place to ensure that each transaction is made in accordance with the law. Because of this State regulation, the integrity of gaming site operators, the identity of the participants, consumer fraud and money laundering are not at issue.

It is ironic that this Congress would stand here today and attempt to trample on the rights of States to regulate

their own businesses. The adoption of this amendment would be the triple crown of injustices. It would put hard-working folks out of work, it would take away much-needed revenue from the States, and it would deprive honest folks the fun of putting a couple of bucks down on their favorite horse to win, place, or show. I ask Members to reject the Sensenbrenner amendment and support the bill as written.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what an exciting day on the floor of the House. The Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act just happens to have one problem: It accepts horse racing. Now, can somebody explain to me why that is so? We are going to ban Internet gambling except horse racing. Why?

Well, it is because the horse racing lobbyists and the dog racing lobbyists have said that is what we ought to do. Why did they write a bill like this? This is a bill that expands gambling, expands gambling by accepting two industries.

Now I have been in touch with Reverend Lou Sheldon of the Traditional Values Coalition and Paul of the Free Congress Foundation, and they have told me this is a bad, bad bill, not to do it. We have a wire act from 1961 that has forbidden gambling, and now we are making the exception for horse racing. Can someone suggest why this bill was written this way? Anyone on the floor, I yield.

I did not think so.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire as to the time left on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) has 4 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has 7 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has 3½ minutes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I oppose it because it prohibits Americans from using their credit cards for behavior that is entirely legal. Pari-mutuels, horse tracks, dog tracks, and jai lai frontons are all legal in many States. They are heavily regulated. They pay taxes. They provide jobs, and in many communities are an important part of the tourism industry and local culture. That is why the National Governors Association is against this amendment.

□ 1800

Pari-mutuels employ thousands of Americans and provide enjoyment to millions more. The horse racing industry generates \$34 billion a year and creates 472,000 full-time jobs in America. Greyhound racing is a \$2.3 billion industry creating over 30,000 jobs in America. They both provide very needed tax revenue to our States. It makes

no sense for Congress to usurp States' rights with the result being a loss of employment of Americans and State revenue.

The underlying bill rightfully bans credit card use for illegal gambling. Casino-style offshore Web sites are not regulated. They do not pay taxes, and they do not employ Americans. They are illegal, and American banks should not help facilitate them. But the issue here is whether Congress is going to make a policy that says Americans cannot use credit cards to engage in behavior which in their State is legal. Not illegal, but legal.

I would respectfully argue that Congress should do no such thing and should oppose this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his work on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by expressing my great esteem for the proponents of this bill. I believe that they honestly think that this bill will limit or, to some degree, prohibit or slow the growth of the pernicious vice of gambling on the Internet. I am personally not convinced that that will happen; and if I might, I would like to just focus on comments by the last two gentlemen who have spoken.

The gentleman from Kentucky talks about 52,000 jobs in his State that depend upon horse racing, which is currently legal in his State and currently legal in many other States in the Union and around the world. The gentleman from Florida has just talked about 700,000 jobs in the country or more that relate to horse racing and 30,000 jobs that relate to dog racing; and, of course, the other two exceptions that are carved out in the underlying bill are jai alai, which is, of course, a big sport in Florida, and State-run lotteries.

The problem with this bill and the reason we have so much emotion and so much emotional support for the idea that this amendment is bad is that this amendment might make those activities illegal when in fact what this amendment does is eliminate carve-outs and eliminate gambling that is now illegal. The problem for me is that I represent the State of Utah, one of only two States that actually totally prohibits gambling. The other State is Hawaii. From the perspective of our States, and I say this with all due respect, this is not the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, this is Internet Gambling Enabling Act. It actually allows gaming in Utah and will do so in Utah and Hawaii and other States where there are limitations on gambling unless the carve-outs are removed.

The underlying bill provides these major carve-outs, and I think we have broad consensus from those who have actually looked at the bill and under-

stand it. The U.S. Department of Justice and the National Association of Attorneys General have expressed themselves on this issue. In testimony before the Senate Banking Committee, John Malcolm of the U.S. Department of Justice testified that the aforementioned section, the carve-out section, was one of the reasons DOJ could not endorse Senate 627, which is nearly identical to H.R. 21 and now H.R. 2143. Testifying on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General, Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of Connecticut, warned that under that bill the exceptions could swallow the rule. Certainly in those States where gambling is outlawed or some gambling is outlawed, the exceptions could swallow the rule. In testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary, when asked if that action would allow lotteries to go online, Malcolm responded, "Absolutely." You cannot do that in Utah today, but you will be able to if this law preempts local State law.

Thus, H.R. 21 is not really an Internet gambling prohibition bill. You might actually consider it an Internet gambling industrial policy bill because we are choosing a favored class of state-sponsored Internet gambling under this bill.

Last year during consideration of a similar bill, H.R. 3215 in the 107th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary voted overwhelmingly against allowing carve-outs in Internet gaming legislation. Last year when the Committee on the Judiciary was considering the Goodlatte Internet gambling bill, which had similar carve-outs, I offered amendments to strike those carve-outs. The amendments were adopted by wide margins, and the bill as modified was reported overwhelmingly by the committee.

The argument that the provisions simply allow States to regulate intrastate wagers does not wash. The provision is an exception from the definition of "bets or wagers." It is not confined to intrastate. It essentially says that state-licensed facilities can do anything their license allows them to do, be it pari-mutuel, casino-style, or any other kind of betting.

This bill is ill considered despite the great intentions of its proponents. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my recorded vote request on the Jackson-Lee amendment. I will work in conference to make sure that children are protected in America.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The request for a recorded vote is withdrawn and, pursuant to the voice vote, the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, as a strong opponent of Internet gaming, I rise in support of the Sensenbrenner-Conyers-Cannon amendment. The Traditional Values Coalition supports this amendment, which removes the exemption that would allow state-licensed or authorized businesses to conduct Internet gambling. The bill does not provide equivalent treatment for tribal governments. If this bill becomes law, the outcome will result in the unequal treatment of Indian tribes because the current Federal law, the Wire Communications Act that prohibits Internet gambling will apply only then to Indian tribes. Only state-licensed businesses will be permitted to conduct Internet gambling.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will actually make it possible to expand Internet gambling rather than prohibit it. This amendment eliminates the special interest exemption for various gambling groups that support the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), who rises in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, as the cochair of the Congressional Horse Caucus and a Member from Kentucky, I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS). Kentucky is where more thoroughbreds are born each year than in any other State. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, an amendment that seeks to change the very intent of the bill before us. Horse racing is one of the most highly regulated industries, and we do not want to do harm to an industry that employs well over half a million people nationwide.

The title of the bill, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act, says it all. The intent is to address the problem of unlawful, unregulated gambling over the Internet. H.R. 2143 does this while respecting existing Federal and State gambling laws.

We have heard supporters of this amendment argue that it is needed because it will keep the bill from expanding Internet gambling. This is just not true. In fact, the bill itself without this amendment deals only with the use of credit cards and other bank instruments in connection with unlawful Internet wagering. The bill does not change any Federal or State gambling provision. It does not make any unlawful gambling lawful. It does not make any lawful gambling unlawful. And it does not override any State prohibitions or requirements.

The National Governors Association is opposed to this amendment because they understand and support this distinction in the bill and its purpose. Governors in States like Kentucky that allow lawful, state-sanctioned and regulated gaming activities such as

pari-mutuel horse racing know the importance of the economic impact of gaming in the form of jobs and tax revenue generated to the State. State governments across the country are grappling with shortfalls.

Regardless of what you hear, that is what passage of this amendment will do. We need to oppose this amendment and support H.R. 2143.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sensenbrenner amendment. The underlying bill, as we know, exempts transactions with a business licensed or authorized by a State from the definition of "bet or wager." This will permit lotteries, horse and dog tracks and other gambling operations to go on the Internet, but does not cover transactions with tribal governments. It is simply unfair not to provide parity for Indian tribes.

If this bill becomes law, the outcome will result in unequal treatment of Indian tribes because the current Federal law that prohibits Internet gambling will only apply to Indian tribes. With this bill, only state-licensed businesses will be permitted to conduct Internet gambling. The gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment, with the gentleman from Michigan, ensures fairness for everyone, placing tribes and States on a level playing field. Indian gaming, as we know, has provided tribal communities with economic self-reliance; and it has also helped to create jobs in surrounding communities, not just for tribes but for other people in the surrounding communities. It is simply unfair not to provide parity.

I would ask my colleagues to vote in favor of the Sensenbrenner amendment if they feel strongly that there should be parity for Indian tribes.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) in opposition to the Cannon-Sensenbrenner amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Sensenbrenner amendment. There has been a lot of talk on the floor and sometimes what appears to be is not to be. It is very, very confusing to somebody who is watching it. Simply, it is a poison pill. The Sensenbrenner amendment is a poison pill. If you want to kill the bill, vote for Sensenbrenner. It looks good. It looks good, but it will hurt the effort. Many people, particularly young people, will be hurt by the failure of this bill to pass.

If you want this bill to pass, if you are opposed to Internet gambling, if you care about the future of these young people, I ask you to vote against the Sensenbrenner amendment and vote in support of the base bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, unequal treatment of American Indians and American Indian tribes is not an American value. I have great respect for those who resist this amendment because I believe they are acting in sincere good faith and trying to establish American values. But we need to pass this amendment to assure that the American value of fair treatment of American Indians, which has been denied them in certain times in our history, to our great shame, is not repeated in this bill.

This amendment, when passed, will assure that we do not have special interest legislation just for non-Indian Americans. Indian and non-Indian Americans ought to be treated the same. That will not happen unless we pass this amendment.

I will tell Members why I feel so strongly about this. About a year ago, I was driving through the Tulalip Indian reservation by Marysville, Washington. I spent a lot of time in my youth there. I noticed a new building that had just gone up. It was the first Boys and Girls Club on an Indian reservation in America. Today as we speak, there are kids there who are learning teamwork and new skills and getting new job training at that Boys and Girls Club. The reason that club is there is because of this industry, this legal industry.

Let us not hearken back to the dark days of treating Indian tribes with less respect of law than other industries in America. Let us pass this amendment. Let us do what is right for a lot of folks, including the Boys and Girls Club and the Tulalip Indian reservation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from the United Methodist Church, the National Council of Churches, and four other faith-based organizations and a letter from the National Governors Association in opposition to the Sensenbrenner amendment.

JUNE 3, 2003.

*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a diverse bipartisan coalition of family and faith-based organizations, we are very concerned with the effects of gambling on our society and the well-being of young people and families. We write to strongly support the passage of H.R. 2143, To Prevent the Use of Certain Bank Instruments for Unlawful Internet Gambling, and for Other Purposes. Internet Gambling is already against the law in all 50 states, yet offshore gambling interests continue to operate without any accountability and are available in every state by utilizing the Internet. We urge you to support H.R. 2143 and reject any amendment or proposal which would weaken the bill or hinder its enforcement according to current federal law.

The National Gambling Impact Study Commission Report presents a disturbing and devastating picture of the effect of gambling on families. Some crucial points to consider in this report as it relates to Internet gambling are:

Gambling costs society \$5 billion a year in societal costs including, job loss, unemployment benefits, welfare benefits, poor physical and mental health, and problem or pathological gambling treatment, bankruptcy,

arrests, imprisonment, legal fees for divorce, and so forth.

Because the Internet can be used anonymously, the danger exists that access to Internet gambling will be abused by underage gamblers, our children and youth.

The high-speed instant gratification of Internet games and the high level of privacy they offer may exacerbate problem and pathological gambling.

Lack of accountability also raises the potential for criminal activities, which can occur in several ways. First, there is the possibility of abuse by gambling operators. Most Internet service providers hosting Internet gambling operations are physically located offshore; as a result, operators can alter, move, or entirely remove sites within minutes. Furthermore, gambling on the Internet provides an easy means for money laundering. Internet gambling provides anonymity, remote access, and encrypted data. To launder money, a person need only deposit money into an offshore account, use those funds to gamble, lose a small percent of the original funds, then cash out the remaining funds. Through the dual protection of encryption and anonymity, much of this activity can take place undetected.

Computer hackers or gambling operators may tamper with gambling software to manipulate games to their benefit. Unlike the physical world of highly regulated resort-destination casinos, assessing the integrity of Internet operators is quite difficult.

Please support H.R. 2143 and reject the spread of a predatory industry, which is contrary to the well-being of individuals and all of society.

Sincerely,

Christian Coalition of America, Concerned Women for America, Family Research Council, General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion (NCAGE), National Council of Churches.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2003.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Ranking Member, House Financial Services Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE FRANK: On behalf of the National Governors Association, we are writing to express our interest in H.R. 2143, the Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act. We appreciate your efforts to address the troubling problems posed by Internet gambling, while recognizing the authority of states to regulate gambling within their own borders.

We urge you to maintain the exemption currently included in H.R. 2143 for Internet transactions with businesses licensed or authorized by a state such as a state lottery. We understand that there may be efforts to strip the bill of this provision, and we encourage you to oppose such attempts. An incursion into this area with respect to online gambling would establish a dangerous precedent with respect to gambling in general as well as broader principles of state sovereignty.

Sincerely,

Governor MIKE JOHANNIS,
Chair, Committee on Economic Development and Commerce.

Governor JAMES E. MCGREEVEY,
Vice Chair, Committee on Economic Development and Commerce.

□ 1815

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who, second to none, has led the fight against this illegal Internet gambling.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, for his leadership on this legislation, which is a big step forward in the fight against Internet gambling. This amendment, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) described, is indeed a poison pill. The reason is, it does not have any effect on the lawfulness or the unlawfulness of gambling, the provision that they want to pull out. That provision simply protects the rights of States to regulate gambling.

Historically, that is what we have always done in this country. Gambling has always been the province of the States. They regulate gambling, and this amendment would change that. This amendment would take away from the States the right to do that.

We are simply attempting to maintain the status quo with respect to underlying Federal and State substantive law on gambling. We are not tilting the playing field one way or another unfairly, we are simply trying to address the problem of unlawful gambling, as the title of the bill suggests. I would love to do more on these other issues, but this is not the bill, this is not the place to do it.

The term "lawful" is included in this provision of the bill to indicate that no transaction will be exempted from the effect of the bill unless that transaction complies with all other State and Federal laws. The amendment already adopted offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) makes that even clearer, so the complaints of the gentleman from Utah, whose State I have great admiration for in terms of their efforts to combat gambling, need have no fear of this legislation. This does not open up Utah to any new forms of gambling. It will tighten it down.

There are plenty of people in Utah today who pull up a chair in front of their computer in their living room and go on and place a bet, using a credit card or wire transfer or some other form of financial transfer, that this legislation will stop. We should not allow a poison pill to prevent this legislation from moving forward to accomplish that.

In addition, States have traditionally had the power to decide whether to allow gambling within their borders. We should not put into question the authority of those States to decide these matters for themselves. Utah, Virginia, or any other State in the country, they ought to be able to make that decision, and we ought not interfere with it. Striking this provision of the bill would eliminate a provision

that reinforces the rights of the States to decide whether or not to prohibit gambling, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—186

Abercrombie	Gutknecht	Olver
Akin	Harman	Ortiz
Baca	Hastings (FL)	Ose
Baird	Hayworth	Owens
Baldwin	Herger	Pallone
Ballance	Hinches	Pastor
Ballenger	Hinojosa	Payne
Bartlett (MD)	Hoeffel	Pearce
Becerra	Hoekstra	Pelosi
Bell	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Hostettler	Pombo
Berkley	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berman	Hunter	Price (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Inslee	Rahall
Blackburn	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Bono	(TX)	Rehberg
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Renzi
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (CT)	Reyes
Cannon	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Rush
Case	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kind	Ryan (WI)
Clyburn	King (IA)	Sanchez, Linda
Cole	Kleczka	T.
Conyers	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Cox	Lampson	Sanders
Crane	Langevin	Schiff
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Cunningham	Levin	Shays
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Simmons
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Solis
DeFazio	Lynch	Souder
DeGette	Majette	Stark
Delahunt	Markey	Stenholm
DeLauro	Marshall	Stupak
Deutsch	Matheson	Tancredo
Dicks	Matsui	Tauscher
Dingell	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McDermott	Tiahrt
Dreier	McGovern	Towns
Edwards	McIntyre	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Van Hollen
Farr	Menendez	Velazquez
Fattah	Millender-	Visclosky
Filner	McDonald	Wamp
Flake	Miller (NC)	Watson
Fossella	Miller, George	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore	Waxman
Frost	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gallegly	Murtha	Weldon (FL)
Gingrey	Napolitano	Weldon (PA)
Granger	Neal (MA)	Wilson (NM)
Green (TX)	Nethercutt	Woolsey
Green (WI)	Ney	Wynn
Grijalva	Oberstar	Young (AK)
Gutierrez	Obey	Young (FL)

NOES—237

Ackerman	Bachus	Beauprez
Aderholt	Baker	Berry
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Bigert
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis
Andrews	Bass	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY) Greenwood
Blunt Hall
Boehlert Harris
Boehner Hart
Bonilla Hastings (WA)
Bonner Hayes
Boozman Hefley
Boswell Hensarling
Boucher Hill
Boyd Hobson
Bradley (NH) Holden
Brady (PA) Holt
Brady (TX) Hooley (OR)
Brown (SC) Hulshof
Brown-Waite, Ginny Hyde
Burgess Isakson
Burns Israel
Burr Issa
Burton (IN) Istook
Buyer Janklow
Calvert Jenkins
Camp John
Cantor Johnson (IL)
Capito Johnson, Sam
Capuano Jones (NC)
Cardoza Kaptur
Carter Keller
Castle Kelly
Chabot Kennedy (MN)
Chocola King (NY)
Coble Kingston
Collins Kirk
Cooper Kline
Costello Knollenberg
Cramer Kolbe
Crenshaw LaHood
Crowley Latham
Davis (AL) LaTourette
Davis (FL) Leach
Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (CA)
Davis, Tom Lewis (KY)
Deal (GA) Linder
DeLay Lipinski
DeMint LoBiondo
Diaz-Balart, L. Lucas (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas (OK)
Dooley (CA) Maloney
Doolittle Manzullo
Doyle McCarthy (MO)
Duncan McCarthy (NY)
Dunn McCotter
Ehlers McCreery
Emanuel McHugh
Emerson McClinnis
Engel McKeon
English McNulty
Everett Meek (FL)
Feeny Mica
Ferguson Michaud
Foley Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Ford Miller, Gary
Franks (AZ) Mollohan
Frelinghuysen Moran (KS)
Garrett (NJ) Murphy
Gerlach Musgrave
Gibbons Myrick
Gilchrest Nadler
Gillmor Neugebauer
Gonzalez Northup
Goode Norwood
Goodlatte Nunes
Goss Nussle
Graves Osborne
Otter

NOT VOTING—11

Cubin Gordon
Eshoo Houghton
Fletcher Lantos
Gephardt Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1848

Messrs. GILCHREST, UPTON, GREENWOOD, KIRK, DEMINT, DOOLITTLE, TAYLOR of Mississippi, FRANKS of Arizona, BOSWELL, FRELINGHUYSEN, CAMP, RYUN of Kansas, VITTER, NUSSLE, BURNS,

GOSS, PORTMAN, JANKLOW, TAYLOR of North Carolina, ROGERS of Alabama, FORBES, WILSON of South Carolina, PITTS, BOOZMAN, and ISSA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, RODRIQUEZ, OWENS, BECERRA, MARSHALL, VISCLOSKEY, WYNN, BEREUTER, FOSSELLA, MENENDEZ, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1850

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 263, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 252.

The vote to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 110 will be postponed until tomorrow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 319, nays 104, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—319

Aderholt	Ballenger	Bereuter	Blunt	Greenwood	Northup
Akin	Barrett (SC)	Berry	Boehlert	Gutknecht	Norwood
Alexander	Bartlett (MD)	Biggart	Boehner	Hall	Nunes
Allen	Barton (TX)	Bilirakis	Bonilla	Harman	Nussle
Bachus	Bass	Bishop (GA)	Bonner	Harris	Obey
Baird	Beauprez	Bishop (NY)	Boozman	Hart	Ortiz
Baker	Bell	Blackburn	Boswell	Hastings (WA)	Osborne
			Boucher	Hayes	Ose
			Boyd	Hefley	Otter
			Bradley (NH)	Hensarling	Oxley
			Brady (PA)	Hergert	Pascarell
			Brady (TX)	Hill	Pearce
			Brown (OH)	Hinojosa	Pence
			Brown (SC)	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
			Brown, Corrine	Hoefel	Petri
			Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hoekstra	Pickering
			Burgess	Holden	Pitts
			Burns	Hooley (OR)	Platts
			Burr	Hostettler	Portman
			Burton (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
			Calvert	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
			Camp	Hunter	Putnam
			Cantor	Hyde	Quinn
			Capito	Isakson	Radanovich
			Cardin	Israel	Rahall
			Cardoza	Issa	Ramstad
			Carson (IN)	Istook	Regula
			Carter	Jackson (IL)	Rehberg
			Case	Janklow	Renzi
			Castle	Jenkins	Reynolds
			Chabot	John	Rogers (AL)
			Chocola	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
			Coble	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
			Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
			Collins	Jones (NC)	Ross
			Cooper	Kanjorski	Rothman
			Costello	Kaptur	Royce
			Cox	Keller	Ruppersberger
			Cramer	Kelly	Rush
			Crane	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (OH)
			Crenshaw	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
			Crowley	King (NY)	Ryun (KS)
			Culberson	Kingston	Sabo
			Cunningham	Kirk	Sanders
			Davis (AL)	Kline	Sandlin
			Davis (FL)	Knollenberg	Saxton
			Davis (IL)	Kolbe	Schiff
			Davis (TN)	LaHood	Schrock
			Davis, Jo Ann	Lampson	Scott (GA)
			Davis, Tom	Langevin	Serrano
			Deal (GA)	Latham	Sessions
			DeGette	LaTourette	Shadegg
			DeLauro	Leach	Shaw
			DeLay	Levin	Shays
			DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Sherman
			Deutsch	Lewis (KY)	Sherwood
			Diaz-Balart, L.	Linder	Shimkus
			Diaz-Balart, M.	Lipinski	Shuster
			Dingell	LoBiondo	Simmons
			Doggett	Lowey	Simpson
			Dooley (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Skelton
			Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Slaughter
			Doyle	Lynch	Smith (MI)
			Duncan	Majette	Smith (NJ)
			Dunn	Maloney	Smith (TX)
			Edwards	Manzullo	Snyder
			Ehlers	Marshall	Souder
			Emanuel	Matheson	Spratt
			Emerson	McCarthy (MO)	Stearns
			English	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
			Etheridge	McCotter	Strickland
			Everett	McCreery	Sullivan
			Fattah	McHugh	Sweeney
			Feeny	McInnis	Tancredo
			Ferguson	McIntyre	Tanner
			Filner	McKeon	Tauzin
			Foley	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
			Forbes	Meek (FL)	Taylor (NC)
			Ford	Meeks (NY)	Terry
			Franks (AZ)	Mica	Thomas
			Frelinghuysen	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
			Gallely	Millender	Thornberry
			Garrett (NJ)	McDonald	Tiahrt
			Gerlach	Miller (FL)	Turner (OH)
			Gibbons	Miller (MI)	Turner (TX)
			Gilchrest	Miller (NC)	Upton
			Gillmor	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
			Gingrey	Mollohan	Vitter
			Gonzalez	Moore	Walden (OR)
			Goode	Moran (KS)	Walsh
			Goodlatte	Moran (VA)	Wamp
			Gordon	Murphy	Waters
			Goss	Murtha	Waxman
			Granger	Musgrave	Weldon (FL)
			Graves	Nadler	Weldon (PA)
			Green (TX)	Napolitano	Wexler
			Green (WI)	Neugebauer	Whitfield
					Wicker

Wilson (NM) Wolf
Wilson (SC) Wu

NAYS—104

Abercrombie Hinchey
Ackerman Holt
Andrews Honda
Baca Insee
Baldwin Jackson-Lee
Ballance (TX)
Becerra Jefferson
Berkley Johnson, E. B.
Berman Jones (OH)
Bishop (UT) Kennedy (RI)
Blumenauer Kildee
Bono Kilpatrick
Cannon Kind
Capps Kleczka
Capuano Kucinich
Carson (OK) (WA)
Clay Lee
Clyburn Lewis (GA)
Conyers Lofgren
Cummings Markey
Davis (CA) Matsui
DeFazio McCollum
Delahunt McDermott
Dicks McGovern
Dreier Meehan
Engel Menendez
Evans Miller, George
Farr Neal (MA)
Flake Nethercutt
Fossella Ney
Frank (MA) Oberstar
Frost Olver
Grijalva Owens
Gutierrez Pallone
Hastings (FL) Pastor
Hayworth Paul

NOT VOTING—11

Buyer Gephardt Smith (WA)
Cubin Houghton Tierney
Eshoo Lantos Toomey
Fletcher Larson (CT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1906

Messrs. WELLER, GUTIERREZ, and HOLT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN WTO TO END THE EUROPEAN UNION'S TRADE PRACTICES REGARDING BIOTECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 252, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.R. 252, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 80, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—339

Ackerman Etheridge
Aderholt Evans
Akin Everrett
Alexander Feeny
Bachus Ferguson
Baker Flake
Ballance Foley
Ballenger Forbes
Barrett (SC) Ford
Bartlett (MD) Fossella
Barton (TX) Franks (AZ)
Bass Frelinghuysen
Beauprez Frost
Becerra Gallegly
Bell Garrett (NJ)
Bereuter Gerlach
Berman Gibbons
Berry Gilchrest
Biggart Gillmor
Bilirakis Gingrey
Bishop (GA) Gonzalez
Bishop (UT) Goode
Blackburn Goodlatte
Blumenauer Gordon
Blunt Goss
Boehlert Granger
Boehner Graves
Bonilla Green (WI)
Bonner Greenwood
Bono Gutknecht
Boozman Hall
Boswell Harris
Boucher Hart
Boyd Hastert
Bradley (NH) Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA) Hayes
Brady (TX) Hayworth
Brown (SC) Hefley
Brown-Waite, Hensarling
Ginny Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Insee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourrette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)

Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Mushgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood

NAYS—80

Abercrombie Hastings (FL)
Allen Hinchey
Andrews Honda
Baca Jackson (IL)
Baird Jackson-Lee
Baldwin (TX)
Berkley Jefferson
Bishop (NY) Jones (OH)
Brown (OH) Kaptur
Brown, Corrine Kennedy (RI)
Capps Kildee
Carson (IN) Kilpatrick
Clyburn Kleczka
Conyers Kucinich
Davis (IL) Langevin
DeFazio Lee
DeGette Lewis (GA)
Delahunt Lipinski
DeLauro Majette
Doggett Maloney
Engel Markey
Farr McCollum
Fattah Miller, George
Filner Nadler
Frank (MA) Oberstar
Green (TX) Obey
Grijalva Olver
Gutierrez Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Cubin Harman Manzullo
Davis, Tom Herger Sessions
Doolittle Houghton Smith (WA)
Eshoo Lantos Toomey
Fletcher Larson (CT)
Gephardt Leach

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in the vote.

□ 1915

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 256 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today, Tuesday, June 10, 2003, to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 252, 253, 254, 255 and 256 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

“No” on rollcall vote No. 252 on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 263, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2143, To prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes;

“No” on rollcall vote No. 253 on H. Res. 263, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R.

2143, To prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 254 on the amendment offered by Representative SENBRENNER to H.R. 2143, To strike language in the bill which states that a bet or wager does not include "any lawful transaction with a business licensed or authorized by a State";

"No" on rollcall vote No. 255 on H.R. 2143, To Prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes; and

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 256 on H. Res. 252, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the United States in its efforts within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's protectionist and discriminatory trade practices of the past five years regarding agriculture biotechnology.

□ 1915

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2143, UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2143, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 660

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 660.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 660

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 660.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. LEVIN, Michigan,
Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio,
Mr. BROWN, Ohio.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY CREATED BY ACCUMULATION OF WEAPONS-USABLE FISSILE MATERIAL IN THE TERRITORY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-83)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 2003.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY CREATED BY ACCUMULATION OF WEAPONS-USABLE FISSILE MATERIAL IN THE TERRITORY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation is to continue beyond June 21, 2003, to the *Federal Register* for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on June 20, 2002 (67 FR 42181).

It remains a major national security goal of the United States to ensure that fissile material removed from Russian nuclear weapons pursuant to various arms control and disarmament agreements is dedicated to peaceful uses, subject to transparency measures, and protected from diversion to activities of proliferation concern. The accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation and maintain in force these emergency authorities to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 2003.

CONSTITUTION IS NOT IRRELEVANT

(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, when have my colleagues heard of the Constitution being thrown to the side as if it is not relevant? Just a minute ago, I heard a headline news item that says it may not be important about the question of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to disagree. I believe when the American people move toward war the truth must be told. I believe it is crucial that we have an independent investigation, a special prosecutor, an independent commission to determine the veracity of the truth of the intelligence community upon which this Congress relied.

The war was declared without an actual vote of this Congress under the Constitution under article 1. Now they tell us when young men and women are on the front lines, when we have lost lives, when young men and women are still dying in Iraq, it is irrelevant about the weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, our Congress will be irrelevant and the American people will be ashamed of us if we do not find out the credibility of the intelligence community and demand the truth be told to the American people.

I am calling for an independent commission, and I believe we need to stand on the truth so that as we fight wars we will fight them united as Americans, knowing the truth.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and

under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING AL DAVIS

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Albert J. Davis was the chief economist on the Democratic staff of the United States House Committee on Ways and Means. He died Friday, May 30, 2003, of injuries caused by a car hitting him on May 19 in Arlington, Virginia, outside of the Metro stop on his way home from work. He was only 56 years old.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for me to list all of the people who have come up to me since the accident to tell me how much Al meant to them. He had such a personal one-on-one relationship with so many Members of this body, so many staff, so many journalists, that all the meetings I had last week became times of reflection on Al's life. Whether I was meeting with other senior Democratic Members or columnists from a weekly news magazine or the experts on tax legislation, we forgot what we were meeting for so that we could pay honor to Al.

I could not help thinking that it was indeed a blessing that Al could have touched so many people so deeply through his hard work, his intelligence, and his good humor. Al worked nearly 20 years for this great institution of democracy, first on the House Committee on the Budget staff, at least the last 5 years at Ways and Means. He was one of those staff members who, though he never had to answer directly to the voters, devoted every minute to bettering the lives of ordinary working people.

Though he appeared soft spoken and cerebral, Al Davis was passionate about defending the interests of the working men and women of this country. Using charts and spread sheets and solid numbers, Al was a powerful fighter for economic justice.

He loved his job. He loved providing information to Members. His analysis was so honest that Members from both sides of the aisle would ask him for information even though they would disagree with him.

While Al was seldom quoted or mentioned in newspapers or on television, he had a profound effect in shaping legislation, publicizing poor policy, and changing minds.

Al is survived by his companion of 20 years, Mary Bielefeld. Mary's an incredibly kind and strong woman in her own right. Her strength has given those of us who worked with Al strength. Like Al, Mary works in public service as an attorney at the United States Department of Justice. They never got rich serving the people of this Nation, but they had a full and rich life in each other's company.

Al worked long hours when he worked here, often to midnight or 1:00

a.m. in the morning on days. He loved the outdoors. He loved getting to know the wilderness, and he shared these experiences with Mary and his close friends.

Most of all, Al valued honest government. He was mainly frustrated when people would cook books or fudge the numbers simply for political gain. Al believed that government in a democracy should be honest. He devoted his life to making sure that it was. He debunked myths whether they were Democratic or Republican. In a political environment too used to skirting around politically inconvenient facts, Al promoted honest opinion, honest budgets, and honest analysis.

Al's death is a loss for the entire Nation.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a number of us met today to review the Republican prescription drug benefit plan that is going to be presented before this House in the not-too-distant future. I have not seen the Democrat plan, but I am sure it has some of the same benefits and some of the same problems.

One of the problems that bothered me the most was that the pharmaceutical industry is going to continue to be able to charge exorbitant prices for many of the prescription drugs that are going to be covered under the prescription drug benefit bill, and that really bothers me.

For the last several weeks, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), myself, and many others on both sides of the aisle have been looking into and complaining about the exorbitant prices that are being charged to Americans as compared to the people in Canada and France and Germany and Spain and other parts of the world. We pay the highest prices for prescription drugs of any country on the face of the Earth; and when we start trying to, as Americans, to buy prescription drugs, the very same drugs that are sold here in America, from Canada, from pharmacies in Canada, where they charge maybe one-fifth or one-half or one-tenth the price of what they are here, the Food and Drug Administration starts saying, oh, my gosh, there is a question of safety; and they threaten to penalize, even prosecute, people who bring pharmaceuticals into this country.

My question has been why is it that the American people are paying two, three, four, five, 10 times as much for pharmaceutical products as they are paying in Canada right next door or in Spain or France or other parts of the world? Now we are going to pass a prescription drug bill that does not address this problem? The taxpayers are going to spend billions, probably tril-

lions, of dollars for pharmaceutical products without any real control over these expenditures?

I am not for price controls. I believe in the free market system; but at the same time, I do not believe the American people should pay exorbitant prices for the same product that is being sold 50 miles away along the Canadian border to the Canadian people, and when Americans go up there to try to save money, because it costs so much for their pharmaceutical products, they are going to be penalized for it and the FDA says that they cannot be reimported into this country, the very same products, and they complain about safety.

We found that there has been absolutely no safety problem whatsoever; and so at this point, unless we make some changes in our prescription drug bill, I am not going to vote for it. I am not going to vote for a bill that is going to charge the American people, the American taxpayer, huge amounts of money for pharmaceutical products for seniors when they can get those same products next door for less money, and that is just something that cannot be tolerated.

In addition to that, what about the rest of us that will not be covered under the prescription drug bill? What about the rest of Americans that are paying these exorbitant prices? Will the additional profits that are going to be made be passed on to them so that they can lower the prices a little bit to benefit the seniors who are covered under the prescription drug benefits of this bill? It is something that we cannot tolerate.

We need to address the entire problem of exorbitant prescription drug prices, pharmaceutical prices here in the United States.

□ 1930

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) has been working on this for a long time. I join in his army to try to do something about it. We are not for price controls but the pharmaceutical industry needs to realize we are not going to pay exorbitant prices when they are not charging the same prices in other parts of the world.

They are saying it is because we spend so much on research and development. If that is the case, spread it around, do not load it on the back of the American people.

In addition to that, many, many of these products have been subsidized by the American taxpayer through our health agencies, Health and Human Services. Last night the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) talked about one where \$500 million had been spent on research and development, yet Glaxo had a \$9 billion profit on this product and they only gave \$35 million back in royalties to the United States Government through HHS. Those are things that we cannot tolerate. Something has to be done about it. We are going to continue to

pound on this issue until there are some positive changes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and state that unless a bill comes to this floor that has a mechanism in it to have a negotiated rate for large numbers of buyers, as we do with our Department of Defense buying and our Veterans Department buying, we are going to force Americans out there in the drug market in their tiny little canoe on an ocean that is very, very rough. They cannot get a good price unless there is a mechanism within a bill which is cleared here which would provide for negotiated rate buying. I thank the gentleman for bringing this problem up.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me say I want to look at the gentleman's approach to making the way we deal with veterans' pharmaceuticals maybe the way that we deal with things under this health bill.

TRIBUTE TO AL DAVIS

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, at a later moment in this Special Order the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, will be speaking more fully about Al Davis, the chief economist for the Committee on Ways and Means, and formerly the economist for the House Budget Committee.

Today I come to the floor to pay tribute to Al Davis and express my deepest sympathy to Mary, Al's partner for more than 20 years. Al had a remarkable life, one in which he made an unforgettable and immeasurable contribution to the scope of this country's economic and budgetary policies. Although most Americans will never know his name or his extraordinary contributions, he has influenced each of us in our lives for the better.

Five years after serving in the U.S. Army from 1969 to 1971 during the height of the Vietnam War, Al began his lifelong career as an economist while working for the Wisconsin Revenue Department until 1980. While there, he rose from an analyst to the bureau chief in the research and analysis division in a very short period of time.

During the early 1980s, he served as senior analyst on the Taxation and Finance Committee with the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. And from 1994 to 1998, he was chief economist for the Democratic budget staff and then was the economist since 1999 until his tragic passing just last month as the chief economist for the Committee on Ways and Means.

Al was a master of economic and budgetary policy through four administrations. He helped our committee staff navigate every economic budget and tax proposal put before the U.S. Congress.

Al called us, that is the Members of Congress and his colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget his customers, and he provided us with realms of memos and charts and analysis that only Al could produce. He did it with insight and humor. He stripped away the clutter to extract the critical details of major issues facing the American public.

You would often hear about Al's ability to translate complex and difficult economic concepts for Members, staff, and, of course, the press. On his own, he was a unique gift, but what made Al truly remarkable was his delivery of his translation and the integrity that he actually had which he imposed upon all of us because anyone dealing with Al Davis knew they had to be honest with themselves because of his basic decency and honesty.

When Al found a provision or proposal that he analyzed to be unfair to the American public, this translation, without fail, was laced with humor and simultaneously expressed his frustration, and he always exposed the unfairness of whatever he was working on if he believed it to be unfair.

Over the years, Al Davis provided the Democratic Members of the Committee on Ways and Means with probably 150-200 memos. Most of us read all of them, not only because of the analysis that he gave us, but also because of his humor and his sense of humanity. I would like to take a moment to quote two paragraphs in a January 30, 2003 memo. The subject from Al Davis to the Committee on Ways and Means Democrats is "Snow Hearing Next Week and Budget Deficits." Of course, we had a lot of snow during the month of January, so it was snow hearing and budget deficits. And the caption is "The Return of Budget Deficit as Far as the Eye Can See." He says, and I do not mean to be partisan here, but it is humorous. It is not dry. He says, "Normal mortals would be in the hospital with whiplash if they changed their positions as radically as my Republican colleagues." And then in the same memo he states. "Tax cuts and war look cheap because we are about to put them on a national credit card and pass the costs on to our children."

Al had a way of saying the obvious and stating public policy by actually communicating with a sense of humor to all of us. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we in this country are very blessed because we have always had through the agencies, through the executive branch and the judicial branch, but particularly through the legislative branch of our government, people who are dedicated to the betterment of our country, and truly Al Davis was a symbol of that standard that all of us are here to certainly aspire to.

Al, we are going to miss you very much and we thank you for everything you have done for all of us.

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

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

IN MEMORY OF AL DAVIS

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who has spoken and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) who has now just spoken, and those who will speak after me about Al Davis, I relied on him every day on a wide variety of issues and on this floor and in committee I miss him every day.

When we hit a tough question, the answer was, "Ask Al." We expected and received from him a straight, unvarnished answer, and if he did not know the answer and I can remember many days he would say, "I am not quite sure," off he would go to find the information.

Al Davis was available with memos, with charts. His documents were so plentiful and useful during debates on taxes that the staff in my office often included in my briefing binders a tab entitled simply "Al Davis memos." I cannot recall a tax debate when so many of us did not rely on some document or some analysis that Al Davis prepared. He was prolific. He analyzed tax bills and budgets upside down and backwards. My tax counsel, who assures me that Al's memos were so valuable that he never deleted a single one, counted 44 memos, charts, and other analysis from Al to the committee from March 1 through May 19 of this year. So many points from these memos were used to help shape important tax and budget debates. He was blessed with the ability to take issues that were complex and numbers even more complex and to explain them in ways that everybody could understand. He hated dishonesty and inaccuracy.

In the past 2 weeks, many, particularly those in the media, have commented on how accurate and reliable his work was. His vigilance helped ensure that all of us who relied on him and worked with him also avoided the temptation to let the digestible sound bite overwhelm the accurate and honest debate that America deserves.

The Washington Post in its editorial, rather unusual in terms of a tribute to a staffer unknown to the public, so well known, though, within this institution, this is what the Washington Post had to say. "Unless you are a tax and budget wonk, you probably did not know Al

Davis. Mr. Davis, the Democrat's chief economist on the House Committee on Ways and Means, was one of those classic Capitol Hill staffers whose effectiveness cannot be measured by the number of times they are mentioned in a newspaper. From his cluttered office in the Longworth House Office Building," and we knew well of the clutter in that office, "Mr. Davis helped mold and inform the public debate about what he saw as the troubling direction of the Nation's economic policy, churning out fact sheets that were as accurate as they were partisan. He could get as worked up, maybe more, about Democrats using distorted numbers as about Republicans who did so."

Like so many others, I will miss Al very much. He was not only an important asset to the country, but for so many of us, he was a friend. Our words today cannot replace the loss felt by Al's longtime companion, Mary Beilefeld. I express my deepest condolences to Mary. I hope it is somehow comforting that her loss is not only hers but is shared by all of us on the Committee on Ways and Means and by all of us in this institution who had the privilege of working with Al Davis.

[From the Washington Post]

ALBERT J. DAVIS

Unless you're a tax and budget wonk, you probably didn't know Al Davis. Mr. Davis, the Democrats' chief economist on the House Ways and Means Committee, was one of those classic Capitol Hill staffers whose effectiveness can't be measured by the number of times they are mentioned in the newspaper. But from his cluttered office in the Longworth House Office Building, Mr. Davis helped mold and inform the public debate about what he saw as the troubling direction of the nation's economic policy, churning out fact sheets that were as accurate as they were partisan. He could get as worked up—maybe even more—about Democrats using distorted numbers as about Republicans who did so.

Mr. Davis had the gift of being able to translate the most arcane economic data into real-world language that Democratic lawmakers—the people he called his "customers"—could use to make their case. For reporters scrambling to make sense of a study or to dredge up an obscure detail, he was the ultimate resource, with a seemingly encyclopedic understanding of the tax code. If you wrote or advocated about such matters, you'd quickly find your way to Al—or he to you. He patiently educated the uninitiated, from green legislative aides to reporters new to the economics beat. When a bill was on the floor, Mr. Davis was always there with his bulging accordion file, colleague Janice Mays recalled, offering when the most obscure of points came up, "I just happen to have a memo here."

Mr. Davis died last week at 56 after being struck by a cab on his way home from work. The accident occurred as Congress was finishing work on a tax bill that Mr. Davis detested, and, as he lingered in a coma for 11 days after the accident, we can only imagine how frustrated he would have been not to be immersed in the debate. Len Burman, co-director of the Tax Policy Center, recalled visiting Mr. Davis at George Washington University Hospital and delivering updates on the latest outrages in the tax measure. "I kept on thinking, he's definitely going to wake up for this," Mr. Burman said. Mr.

Davis's boss, Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.), said that Mr. Davis "promoted truth in an institution too used to skirting around politically inconvenient facts."

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH PRESCRIPTION DRUGS PRICES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about the outrageously high prices that Americans pay for prescription drugs. But before I get started, I want to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) because the gentleman wants to correct something that he said earlier.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I mentioned Glaxo that made the \$9 billion, and I think they made money on other drugs that we will be discussing later, but the company in question was SmithKline Beecham that made \$9 billion and returned only \$35 million back in royalties to this government for the patents they had.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. And there are published reports that the president of SmithKline Beecham 2 years ago earned over \$200 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just comment on that. If he earned \$200 million, maybe he deserved it for ripping off the American people to the tune of \$9 billion for their very small investment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana mentioned earlier, we had a Special Order the other night and we had Republicans and Democrats, and we hope to do it next week with Republicans and Democrats because this issue about what Americans pay for prescription drugs is not a matter of right versus left, it is right versus wrong.

I think anybody who spends any time at all on this issue realizes it is wrong to force American consumers to pay the world's highest prices partly because we subsidize the research and development. There was a study done by the Boston Globe several years ago, and what they found was that of the 35 largest selling drugs in America, 32 of them were brought through the R&D channel by the Federal Government. The NIH paid for the basic research and development, got them to phase 3 trials. So we subsidize them in the research and development, we subsidize them in the Tax Code, and yet we are still required to pay the world's highest prices.

Two years ago this Congress came together, the House and Senate, and we voted 304-101, I believe was the final vote, but it was over 300 votes in the House, and we said Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. That bill passed. It is on the books right now.

□ 1945

But unfortunately the FDA is not enforcing the law because in the con-

ference committee they put a little safety language in there that says essentially if they cannot absolutely guarantee safety, the FDA does not have to enforce that.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk about safety. What I have in my hand tonight is a counterfeit-proof package of prescription drugs. It is called a blister pack, counterfeit-proof package of prescription drugs. This packaging is available today at a cost of about two cents per package. It is available today. Let me tell you what is available soon. They have been working on this at MIT. I do not expect anyone to see this because I cannot see it; but in this little vial, and if you would like to see this, I will share this with Members, in this little vial are 150 tiny computer chips, microchips. Ultimately, this is going to become the next UPC code. With this little chip, we can know where that product was manufactured, where it came from. It can help with inventory control, and ultimately it can guarantee that it is in fact Prilosec and not something else.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can solve this problem. I have said before, it is not shame on the pharmaceutical industry; it is shame on us. The President of Glaxo or SmithKline does not work for us, but the head of FDA does. It is time for us as Members of Congress to do our responsibility, to make certain that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices. No, there is nothing wrong with the word profit. I believe in the word profit. But there is something very wrong with the word profiteer. It seems to me in the heritage of Teddy Roosevelt and so many other politicians who have been here in this city who stood up for the little guy, it is time for us to say, it is not a matter of right versus left; it is a matter of right versus wrong. We need to do the right thing. We need to open American access, we need to create competition here in the United States, and we need to make certain that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Oregon's time.

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

There was no objection.

ANOTHER REPUBLICAN ATTEMPT TO UNDERCUT MEDICARE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Republican leadership will soon unveil legislation representing yet another attempt to undercut Medicare. As they did last year, my Republican colleagues will try to coopt the prescription drug needs of Medicare beneficiaries to secure fundamental changes, privatization, in the way they receive coverage. My Republican friends will use stand-alone drug coverage as a lever to try to privatize Medicare. The irony is that their proposal is being marketed as a kinder, gentler take on Medicare reform. Kinder and gentler, that is, than the President's breathtakingly callous "let them eat cake" approach.

You have got to give the President and Republicans credit. By playing good cop, bad cop, they are poised to set the clock back 38 years to the beginning of Medicare, 1965, and force seniors back into the private insurance market for their coverage. It is a shining moment for compassionate conservatism.

The President acclimated Congress and the public to the most irresponsible of Medicare privatization gambits by proposing to force seniors who need drug coverage out of Medicare and into HMOs. Blatantly exploiting the most vulnerable seniors to achieve the purely ideological goal of Medicare privatization is so offensive, in fact an egregious breach of the public trust, that virtually any alternative would look good in comparison.

When Republicans announced they planned to reprise their stand-alone drug plan proposal, everyone applauded because at least seniors would not be, as the President wanted initially, forced out of Medicare altogether in order to get drug coverage. Unfortunately, there is more than one way to gut Medicare, and the Republicans have found it. You can force seniors into HMOs, you can coerce seniors into HMOs, you can lure seniors into HMOs. You can, as my Republican colleagues are proposing, require seniors to buy stand-alone private prescription drug plans if they want drug coverage. It would be difficult to come up with a less efficient, less reliable, or more costly way to deliver drug benefits than to build an individual market for them. Yet that is what they are proposing.

The only reason to manufacture this new insurance market is to privatize Medicare. Here is how you do it: you give seniors two options. They can juggle traditional Medicare, plus a supplemental policy, plus a stand-alone drug coverage; or they can join a private insurance plan that offers all three. Once you sweeten the pot by offering enhanced preventive and catastrophic benefits at more cost under the private

plans, you have effectively set traditional Medicare up for failure.

Make no mistake about it. Every Member of Congress who votes for the Republicans' Medicare prescription drug coverage plan is voting for Medicare privatization. You know and I know that seniors will not be better off choosing between and among private insurance drug plans just as they have not been better off choosing between this Medicare+Choice HMO or that Medicare+Choice HMO. Health insurance is not like a car. You do not customize it to fit your life-style. Good health insurance covers medically-necessary care delivered by the health care providers we trust. Bad insurance simply does not. Good health insurance lasts. Disappearing health plans and shrinking benefits are the hallmarks of the private insurance experiment that is already part of Medicare, Medicare+Choice. Instead of alleviating uncertainty, Medicare+Choice plans breed it.

Proponents of privatization argue Federal employees have a choice of private health plans, but the fact that FEHBP, the Federal program, features lots of private health plans does not mean it is a better system than Medicare. Federal employee health plan premiums grew 11 percent in 2003. Social Security income grew by 4 percent. Seniors earned \$14,000 on average last year. There is not much cushion in that for unpredictable premium increases as you will get under privatized Medicare.

Let us not forget that my Republican friends want to means-test Medicare benefits. So goes the coverage guarantee. So goes Medicare's practical value to every enrollee regardless of income. And so goes popular universal support for the program that we know and respect, known as Medicare. If the Republicans' prescription drug coverage plan is signed into law, Members of Congress who voted for it will be able to look back and take credit for undermining a popular, successful, public insurance program that covers 40 million people and that ensures your parents access to reliable, high-quality care and replacing it with another iteration, another experiment of the failed Medicare+Choice program.

I do not know how any Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, can look their constituents in the eye after voting to sabotage a public program, Medicare, that anchors the financial security of our Nation's retirees. I hope a majority of us will stand up for Medicare and block any attempt, covert or overt, to destroy it.

ANOTHER VOICE IN THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG DEBATE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk to my colleagues about

the prescription drug reimportation debate that has been the subject of so much discussion in this House. I would urge my colleagues to use caution and reason when approaching this issue. Several complicated and interconnected issues dominate this situation: trade relations, patient safety, drug costs and government regulation, just to name a few. Some in this House believe that if Americans had the ability to purchase their drugs from Canada or Mexico or Europe or Mars that the United States market would adjust to reflect the importation of cheaper medicines. Let us be clear: foreign countries place price controls on their prescription drugs. This means that the drugs purchased by Canadian citizens may be priced lower than that which an American citizen will pay for the same compound because of that government's artificial market intervention. If an American citizen purchases a drug from a Canadian pharmacy, it may be cheaper. But by permitting the reimportation of drugs into this country, we effectively allow the importation of foreign price controls in the United States market as well. This would be shortsighted and run counter to the free market system that is established in this country. If drug reimportation becomes the established policy in this country, the United States would in essence be allowing foreign governments to set the prices for American businesses.

If we truly believe in the power of the free market, we should remove the market distortion of foreign price controls, a market distortion which ensures that America's seniors and America's uninsured pay the highest prices for their medications. And what happens in countries that have adopted price controls? Pharmaceutical companies and biotech companies have left in droves. According to a report by the Directorate General Enterprise of the European Commission, European drug multinationals have increasingly relied on sources of research capabilities and innovation located in this country. Because of the stranglehold of regulation in European countries, including price controls on pharmaceuticals, Europe is lagging behind in its ability to generate, organize, and sustain innovation processes that are increasingly expensive and organizationally complex. The United States biotech industry in the last decade has had a meteoric rise; but we would place a chill on the industry's development, the number of jobs it creates and the revenue it produces if we allowed foreign drug prices to stymie its growth.

More importantly, if we inject foreign drug price controls into the United States, you will see less innovation in this very promising new field of science. Most importantly, underlying all of the complex economic and trade issues is one that ultimately impacts us all, and that is patient safety. The Food and Drug Administration exists to protect American consumers from

dangerous substances that may be in the food we eat for nourishment or the pharmaceuticals that we take to cure our ills. Only our FDA in this country can assure the safety of drugs for American citizens. I think this House would be shirking its duty if we created a system that relied upon the actions of regulatory officials in Canada, Thailand, Belize or Barbados to ensure the safety of American patients. Allowing drug reimportation from foreign countries would only be a signal to foreign drug counterfeiters that it is open season on the health and safety of Americans citizens. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, these foreign counterfeiters are very clever; and with all due respect to my colleague who held up the package this evening, packaging in and of itself does not guarantee that that has not been tampered with and that that is not a counterfeit item. I could relate to you stories from my own medical practice from a few years ago where patients had what might be politely described as therapeutic misadventures by the ingestion of drugs which were imported, illegally, from Mexico.

The House can approach the drug cost issue through far less shortsighted solutions than permitting drug importation from foreign countries. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the pharmaceutical companies in this country also have an obligation to control the cost and be certain that their profits are reasonable. Without this, we will continue to hear the arguments for reimportation nightly on the House floor. The purchasing power of the Federal Government should bring down the cost of safe pharmaceuticals in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we should remember the admonition of a long-ago physician, to first do no harm. In this House, we would do wise to heed that advice.

NATIONAL RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in support of investing in our Nation's rail infrastructure and making rail transportation part of a strong transportation triad that includes highway, air, and rail. The freight rail industry is one that provides services that are key to the operation of practically every other industry.

In an atmosphere of mounting highway congestion and pollution, shippers ought to be changing more and more of their loads to rail. However, due to the fact that trains are not moving fast enough, these switches to rail are not being made. With 19th century signaling systems and antiquated grade-level junctions, railroads are often unable to deliver a truck-competitive service for many shippers. For example, trains that should be able to move

through Chicago in 6 to 8 hours are taking over 2 days.

While freight rail is a sensible, cost-effective way to absorb the expected increase in freight traffic, it is also becoming a major contributor to a variety of social ills, including air and noise pollution, congestion and a declining quality of life. Rail infrastructure improvements would raise the capacity of our transportation network for both goods and passengers; increase safety along the rail network; improve the environment wherever congestion is relieved; and eliminate waits at grade crossings. Since passenger rail service and rail-based transit systems typically share infrastructure with freight rail, improving freight rail infrastructure would also provide much-needed assistance to passenger and commuter rail.

In January, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials released their freight rail bottom line report that states that an additional 2.6 to \$4 billion is needed annually for capital investment in our freight rail system. Last fall, the Federal Railroad Administration and the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association commissioned a study that found short line railroads need nearly \$7 billion to upgrade tracks and structures to handle the newer 286,000-pound rail cars used by the class I railroads.

□ 2000

So, how can we meet these growing rail capital needs? We cannot afford to simply rely on the railroads for these funds. The Association of American Railroads' policy position book for the 108th Congress states, "Especially over the past couple of years, railroads have become increasingly constrained in how much capital they can devote to infrastructure spending."

The answer to this rail infrastructure funding gap is the bill I have introduced, the National Rail Infrastructure Program, H.R. 1617. H.R. 1617 would create a new significant and dedicated stream of funds for rail projects. Just as we have the Highway Trust Fund and the Aviation Trust Fund, this legislation that I introduced last month would create a national rail infrastructure program. The total revenue stream in my legislation would amount to \$3.3 billion annually.

This is a Federal investment that the American public desperately wants. In fact, Strategies One, a Washington, D.C. polling firm, conducted a national public opinion poll that shows 63 percent of Americans strongly favor moving more freight by trains, especially when the alternative is adding to highway capacity larger and longer trucks.

We cannot afford to sit back as freight and passenger traffic swells. We must craft a multi-modal solution to this capacity shortfall in which we can all win, or else we will all massively lose. Therefore, I urge Members to join the 40 bipartisan cosponsors and me

and cosponsor H.R. 1617, the National Rail Infrastructure Program.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2115, FLIGHT 100—CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-146) on the resolution (H. Res. 265) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE NEED FOR ASBESTOS LITIGATION REFORM

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, in 48 hours Congress will face the single most important pending issue of legislation to help our economy. Does your 401(k) look like mine? If so, it is due to the dot.com bust, the war, recession, and possibly even a little bit of Martha Stewart. But it is also due to another problem, and this problem is depressing the value of 900 stocks that form the bedrock of our retirement savings.

The issue is asbestos liability reform. Really. We bankrupted asbestos makers like Johns Manville and U.S. Gypsum a long time ago, but lawsuits now reach out to many companies, most companies, who have had asbestos anywhere in their ceiling tiles, walls, or in the case of Sears Roebuck, in one washer and one iron sold between 1957 and 1958.

Spending on the lawsuits might make sense if our justice system actually compensated victims suffering from asbestos poisoning. But, as the chart behind me shows, most asbestos awards go to lawyers' fees and court costs, and a minority actually goes to the lawsuit plaintiffs. Of the amount that goes to plaintiffs, only a small fraction goes to people who are actually suffering from asbestos poisoning.

When you look at this situation, as Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg did, you see a system crying out for reform. Amazingly, the American Bar Association has called for this liability reform.

In this House, I introduced the Asbestos Compensation Act with 40 cosponsors, and my colleague the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) introduced similar legislation. But in 2 days, our eyes will be on the Senate Judiciary Committee, who will take up this issue with Senator LEAHY and Senator HATCH, and I think it is the best chance that we have to move a key piece of legislation forward to help our economy.

We know that two-thirds of asbestos plaintiffs have no symptoms whatsoever and they are flooding the courts to protect their rights in case they get sick sometime in the future. Meanwhile, plaintiffs who are sick are left behind. This has been a key point that the trial bar representing actually injured plaintiffs has raised.

But the financial uncertainty of asbestos liability is probably causing the greatest cost. Already 70 companies have gone into bankruptcy court, and there are approximately 900 publicly traded companies now facing asbestos lawsuits. If Congress does not act this year, we estimate 800 companies will go bankrupt over this issue. This, according to the National Economic Research Association and Rand Institute study, has cost Americans 60,000 jobs so far, and will cost 423,000 jobs in the future.

The system that we are under now has very uncertain results. Robert York has no symptoms and collected \$1,200 in his asbestos lawsuit. Half went to his lawyer. William Sullivan had undefined asbestos exposure and collected \$350,000, with his lawyer's contingency being undisclosed. Ken Ronnfeldt had exposure to asbestos and collected \$2,500, half going to his lawyer; whereas Ron Huber, who had asbestos-related illness, collected only \$14,000, and is appealing, rightly, his case.

I think the time is now for asbestos liability reform. I think this is a critical issue, not just to make sure that actual victims truly suffering consequences are compensated, but also that we remove this cloud of liability from America's companies that is depressing the value of the retirement savings of millions of Americans.

The test comes in 2 days before the Senate Judiciary Committee. My hope is that we have a bipartisan agreement to move asbestos liability reform through the Senate, and then it will be time for the House to act.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF DAVID LIZARRAGA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the 35th anniversary of the East Los Angeles Community Union to recognize its president and CEO, David Lizarraga, and to commend TELACU on the 20th anniversary of its scholarship program.

TELACU is a nonprofit community development corporation dedicated to rebuilding the East Los Angeles community. Despite complex challenges, TELACU's approach is simple: to provide people with the tools for self-empowerment and self-sufficiency and to create opportunities to use those tools to improve their lives.

Under the leadership of Mr. Lizarraga, TELACU has become the largest, most successful Hispanic community and economic corporation in

the Nation. With nearly \$400 million in assets, TELACU has created thousands of jobs, brought affordable hopes to untold numbers of families, leveraged millions of dollars in small business loans, and, most importantly, provided numerous educational opportunities for young people and veterans, not only in my congressional district, but throughout the United States.

As a prominent national Latino leader, Mr. Lizarraga is a leading voice in the revitalization of inner-city communities and a beacon of hope for young people searching for a path to a brighter future.

Mr. Lizarraga is an example of the American spirit through which dedicated, hardworking, and enterprising individuals do not just get ahead, but, in striving for a better life for themselves, they empower others to realize the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to acknowledge TELACU and Mr. Lizarraga for their dedication to creating jobs and opportunities in our communities, and to wish them continued success for many years to come.

TAX CUT STEALING FROM FUTURE GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to speak on behalf of future generations of Americans. The needs of these children, and their children, are clear. They need a strong economy, quality education, health care and a clean environment.

The \$350 billion tax cut passed by House Republicans provides none of this. In fact, the tax cut steals from the future to feed the greedy of today.

Last-minute changes made by Republicans will prevent families, like this one, with incomes of less than \$26,000, who have 11.9 million children, from receiving the child tax credit. In fact, 1 out of every 4 families in my district in California will get no child tax credit.

Working families, like the one pictured here, who told me how hard they are working just to provide basic needs for their children, will get nothing. House Republicans claim they could not fit these families into their tax cut. Somehow they found plenty of room, however, to allow corporations such as Enron to continue to hide \$50 billion in offshore tax shelters.

How can I go back to my district and tell families such as this one that their children will get no tax relief because Republicans chose to protect corporate tax shelters instead?

In the Republican plan to rob the future, millionaires get \$90,000 in tax cuts, while working families like this one, who build and invigorate our economy, will get next to nothing.

For example, 47 percent of the people in my State of California will get a total tax cut of less than \$100. One hun-

dred dollars does not go too far in California, which has some of the highest costs of living in the country; 140,000 of those families in my district will get no child tax credit, and many of these families saw their sons and daughters and fathers and mothers go off to the war. Across the country, there are 250,000 children of active duty military families, such as these, that will receive no child tax credit.

These families all sacrifice when we ask them to protect future generations of Americans. How can I go home and tell these families that their own and future generations will get nothing because Republicans would not even sacrifice a few thousand dollars of the millionaire's \$93,000 tax cut?

Families in my district and across the country suffer from rapidly increasing rates of asthma and respiratory disease. How can I tell them the pollution that compromises their health will only get worse because Republicans made room for \$100,000 tax breaks for the largest, most polluting SUVs?

These same families, along with families of 9.2 million children across the country, already cannot get relief for their children because they have no health insurance. How can I tell them that we could have provided this coverage, but instead Republicans chose to create a \$350 billion tax cut that goes mostly to the wealthy?

Everywhere we look we see future generations in peril. We have schools that need \$300 billion in maintenance and repair, a No Child Left Behind Act that is short \$9.7 billion, 44 million people with no health care, basic water infrastructure in critical decline, and 9 million people unemployed.

With a \$400 billion deficit and 100,000 jobs lost from the economy each month, we have few resources and little time to deal with this problem. Yet Republicans spend our time forcing through a tax plan that primarily helps millionaires, offshore tax haven, and large SUVs.

This is nothing short of a crime. The future has been stolen from future generations, like this family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUTTING THE PRIVILEGED FEW AHEAD OF WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, hard-working families need a break more than anyone in this country, especially since they are bearing the brunt of this very weak economy. But, for some reason, the Republican leadership feels

that the privileged few are more important than the 12 million children who are left out of the Republican tax cut. That is just plain wrong.

Voices across the Nation are speaking out, and they are speaking out loudly, and in overwhelming numbers they are in support of increasing the child tax credit and making it permanent, especially for those 12 million children who were left out of the recent tax package.

□ 2015

That is why President Bush is finally urging the House to follow suit with the other body so he can sign legislation that will restore tax credits for lower income families and put this bad and actually embarrassing decision behind him. Why is the Republican leadership dragging their feet here in the House when we can help American families now?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know it is important that we swiftly extend the child tax credit to lower-income families. It should not, however, be part of another broad package that extends even more benefits to the wealthy.

We must pass a clean bill, a bill that solves the injustice that has been done to these hard-working families. Our priority should be the 12 million forgotten children, not more tax breaks for the rich.

Mr. Speaker, how am I supposed to go back to my district and tell a mother from Santa Rosa, California, located in the 6th Congressional district of California that I represent, just north of San Francisco across the Golden Gate Bridge, tell her that according to the House Republican leadership that her job at Head Start does not contribute enough into the tax system to deserve an increase through the child tax credit? This mother, whose name is Cori, is the head of one of the 6.5 million families that pays Federal, State, and local taxes; yet she has been left out of the recent increase to the child tax credit. Cori overcame the obstacles of being a single parent. She did it without a support system and she did it with very little money. After turning to the Head Start program for help, she went back to school and became a Head Start teacher to give back to the program that she thought and felt and knew saved her.

How do I explain to Cori that her hard work is not worth rewarding, that she does not give enough to the system to deserve a break? I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle where is the compassion for Cori and her children?

It is time that we help working families like Cori so they can balance their responsibilities of earning a living and meeting family demands. Our priority today should be expanding the child tax credit for lower-income families. Passing it can be the first step in reversing a very serious wrong.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to restore compassion to our Nation's families,

rather than our Nation's millionaires. American families need to know we have not forgotten them. The 12 million children that have been ignored by the Republican leadership need to know that they are important.

I demand that the Republican leadership in the House act now and extend the child tax credit to those who need it the most: our children. Our children, 25 percent of our Nation, 100 percent of our future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

AMERICA OPPOSES THE REPUBLICAN "LEAVE 12 MILLION CHILDREN BEHIND" ACT

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to protest the Republicans' tax cut bill, the Leave 12 Million Children Behind Act.

Soon after this tax bill was passed, it was discovered that the Republicans deliberately chose to drop a provision that would have helped 12 million children living in moderate-income working families. Among these children left behind are 1 million children of active duty military.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this clear. Leaving 12 million children behind was not a last-minute oversight; it was a deliberate decision by the Republicans. As our Nation struggles through a Bush recession, Congress has a responsibility to do what is right for families who may need a little extra help, and it

is obvious that the Republicans are shirking this responsibility.

The most shocking part of the Republican decision is its impact on families in the military. Many enlisted men and women make far less than \$26,000 per year. As a result, their children will not be eligible for the family tax credit. It is clear from this callous denial of assistance that the Republicans' priorities lie with tax cuts for the wealthy, not with the livelihoods of working families and our servicemen and women in the armed services. These priorities are clearly out of step with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are working to help these families. Democrats have introduced legislation that restores these benefits to all working families and ensures that our men and women in the military are not denied tax relief while they are fighting in Iraq.

However, the Republican majority refuses to even consider this legislation. According to the Republican majority leader, "There's a lot of things," he says, "that are more important than that."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I disagree; and I join my Democratic colleagues today to once again urge the Republican leadership to restore the child tax credit to all working families. Democrats will continue to fight so Congress can fulfill its promise to truly leave no child behind.

AERONAUTICS INDUSTRY FACING IMPORTANT CHALLENGES AFFECTING AMERICA

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to address an emerging issue that Congress is going to need to deal with, and that is the challenges to one of our most important industries in America, and that is the aeronautics industry.

Right now this portion of our economy from an export standpoint is probably the most successful in our economy, and a large percentage of our export surplus, to the extent it exists, arises from our exports of airplanes. The company, largely located in my neck of the woods in Washington State, Boeing, is the largest net exporter of products in our country and is the largest contributor to a potential surplus that we have; and it has over 150,000 employees and 26,000 suppliers that are located in all 50 States. This is an industry of enormous importance to our trade balance and to job creation in this Nation.

But unfortunately, because of the untoward practices of some European nations associated with Airbus, that industry is threatened; and it is threatened because contrary to well-accepted trading rules in a rules-based trading relationship, Airbus is taking advantage of a significant number of national subsidies for their program.

Among those are a state-sponsored loan program which has significantly reduced the cost of financing for Airbus development, and that can lead to up to as much as \$26 billion in additional benefits to Airbus. In addition, they have received subsidies for their research and development costs; and of course, in the development of airliners, R&D is of tremendous importance to the ultimate cost of a product.

It appears clear that these subsidies, in fact, have continued, despite our efforts, our assiduous efforts to try and, in fact, maintain a rules-based trading system. And that now has to stop. The competition, the unlawful, the illegal competition that we have been facing due to these subsidies can no longer stand. And the United States Government needs to take a more aggressive policy to, in some sense, restore balance and fairness to this trading relationship.

In the next several weeks, my colleagues and me will be discussing the appropriate way to do that. Various means are at our disposal. We can consider trade efforts in an attempt to convince our partners in Europe to, in fact, respect a rules-based trading system and end these unlawful subsidies to this sector of the economy, with whom we are happy to compete under a rules-based system. We also may consider, in fact, assisting in the research and development in the technology to benefit America, and certainly in our energy policy. Many of us think that while we are assisting the development of an energy policy, we should assist the development of the most energy-efficient jet the world has ever seen, which we hope to be the 77 manufactured by Boeing.

So there are a variety of measures; but in some fashion, it is now time for America to get serious to insist on a rules-based trading system, one that can allow the best technologically efficient product to emerge so that the marketplace can choose, rather than having governments interfere with that process. And unfortunately, our European partners have muddled about in that system and governments have interfered in the functioning of this marketplace. That is something we have tolerated now for quite a number of years. It is no longer subject to toleration.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for America to become serious and engage in resolving this problem, and I will be working with my colleagues in the upcoming weeks to make sure that the rules are fair and applicable and assist the United States aeronautics industry.

A TRIBUTE TO AL DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to honor Al Davis, a dear friend, who died in the prime of life in a tragic, wholly unnecessary accident. But in his 56 years, he made a huge, if unheralded, contribution to the government of this country. We have lost a close associate, a valuable colleague. The House has lost part of its institutional memory and its analytical ability, particularly in the bramble bush we call tax policy; and the country, the country has lost a genuine, if sometimes critical, patriot.

Before Al became the chief economist for the Committee on Ways and Means, he was the chief economist for the Committee on the Budget; and it was on the Committee on the Budget that I came to know him best.

Mr. Speaker, if I might digress a minute, I would say that from 1969 to 1970 I served as a young officer, Army officer in the Pentagon and interacted with Congress and its staff; and when I came here in 1983 as a Member of Congress, the most striking change I found in the institution was in the staff, Members' staff and committee staff both. The number of staff had increased several fold, and the professional quality has increased even more. And more than I had ever appreciated, I soon found out how the House literally could not function without our staff. Their roles are often off stage. They make, however, those of us on stage look good. They keep the debate moving forward, and they see to it that the House churns out its enormous work product of bills and reports and conference agreements and correspondence and countless other documents.

Even among the excellent staff that is throughout the House on both sides of the aisle, Al Davis stood out. He was noted for two areas of expertise: the Tax Code and Social Security. And in those fields, he had few peers. He was good because he knew what he was doing, believed in what he was doing, and never tired of what he was doing until he got it right.

□ 2030

I often asked Al a question and got a tentative answer. Then, a week later, long after I had forgotten the question I put to him, I got from Al a memo, a fax sheet, a graph, a table, whatever. He then came up and explained it to me meticulously in a way that anybody, me included, can understand; because Al was not just our analyst or our economist, he was our tutor. Not only did Al produce memos that answered the questions we put to him, but he

also came forth with memos containing answers to questions we should have raised but did not.

I can remember myself more than once in the well of this House struggling, coping to defend our position, only to have Al appear from the benches back here with a memo he just happened to have written in anticipation of this issue.

He was a Democrat, make no mistake about it, but he did not pull punches for partisan purposes. If one wanted a sophist to help rationalize a poor policy proposal, you did not want Al Davis. On the other hand, if we had the right position, if we were principled, if we faced entrenched opposition, special interests, and found our policy hard to defend, we wanted Al Davis on our side, because he would cut to the core of an issue and bend every effort to help us.

His encyclopedic knowledge, his keen mind, his corporate memory, his sense of principle, his passion for the truth, and his patience in explaining it made Al Davis a joy to work with, a colleague that we cherished, a friend we will never forget.

The House will go on without him, of course, but the debate about taxes will be a little less incisive, the explanations of Social Security will be a little less clear, the arguments against the deficit not quite so compelling without the work of Al Davis behind them.

He served his Congress, this Congress, and his country well, and those of us who worked with him will be inspired for a long time by his example, moved by what he taught us, consoled by his humor, for as long as we serve in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), former chairman of the Committee on the Budget who also worked with Al Davis on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, in this institution of democracy there is always a small group of smart, talented, hardworking, honest people who labor anonymously behind the scenes. They are absolutely essential to the success of our form of government. Al Davis was at the top of that group. His brilliance was exceeded only by his work effort and his integrity.

Al worked hard to help those of us who are Members of Congress fulfill our responsibilities in developing, debating, and voting on tax and budget laws. He also helped other staffers, policy thinkers, academics, reporters, and the general public understand the issues. I am told that whenever tax policy experts around town ran into a particularly thorny problem, they looked at each other and would say, this is an Al question.

Al was also brutal in his honesty. If he thought something was a bad idea, it did not matter where it came from, he would tell the truth. Al made himself learn budget rules even when they

seemed silly, so that he could bring his understanding of economics and tax law into the budget process. He spent endless hours late into the night doing calculations and grinding out memos on every possible point of argument or challenge that might come up from a floor debate.

Al patiently answered the same questions over and over, so Members who had not been in the committee debates could understand what they were voting on. He spent endless hours helping our staffs learn what they needed to know.

Having said all that, I have to admit there are other staffers here who share these same traits. So what about Al made him so special and so sad to lose him? Much has been said of Al's love of irony and quick humor, but I do not remember him that way. To me, the best single word to describe Al is "twinkly." He was always smiling and winking about something, usually involving numbers. His eyes would sparkle as he saw wonderful number games and possibilities in his mind long before the rest of us caught up with him. There was a little bounce in those long, lanky strides as he walked down the hall, and when he had his special numbers game going in his head, he literally danced.

Like many of the people in the world I come from, Al was a man of few words, but he also was a man of many numbers. He used his profound understanding of numerical relationships and the flow of money to make life better for all Americans, but particularly for people in need. At heart, he was a deeply kind man and a true populist. The House of Representatives, indeed all the people of this country, have lost a great resource, and I have lost a dear friend. I will miss him very much.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and knew Al in that capacity.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for bringing this Special Order tonight to honor Al Davis.

Mr. Speaker, it is true, Al Davis was a brilliant economist. But to all of my Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, he was so much more. He was our conscience on the committee. Somehow, the words "dedication" and "tireless" do not seem adequate to describe the strength of Al's commitment to his work. He spent countless hours on weekends and at night responding to all sorts of Members' inquiries and issues; even some that, to put it kindly, might be considered harebrained.

Still, he took every request seriously and would leave no question unanswered. His efforts were never half-hearted. Unsatisfied with one analysis or two or even ten, Al would often put together hundreds of analyses. Al would leave no stone unturned to pro-

vide all the facts, no matter how obscure.

Despite his unparalleled knowledge and command of some of the most complicated issues dealt with by Congress, Al had an amazing and rare ability to distill and explain information so that it was understandable to the least knowledgeable person. Yet he never, but never, condescended to anyone.

There was something about Al's absentminded-professor persona that was both disarming and reassuring. He could always be counted on to calm passionate temperaments and remind us all of the facts. He would not let us get caught up in hyperbole, and he kept us focused on why we are here: to serve as a voice for the underprivileged and the disenfranchised.

Though he might not have enjoyed the name recognition that my colleagues and I do, there is no doubt that his work was critical to our efforts. Without capable and dedicated staff like Al, this place, Mr. Speaker, would not run. I tell the Members tonight, we will forever be grateful for his service, commitment, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Al Davis fought the good fight. He kept the faith. He worked hard to make things better for those who needed it most. I truly believe we are blessed to have known him. Al, we will miss you. My friend, a job well done.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), also a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for organizing tonight's Special Order in honor of the memory of Al Davis.

Mr. Speaker, when I arrived in Washington as a freshman Member of Congress in January, 1993, I received an assignment to the Committee on the Budget. That was when I met Al Davis. At the time, Al was the committee's senior economist. For someone like me, brand new to the Federal budget policy, Al was nothing less than the Rosetta Stone.

Even before I knew his name, I knew him by my first impression. It was an impression that I held for the next 10 years working with him, our giant brain. The Washington Post said that Al could translate the most arcane economic data into real-world language. That is absolutely true.

But I must also admit that sometimes even Al's translations were hard to grasp. Why? Because, although he was a master of honing sharp political arguments out of obtuse provisions in the Internal Revenue Code, he would never sacrifice content or accuracy. If a Member came to Al with a winning political argument that did not quite square with the facts, Al would patiently explain how the argument could be changed politically and substantively to be sound and accurate. He loved politics, for sure, but Al cared deeply about the enterprise of govern-

ment, and believed that we all have an obligation to carry on our public debate with integrity.

Al was a senior economist and then chief economist for the Committee on the Budget for all my 6 years on the Committee on the Budget. Most know that until recently, Democrat staff of the Committee on the Budget were housed in the old O'Neill Building, which was also the dormitory for House and Senate pages.

It was quite appropriate that the Committee on the Budget staff worked out of a dormitory, because when we went to see Al Davis, working along with his colleagues, Richard Kogan and the others who served with such talent the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and then the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), we truly felt like we were in the gifted and talented dorm at college. Here would be Al in his office, piled high with every budget and economic resource we could imagine, statutes, studies, charts, you name it. Of course, we would always find Al perched in the middle of it with an open collar, or in the summer a short-sleeved shirt, jacket and tie hanging on the wall, just in case of emergencies.

Al would field questions about budget and tax policy with the excitement and enthusiasm of a kid. He not only would answer the question, but also point out the humor, the irony, the inconsistency, or the sheer lunacy of the provision under discussion. When we went to see Al, we were truly talking to the smartest kid in the class.

Al was a very influential staffer, although he had no use for the trappings of authority. Al loved his work for its own sake and not because it made him powerful or sought after, which probably explains why Al treated people like he did. There would be no one in the world more surprised than Al to have an editorial written about him in the Washington Post. He was just as happy to explain the finer points of tax policy to a junior staffer as he was a senior Member. If one was interested in learning the substance, then Al Davis was interested in teaching it to you.

Because of his knowledge and intelligence, we made great demands on Al. We asked him not only to undertake economic analyses to support our policies, but also to develop the arguments and market them. On many occasions, I would decide the night before markup that our charts did not quite capture the perfect argument for the next day. I would ask my staff to call Al to find the data to create the perfect chart. Armed with such an 11th hour request, you can imagine how anyone would be exasperated, and occasionally Al was. But even those times, a few hours later, sometimes well after midnight, Al would send over the chart, just as we had asked.

I served, along with my legislative director for 10 years, Mike Smart, with Al and developed the greatest respect and admiration for him. As he loved

ideas, so he also loved life. I remember my surprise once at disembarking at the Bangor, Maine airport to find Al Davis and his loving partner Mary, Al having one of these goofy camping caps on. He was off for a canoe trip, an incongruous notion for me, thinking of our giant brain paddling that canoe in the wilds of Maine; but that is the kind of diverse and loving-life guy Al Davis was.

I have found my years in Congress to be enriched significantly by knowing Al and having the benefit of his counsel. I will miss him very much.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following items: The Washington Post editorial on Al Davis; the June 9 Tax Notes write-up by Warren Rojas on Al Davis and his contribution to the profession; a tribute in the June 9 Tax Notes from Gene Steurele entitled "Economic Perspective"; and last but not least, a beautiful eulogy that was presented at the St. Charles Catholic Church in Arlington, Virginia, on Monday, June 9, by Dan Maffei, also a staff member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The documents referred to are as follows.

[From The Washington Post, June 7, 2003]

(By Albert J. Davis)

Unless you're a tax and budget wonk, you probably didn't know Al Davis. Mr. Davis, the Democrats' chief economist on the House Ways and Means Committee, was one of those classic Capitol Hill staffers whose effectiveness can't be measured by the number of times they are mentioned in the newspaper. But from his cluttered office in the Longworth House Office Building, Mr. Davis helped mold and inform the public debate about what he saw as the troubling direction of the nation's economic policy, churning out fact sheets that were as accurate as they were partisan. He could get as worked up—maybe even more—about Democrats using distorted numbers as about Republicans who did so.

Mr. Davis had the gift of being able to translate the most arcane economic data into real-world language that Democratic lawmakers—the people he called his "customers"—could use to make their case. For reporters scrambling to make sense of a study or to dredge up an obscure detail, he was the ultimate resource, with a seemingly encyclopedic understanding of the tax code. If you wrote or advocated about such matters, you'd quickly find your way to Al—or he to you. He patiently educated the uninitiated, from green legislative aides to reporters new to the economics beat. When a bill was on the floor, Mr. Davis was always there with his bulging accordion file, colleague Janice Mays recalled, offering when the most obscure of points came up, "I just happen to have a memo here."

Mr. Davis died last week at 56 after being struck by a cab on his way home from work. The accident occurred as congress was finishing work on a tax bill that Mr. Davis detested, and, as he lingered in a coma for 11 days after the accident, we can only imagine how frustrated he would have been not to be immersed in the debate. Len Burman, co-director of the Tax Policy Center, recalled visiting Mr. Davis at George Washington University Hospital and delivering updates on the latest outrages in the tax measure, "I kept on thinking, he's definitely going to wake up for this," Mr. Burman said, Mr.

Davis's boss, Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.), said that Mr. Davis "promoted truth in an institution too used to skirting around politically inconvenient facts."

[From Tax Notes, June 9, 2003]

ECONOMISTS, LAWMAKERS LAUD DEPARTED
DEMOCRATIC COLLEAGUE

(By Warren Rojas)

Fiscal watchdogs on both sides of aisle last week grieved the recent death of House Ways and Means Committee Chief Democratic Economist Albert J. Davis—a public servant many revered for his sharp mind, quick wit, and commitment to economic transparency.

Davis, whom colleagues remembered as a fixture of the Washington economics community since arriving here in the early 1980s, died May 30 after being struck by a taxicab in Arlington, Va., on May 19. Although at press time memorial arrangements for Davis remained were uncertain, Democratic leaders plan to sponsor a special order on June 10 allowing lawmakers one hour of debate time on the chamber floor to share their memories of Davis.

"Our members are all sort of devastated because Al was our crutch," Ways and Means Democratic staff director and Davis's most recent boss Janice Mays said about Davis, that he was the unofficial "go-to" policy guru for most House Democrats.

"From my standpoint, he was the perfect staffer. I am really desolate," Mays said.

Davis's chief foil, Ways and Means senior economist for the majority Alex Brill, voiced genuine admiration for Davis's "strong commitment and belief in economics and his issues."

"We rarely agreed, but he was someone I respected," Brill told Tax Analysts. "He was someone who worked hard and made his issues vibrant and real." While they quite often digested the same economic data only to come to diametrically opposed policy positions, Brill said Davis usually emerged with a "fair read" of alternative views.

"He certainly had that strong grasp of the science," he said, adding, "And I know by reputation that he dissected [the information] very quickly."

Similarly, Ways, and Means Committee ranking minority member Charles B. Rangel, D-N.Y., said that Congress as an institution would suffer from Davis's sudden departure.

"Though he appeared soft-spoken and cerebral, Al Davis was passionate about defending the interests of the working men and women of this country," Rangel said. "Using his spread sheets, his charts, and his memos, Al was a powerful fighter for economic justice. He promoted truth in an institution too used to skirting around politically inconvenient facts. Al's death is a loss for the entire nation."

A NATIONAL TREASURE

Born in Dallas in 1947, Davis laid the foundation for his economic ascension by securing Bachelor of Arts in economics (with Honors) from Swarthmore College in 1968. He followed that up by earning a Master of Arts in economics (with concentrations in international economics and public finance) from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1974.

With tools in hand, Davis then began his professional career as a research director and fiscal policy expert for the Wisconsin Department of Revenue (1976-1980) before moving to Washington and leapfrogging from governmental agency to governmental agency, servicing as: senior analyst at the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1980-1983); senior economist for the Democratic staff of the House Budget Committee (1984-1994); chief economist of the Democratic staff of the House Budget Com-

mittee (1995-1998); and chief economist for the Ways and Means Democrats (1999 to 2003).

While his résumé reads like a road map followed by the prototypical federal number cruncher, economists and friends claim his fiscal vision and translation skills made Davis an unparalleled ally.

According to Mays, Democrats treasured Davis's counsel because the combination of computer savvy and homemade economic models enabled him to provide lawmakers in the minority with in-depth analysis on par with what Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget deliver to the White House.

"He could kind of give you the facts of who would benefit and who wouldn't from various tax changes," Mays said of his understanding of how taxes, budget, and long-term fiscal policy changes here all interrelated. "He had a great overview of how all those things would work together."

Rather than hoard that knowledge, Mays said Davis enjoyed the intellectual exercise of sifting through the tax code and bringing all its hidden flaws to light.

"He enjoyed explaining how the machine worked. Members would talk to him and go away understanding something a little bit better," she said of the impromptu tutorials and explanations Davis could provide at a moment's notice. She added that often, Davis would make time to talk to any legislative assistant who reached out to him—happily logging 20-hour workdays to explain the underlying economic consequences of any legislative proposal.

Explaining how Davis was more than a mere policy work, Urban Institute economist and Tax Policy Institute codirector Leonard E. Burman painted Davis as a "legislative detective" adept at sifting through the fine print of most tax bills and spelling out the particulars to Hill watchers and members alike.

"If you talked to Al every day, you would routinely learn things that others might not read about in the mainstream papers till two or three weeks later," he stated, hailing Davis as "an ordinary guy who was pivotal to how tax policy works."

Burman praised Davis for working "tirelessly to keep both the Democrats and the Republicans on the Ways and Means committee honest and informed about their tax policy options and the implications of their choices," and thanked him for keeping everyone else in Washington up to speed on the day-to-day tax grind.

"He knew how to read the tax law and could figure out how these goofy provisions concocted in the dead of night would [effect] other issues down the road. And he knew how to write so that anyone could understand it," Burman said of Davis's copious policy memos.

On a personal level, Burman said he would most miss scanning the tax dailies in search of a (supposedly) clandestine comment from Davis. "I am going to miss reading articles in Tax Notes and other places where a House staffer or some other well-placed aide was quoted and picking out his voice—because I always knew it was Al," he said.

Congressional Research Service economist and close friend Jane G. Gravelle called Davis's death "a great, great tragedy" for those who were close to him and to the economics profession as a whole.

Although he prided himself on staying behind the scenes, Gravelle said Davis clearly had a "great effect on the transmission of economic knowledge" both in and around Washington.

"To me, he was the epitome of the staff adviser to Congress," she said—although Gravelle quickly added that Davis was somehow able to avoid getting mired down in the

political frustration and procedural malaise that often overtakes people who stay on Capitol Hill too long.

"Whereas there are those on the Hill to whom politics is the predominant issue, Al had principles. He always wanted to communicate the truth—even if his members didn't want to hear it," she stated.

"He was very quick in seeing through to the essence of things—particularly sneaky ways that people could turn and twist the tax code to benefit from policy changes," Gravelle said of Davis's economic intuition. She added that Davis's economic know-how and command of public policy would be hard to replace.

"To replace that set, to explain things and understand them—quite often these two do not go together. Particularly in economics," she quipped. "I can't help but believe that Democrats will suffer from the loss of those skills."

Brookings Institution senior fellow and Tax Policy Institute codirector William G. Gale said Davis's passing would leave a void that will not easily be filled.

"He was deeply committed to what he was doing—but he was also willing to take a step back and laugh about the policy silliness," Gale recounted. "He will be sorely missed both personally and professionally."

While noting that he believes there is a sea of unsung policy experts and congressional staffers keeping most lawmakers afloat, Gale hinted that the stereotypical Washington bureaucrats do their jobs "maybe not quite as well as Al did."

"He wouldn't have bothered writing such clear, compelling stuff if he didn't think it mattered," he said of Davis's economic convictions.

Moreover, Gale suggested that Davis's long commitment to combating complexity and other long-term fiscal concerns had renewed his sense of purpose in recent years.

"One of the things he really railed against was the disingenuity of how tax cuts were advanced over the last few years," Gale said. "It was a constant thorn in his side that tax cut advocates were using any argument to justify their tax cuts. So he spent a lot of time trying to be a reality check on those people."

Mays noted, however, that even though they had been overtaken by the immediate sense of mourning, she and her staff would ultimately honor Davis's memory by continuing to shine a light on potential abuses of the tax code.

"Al would want us to keep fighting. He would not want us to stop just because he is not one of the troops anymore," she stated.

Contributions in memory of Albert J. Davis may be made to memorial funds established in his name at Swarthmore College and the Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

[From Tax Notes, June 9, 2003]

A TRIBUTE TO AL DAVIS

(By Gene Steuerle)

Al Davis. Al Davis. Where are you, Al, now that we need you more than ever? Many tributes are going to be made about Al, who died on Friday, May 30, as a result of injuries from being struck by a taxi. Still, I feel compelled to add my own accolade, not just in gratitude for what he did for me over the years, but to challenge all of us who engage in tax analysis and policy to try to live up to his standards.

Anyone who worked with Al knows that he was a master at putting together information and disseminating it in easily digestible nuggets. He loved data and would reconfigure and recompile it until the stories hidden in the numbers came out and hit you over the head as if they were apparent all

along. He fed all of us information about actions we had missed—especially if they involved some sleight of hand, some manipulation of the numbers, or simply some little noticed special interest provision snuck into a bill late at night. In this endeavor he was ceaselessly bipartisan. Those for whom he worked, Democrats on the Ways and Means and House Budget Committees, may be well aware of his biting edge when he thought Republicans were running amok, but I can assure you that he was equally informative, honest, and skeptical when Democrats were dodging or ignoring principles of tax or budget policy.

Al was a national treasure. He knew more quirks of the tax and budget process than most of us will ever hope to guess at, much less understand. He could translate confusing rules, jumbled numbers, and incomplete actions, with a keen awareness of just how they were going to affect the policy process. He would spend whatever time was necessary to educate his bosses and his colleagues in the tax and budget community, even if it meant that he had to work 18 hours instead of 12 to get other parts of his job done.

Al and I go back to graduate school days at the University of Wisconsin long ago. We both had returned to school after a military tour of duty, and we both had a keen interest in issues of public policy. Al was quickly disaffected by some of the arcane aspects of economics—those that might be great for tenure but had no applicability to the real world. Al wanted to solve problems and his interest from the start was in public policy. How could it be made to work best for the public? From beginning to end, I don't think there was ever any other motivation that so drove him. He was an exemplary public servant, the embodiment of the concept of service.

At the same time, he was fun. Sometimes when action was fierce, battle lines drawn, and staff abuse the order of the day, Al would smile brightly and plunge harder than ever into the morass to try to come out with information that was straightforward, sensible, and influential. And always timely. He had a special smirk for much of the silliness that always prevails in the legislative process, and when you saw it come over his face, you got ready for a good story—the same way you anticipated a Bob Hope punch line. I think Al's energy cells were fueled by the action going on around him.

Integrity largely defines Al's approach to work and policymaking. There's something about our system of government that makes it dependent on people like Al, the ones who tell it like it is and are willing to bear the consequences. There's a story that circulates in government about the many staff persons in Congress and the Executive Branch who either stare at their shoes or simply tell their bosses what they want to hear. The shoe staring arises when an elected official says something outlandish or wrong, but no one has the nerve to correct him or even put better information into the conversation. Al's failure to play these games may have foreclosed certain career options, but he was usually in his element in the jobs he took, always just below the surface visible to the public but right at the heart of policy.

It's hard to convey fully the loss to the policy community, much less to Al's friends and loved ones. I do know this. Al's death warns us once again that those who would serve must do it now, not later after some power has been obtained or some career ambition achieved. Thanks, Al. And every time I see still more silliness in the tax or budget process, I'll sense your outrage that it couldn't have been done better and your humor at how it all happened. I'll try to

maintain hope that, with people like you to grace our lives, maybe, just maybe, we can muddle through once again.

REFLECTIONS AT THE MASS OF CHRISTIAN BURIAL FOR ALBERT J. DAVIS, ST. CHARLES BORROMEO CATHOLIC CHURCH, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA, MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2003

My name is Dan Maffei. I am the spokesperson on the Democratic Staff of the Committee on Ways and Means where Al worked.

I first got to know Al though his memos. Al's memos were sort of like his Star of Bethlehem. They did not reveal all the truths but they led you to him and you were seldom disappointed.

Al's title was "Chief Economist" but Al knew more tax law than most tax counsels and virtually anything about the federal budget. He knew American history. When I had a question about physics or Latin, it was a pretty good bet Al would know that too.

And Al didn't just know the answers, he knew where the answers came from. He could explain how to understand them to any journalist or staff member—his "clients" or "customers" as he called them.

Al was a greater communicator.

Too often, the simple soundbite answer can lead to unfair and unjust policy.

But, as a wise member of the Ways and Means Committee once said, "If you have to 'splain it' you've already lost."

Al Davis was the antidote to that axiom.

Al could, by explaining something so well and so clearly, reveal the simple truth within a complex issue.

Al produced both quality and quantity. Memos, e-mails, distribution analyses, spreadsheets, one-pagers and charts—charts, charts, charts.

With such preparation, it is easy to understand why Al was such a good sailor and outdoorsman. Compared to Al, the best boy scout would look impromptu.

Al even could predict the future.

On the House floor, he was a walking library. A member would ask some obscure question and Al would say, "I happen to have something on that right here."

Though he had served with distinction in the United States Army, Al was not particularly good at taking orders, and not good at delegating. But that did not matter. He was a staff unto himself.

Al had many bosses throughout his career but his big secret was that he really worked for himself. All of his bosses would quickly realize that, if allowed to do it his way, Al could cause a great deal of trouble for some and do a great deal of good for the working Americans.

"Business is good," Al would say.

He would reveal the gimmicks, debunk myths, and correct bad numbers.

A couple of weeks ago, the Senate Republicans' tax bill was derailed by "an estimating error." A memo Al had written two days earlier revealed a flawed estimate. Even as Al lay in the hospital, he had thrown a wrench in the works of those trying to get away with too many short-cuts.

Al was angry at the current Administration and the Republicans, not for their views but for their dishonesty.

Al did not sit well for lies.

Honest opinions, honest numbers, honest budgeting—these meant a great deal to Al.

He had a particular dislike of logically inconsistent statements that were designed to con the public. He saw only one rational reaction—ridicule.

As he wrote, "Most recently, the President has equated tax cuts with 'jobs.' He has warned against a first-round of tax cuts as 'small' as \$350 billion. If economics is that simple, why not eliminate all taxes? If economics were that simple, families could get

ahead by spending twice their income every year."

Al's sarcasm had a lighter side too, frequently accompanied by that trademark grin.

Back in the army, Al would quip that he was given a rifle to guard a paint shed, a night stick to guard a depot, and nothing at all to guard the Pentagon.

Many years later when the Bush White House sent up a budget wrapped in an American flag cover, Al's memo ripping the budget's tax provisions apart had a bold stars and stripes watermark.

As the war in Iraq got under way, Al sent the following e-mail: "The newspapers today say that the stock market 'soared' upon news of the war. Forget the dividend tax cut plan, the stock market is taken care of."

Recently, I sent Al an e-mail about a new Democratic Leadership Council idea to set up a "prosperity reserve fund" so the Federal government could put away money to pay down debt later on. Al's response was five words: "Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey"

That was not the only Democratic dumb idea that came Al's way. As each new young staffer came along, feeling that he or she really had the solution, and came to Al with their flawed idea, Al would sign. Or, it was something he had heard a dozen times before, it would get the head shake.

Al was well practiced at rolling his eyes.

Yet, Al had near endless patience. Frequently, a young legislative aide would assure Al had lost patience with him when, lo and behold, they would get an e-mail from Al with all the answers they needed.

Al disdained it when other staffers or members of Congress would take themselves too seriously. That was a trait he did not have.

In fact, the most frequent victim of Al's acerbic wit was Al himself. He would apologize for "torturing" people with his depth explanations. Or say that some foolish person decided to do a detailed analysis of this bill and then attach a memo that he himself had done.

Just about 6 weeks ago, I asked Al whether he had ever taught college. Al could have made a great college professor. Al said that had he finished his Ph.D., he might have considered it.

But that would have taken Al out of the front lines. In the fight for better government and for a better life for the working people of this country, Al was in the best place he could be.

For even though Al could seem cloistered among his books and files and spreadsheets, and even though he would shun meetings and had to be dragged to the House door, Al loved being an agent in the process—and a potent one at that. He had found work worthy of himself.

And besides, it didn't whether he had the title, Al was the best professor I ever had.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), also a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, unlike many of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, I only knew Al Davis well for a brief period of time, although now I am in my fourth term. I had previously met Al, but I recently became a member of the committee. It did not take me long to learn that Al was an invaluable resource to all of us.

Al's mastery of economics, his vast institutional knowledge and patient demeanor, combined with the rare ability to simplify and explain complex data, helped ease my transition and the transition of many others to the committee.

□ 2045

It served committee Democrats well during crucial tax debates.

As several poignant columns have pointed out this past week, including these that have been referred to in *The Washington Post* and in *Tax Notes*, Al worked tirelessly to shed light on the ways in which data and statistics can be and often are manipulated and misrepresented to serve narrow purposes. At the same time, Al was proudly partisan and used his extensive knowledge to influence public debate on economic and fiscal policy.

Whether one agreed or disagreed with Al, everyone who was familiar with him acknowledged the accuracy of his data and the sincerity of his motives. He never stopped fighting for economic justice, and he was especially passionate in his criticisms of the increasing inequities in the Tax Code. He clearly stood for the working men and the working women of this country.

His charts, graphs, spreadsheets and memos were highly regarded on the Hill and among fiscal and budget policy experts, and his research and presence will be greatly missed.

As many speakers here today are aware, Al's office space was a study in controlled chaos. I met with Al in his office shortly after I joined the committee in January, and I was impressed with both the volume of material in his office and the fact that he was able to quickly locate seemingly obscure information with very little effort. As committee members and staff know, Al typically carried much of this material with him at all times, carried it with him to the floor; and he always had relevant information handy. During our heated debates, he was a constantly reassuring sight to all of us on this side of the aisle and could always be counted on to clearly and concisely refute arguments on fiscal and budget policy made by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Simply put, Al is irreplaceable, a reality check for both Republicans and Democrats; and his friends and colleagues will feel his loss for years to come.

Al's friend and a friend to the committee, Janice Mays, is the Democratic staff director and Al's most recent boss. On the issue of going forward from this point, she recently said, "Al would want us to keep fighting. He would not want us to stop just because he is not one of the troops anymore."

There could be no better memorial than that; and Mr. Speaker, there could be no better compliment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), also a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure is the case with each of those who have spoken tonight, I come to these remarks with a heavy heart, one of the more difficult remarks that I make here I guess for two reasons, both because of my affection for Al and because he is not here to help me with the speech.

As I look back over the floor, I see the spots where I would see Al sitting with John Buckley and Janice Mays and Dan Maffei, with Beth Vance and other members of the staff of our committee, knowing the loss that each of us speaks of tonight as a Member is a loss that has been suffered by his colleagues who worked with him, the closest as staff members on the Committee on Ways and Means.

But I think of the many times that I have been here when I was over there vigorously scribbling the final notes of what I might say in rebuttal to some argument I heard when Al would come over and note something that had been omitted from the debate and totally change my speech; or when having concluded that the strongest argument for our side was a particular bit of data, I would turn to Al and have him indicate that it really was not quite as solid as perhaps the sheet that had come out from one of the various groups particularly interested in the matter might have indicated and that a stronger argument was to be found somewhere else.

Al did all this with that sense of gentleness, of cooperation that has been spoken of by others here tonight. He was a remarkable individual.

Also, I still have a collection of e-mails from Al because, as others have also pointed out, Al would see some bit of contradiction. One of them I came across was one that in a simple message said I was struck by the following sentence in the President's speech last night, preceded by an analysis by Al of the contradictions between what the President said and what the President and his administration had done.

Al has provided the kind of careful insight to public policy, the kind of careful analysis of the numbers but also with an understanding of the human condition, an understanding in a life varied in experience, filled with love from his family and from his colleagues, and he brought that special insight to us so that it was not just a matter of regurgitating the numbers but of putting flesh and bone on those numbers and translating them into what they meant to ordinary American citizens in a way that few people I met here, either elected or unelected, have a capacity to do.

As I think about the tragic loss of Al, something that came so unexpectedly to all of us, to his family, his friends, his colleagues, I think that while I will add a few more specifics in my extended remarks here tonight, that I would want to reflect on Al's commitment to words like dedication, industry, loyalty and integrity and would

say that when it came to issues like retirement security, like assuring that people could get health care, like guaranteeing that there was at least a little sanity in the budget process, and I initially met Al working with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and with his predecessor, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), as a young member of the Committee on the Budget, on issues like tax fairness that have been so important to me personally, that Al was committed to those issues.

His tragic passing reminds us that we never know how long our tenure and our ability to serve what we view the public interest is going to be, and I think we are called upon in remembering Al to remember the causes that were most important to him and to redouble our efforts in his spirit and on his behalf to fight for fairness, to oppose hypocrisy, to stand up for what is right for the American people in much the way Al would do if he could be here offering us suggestions tonight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues gathered here today to honor and memorialize Ways and Means Democratic Staff Economist Al Davis who life was tragically cut short.

Al dedicated many years of his life to helping Democrats in the House of Representatives promote policies to improve the lives of America's working families. He did this first when working for the House Budget Committee Democratic staff and more recently with the Ways and Means Committee Democrats as our chief economist.

Those of us lucky enough to serve in Congress know how important the role of staff really is. A good staffer is not someone who will just agree with you—though it takes many of us a very long time to discover that reality. The best staffer is someone who understands the facts and helps you use those facts to promote policy that you support or oppose, but will tell you when the facts aren't on your side.

Al excelled in this role. He knew the tax code and budgetary impact of any change in law better—and more quickly—than almost anyone. If you needed the facts to support your argument, he was there with a memo to assist you. But, only if your argument was correct and could be substantiated! And, that was why Al will be missed so greatly. He'd tell you if the facts didn't support you—and you couldn't convince him to do otherwise.

There are two words that I think best describe Al Davis. The first is "integrity". As I've said above, he always held true to the facts and helped us do so as well. The second word is "commitment". Al was truly committed to the work he was doing here on Capitol Hill. He was here helping us whenever the Ways and Means Committee was meeting or the full House was considering Ways and Means bills—no matter how late at night it was. When the House wasn't in session late, he was usually still here long after we'd gone home analyzing bills, making charts and getting his memos out to us to make sure that we had the facts necessary to promote or combat various policies.

Al Davis will be sorely missed. He was the consummate Congressional staffer. We need

more Al Davis' on both sides of the aisle. It is very sad that, instead, we have one less in our presence today.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues tonight in celebrating the life, and mourning the loss, of an exemplary public servant, Al Davis.

Al was the embodiment of the concept of public service. He possessed an encyclopedic understanding of the tax code and was committed to the promotion of truth and honesty in American tax and budget policy. In fact, if there was one word synonymous with Al, it would be "honesty". Members and staff on both sides of the aisle expected nothing but the raw truth from Al, and they were never disappointed. It was the core of his being.

Armed with a keen sense of American history, a quick mind and sharp wit, and the passion of his convictions, Al would cut through the political rhetoric to translate complex technical data into readily understandable facts. While the Congress may be diminished by his physical absence, his commitment inspires us to continue the fight for better government.

Al, you will be missed both personally and professionally. But as you look down on us from a better place, we will be inspired by your example and the sense of purpose you set in the fight for a better life for the working people of our country.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues from the Ways and Means Committee honoring Mr. Al Davis.

As one of the two newest members on the committee in the 108th Congress, I was privileged to become acquainted with Al and appreciate his round the clock efforts to make sure the Democratic members of the committee and their staffs were kept abreast of the upcoming events and legislation we would be dealing with. And I do mean round the clock. Messages would come on my Blackberry pager at 11 o'clock at night, sometimes later. When major bills were getting ready to be discussed in a hearing or markup before the committee, the first memo that reached my hands in the morning would be the most recent information that Al had spent the previous night researching and compiling.

To say that Al provided sage-like advice to the committee is an understatement. While my colleagues on the committee are extremely knowledgeable of the economic issues related to the Ways and Means' jurisdiction, rarely would they not yield to Al as he would offer greater insights into the complex issues we faced. I think I can speak for other members when I say that a common first response to questions we had for our staffs was "Let me check with Al and see what he thinks."

Al's tireless work ethic, attention to detail, and cunning sense of humor will be remembered by all his friends and colleagues, here on Capitol Hill and elsewhere. As I take these moments to remember Al, I also want to thank him for his steadfast commitment to the ideals of the committee.

AMERICA'S GREATEST THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I think that our recent military successes in Afghanistan and Iraq have demonstrated very clearly that we are the preeminent military force in the world. Our economy, although it has been somewhat slowed recently, is certainly the strongest in the world.

By most measures, the United States is the most powerful Nation in the world. At the present time, we stand alone in a position of preeminence; and so sometimes when one is in that position, it is easy to begin to think that we are invincible and that this will go on forever, and certainly we hope that that is the case.

Then I think it is important that we cast a historical frame of reference on all of the recent circumstances on things that have happened.

Certainly 2,500 years ago, the Greeks were preeminent; and they, I am sure, felt that their culture would last forever and that they would be in a preeminent position until history ended; and then 500 years later, 2000 years ago, we found that the Roman empire had superseded Greece, and again, for a period of time, it was the most powerful nation in the world, just dominated the then-civilized world as we knew it.

150 years ago, the British Empire certainly was the most dominant nation in the world and controlled most of the affairs in the discovered world at that time; and of course, even the Soviet Union just 20 years ago appeared to be an almost invincible force. It was our rival. And so the United States and Soviet Union were the two most powerful nations in the world; and yet in each case, each one of these great civilizations, each one of these nations fell, and the interesting thing was that they did not fall from outside forces. It was not because somebody took them over. Rather, they fell from internal factors; and so their unity of purpose, their national resolve, the character of their people began to crumble, and as a result, they all to some degree became less powerful, and to some degree they became history.

So what is America's greatest threat today? I am sure some would say al Qaeda. Some would say it is the ongoing conflict in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine. Some would say it is the nuclear capabilities of North Korea and possibly Iran. Others would say the biggest problem we have is the economy, and certainly all of these things are important, and certainly they are all worthy of our attention, and they certainly get it in this body on a daily basis.

I would submit to my colleagues that from my perspective the greatest threat that this Nation faces today is not outside forces, but rather, it is unraveling of the culture from within. So I am going to tonight, Mr. Speaker, document this thesis in some ways, and the reason I say this is because I have had considerable experience working with young people over 36 years.

From 1962 to 1997, I spent almost all of my time working with young people.

Most of them were ages 17 to 22, but I also spent a lot of time in high schools with summer camps where I worked with kids in the 9th, 10th and 11th and 12th grade. I coached 150 young men every year, visited 70 to 80 high schools in all parts of the country. Some were in inner cities, some were in suburbs, some were in rural areas; and I sat in 70 to 80 living rooms all around the country from wealthy to poor to rural. So I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that I understand the whole situation that is going on in our country; but over those 36 years, I began to see some things that were of concern, some things that I think are worthy of note.

The young people I worked with were talented; and as time went on, they became bigger and faster and stronger and in some cases smarter, but they also were more troubled. I saw more personal problems. I saw more stress. I saw more young people who were off balance; and as a result, over that 36-year period, I progressively spent less and less time coaching and more and more time dealing with personal issues; and I think almost anyone in education would tell us the same thing, whether they are a school administrator or a teacher or a coach. Anyone who works consistently with young people over a period of time will tell us that things have changed. There has been a shift, and as far as stability, it has not been for the better.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there are several factors that have contributed to these changes, and the first of these that is very obvious, and I think almost anyone would recognize this, is a change in family stability. In 1960, when I first started working with young people, the out-of-wedlock birth-rate was 5 percent. Today, it is 33 percent. So roughly one out of every three children are born out of wedlock, with no stable marriage and have two strikes against them. That is an increase over that period of time of 600 percent.

In 1960, the great majority of young people lived with both biological parents. We would occasionally see a young person who was from a single-parent family, but usually if we did so, it was because one parent or the other was deceased. Today, roughly one-half of our young people are growing up without both biological parents, again, an increase of probably 3 to 500 percent in terms of lack of stable families.

Today, only 7 percent of our families are so-called traditional families. So the family that we have is generally a father works, a mother stays home with the children and is a full-time homemaker or at least if the mother works, the father stays home, and yet only 7 percent of our families are of that nature today.

□ 2100

So we often think of latchkey kids belonging in the inner city where they come home after school and nobody is there, but I can tell Members from per-

sonal experience that there are roughly 80-90 percent of the young people in the suburbs and rural areas, nobody is home at 3 o'clock and they are latchkey kids as well.

So this has been a tremendous shift in our demographics. Parents today spend 40 percent less time with their children than a generation ago. The average parent spends no more than a few minutes with each child, and a huge amount of time is eaten up with the television set and work activities. The divorce rate has increased, from 1960 to 1995, 300 percent. Currently today, 24 million children are living without their real father.

I dealt with a lot of those young people and I remember particularly one case where this young man was a good football player, and by his junior year he was being mentioned as being an All-American. One day I got a phone call from a man living in another State and he wanted to know if I knew this player. I said, I coach him. He said, "That is my son. I would like to talk to him."

So I talked to this young man and I thought he would be thrilled being reunited with his father. He said, "He left me when I was 1 or 2 years old and now the only reason he wants to talk to me is because I am somewhat famous as a player, and I do not want to talk to him."

I sensed the anguish. I saw young people time and time again who had a father who was missing in their life and they were trying to fill that void, and usually it was with all the wrong stuff; and it was not just young men, it was young women as well.

This Sunday is Father's Day, and fatherless children are in some difficult circumstances at the present time. Fatherless children are 120 percent more likely to experience child abuse, twice as likely to drop out of school, 2-3 times more likely to have mental or emotional problems, 1½ times to 2 times more likely to abuse drugs and alcohol, and 11 times more likely to commit a violent act.

I ran into a story recently that is true, and this had to do with a greeting card business that contacted a prison. Mother's Day was approaching and they notified all of the prisoners that they would provide a Mother's Day card free if the prisoner would use it and send it to his mother. They had almost 100 percent participation. Practically all of the inmates took the card and mailed it to their mother. They thought this was quite a success.

So Father's Day was rolling around and they thought they would do it again. And the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, in that particular prison there was hardly anyone who asked for a card to send to his father because, I would assume, because none knew their father, or their father had abandoned them.

What I am saying as far as the family is that the launching pad, the family, is not totally broken. We have some

good families in our country, but the launching pad is certainly cracked, and changes have been undertaken in our society that are going to be really difficult for us to rectify in the immediate future.

So on top of the family disintegrating to some degree, we find that the environment in which young people are living has changed dramatically. When I began coaching in the 1960s, drug abuse was almost unheard of. We had never heard of cocaine, steroids, methamphetamine. We heard a little bit about marijuana, but that was somebody out in Hollywood, and none of the young people I was dealing with had experienced it. Of course today, currently, we find that we have a drug epidemic on our hands, and that includes alcohol. We have between 2 and 3 million teenage alcoholics in our country today. So the drug issue has become one of epidemic proportion.

The thing that is really interesting to me and astounding to me and discouraging to me is at one time we assumed rural America was the bastion of the family, and that was the one place we could count on traditional values. Yet we find at the present time that drug abuse in rural areas is equal to that of the urban areas, if not greater. The greatest scourge currently in rural areas that we have is methamphetamine abuse. It is roughly twice as prevalent as it is in the cities. If you are addicted to meth, the time that you are going to have to spend in inpatient treatment to have any chance of being cured is not 3 months as it is for alcohol and other drugs, it is roughly 24-36 months, and then the odds are very good you will not beat it and meth probably at some point will kill you.

The average meth addict will commit roughly 130 crimes per year to support that habit. Imagine the cost to each community of one meth addict, and we have rampant meth abuse in the rural areas. We also have the highest rate of violence of any civilized nation in the world at the present time. The United States has the highest homicide rate. We have the highest suicide rate, and of course we have had numerous school shootings in the United States in recent years, and Columbine is almost the catch word for that type of activity. So the violence activity has escalated astronomically over the last 25 years.

Also, pornography has exploded. There are over 1 million porn sites on the Internet today. Sixty percent of all sites on the Internet have to do with pornography, and that is more than one-half. Additionally, there are more than 100,000 child porn sites on the Internet. Child pornography is illegal, and yet we have 100,000 child porn sites. So our children, our young people, are being engulfed by a wave of pornography.

It has been estimated that 1 out of 10 children between the ages of 8 and 16

have viewed pornography on the Internet, and mostly this has been unintentional. They have used a search word such as Pokemon, Disney, Barbie, ESPN, and those search words bring up a porn site, and once you bring up a porn site, you begin to get spam, which is dozens of porn sites and the child is inundated with pornography.

I was really surprised about a year ago, Mr. Speaker, to realize that my name used as a search word brought up a porn site. We were able to get that rectified, but the average young person in my district who is maybe doing a research paper on his or her Congressman and plugged in my name would all of a sudden be confronted with a porn site. In a civilized Nation that simply should not happen. I have grandchildren ages 3-10. I have four of them. I can imagine that they will someday be exposed to hard-core pornography, and this should not happen. Many people say pornography is a victimless crime. It does not really hurt anybody so what you see and hear does not make any difference in terms of how you behave.

If that is true, why do we have an advertising industry that spends billions of dollars on advertising? Obviously, if you see a soft drink advertised in an appealing ad, it changes your behavior. You are more apt to purchase that soft drink or automobile or whatever is being advertised. Obviously what we see and what we hear has a tremendous impact on our behavior, and our young people today are being inundated with these kinds of messages, and that is discouraging to see.

The video game is also a problem. Today, 8- to 18-year-old boys average 40 minutes a day playing video games. There is nothing wrong with that as long as the video games are within the lines. They might be a little bit violent, but they are probably not going to be a real problem. But we see that some of these games have gotten progressively more and more violent and more and more graphic. Many of them teach stalking and killing techniques that are actually used in training military personnel, Special Forces, to go out and kill people.

One particular video game that we saw recently here in Congress was such an example. It was one in which the young person would engage in stalking someone and shooting them, and if you hit them in the right place in the head and the blood flew, you were rewarded by a series of pornographic images. That was your reward. So people say that is for adults and those were adult-rated games, but the average person who plays those games is 12 years old. The marketing is beamed directly at young people who are teenage and preteenage children.

There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that you can play these kinds of games for any length of time and not have it impact you in some way in the depths of your psyche.

There was a school shooting in Kentucky a couple of years ago, and the

young man who did the shooting went 9 for 9. He shot at 9 young people and he hit all 9. Many law enforcement people said that was amazing. Hardly any law enforcement individual could have done that, but the amazing thing was this particular shooter had not fired a gun before. He had played a lot of video games, and in playing those video games, he had shot lots of people. Apparently he got very good at it because he was almost perfect in his score. That shows you what video games can do.

We have much music, some television, many movies, some talk shows are very explicit and very graphic, and all of these things, if you think about it, simply could not have been put on the airwaves 30 years ago. It would have been impossible to present this kind of material, and yet we have drifted so far that this becomes commonplace and nobody objects. And obviously, this is impacting the minds and hearts of our young people.

The family is less stable. The environment young people are growing up in is more threatening, and also I would submit that our value system has shifted and shifted considerably. I would point to a study that was done by Stephen Covey who wrote the "7 Habits of Highly Successful People" and what he did was research everything that he could find that had to do with success. He said that he noticed a marked shift. He said in the first 150 years in our country's history, success was defined primarily in terms of character traits. A successful person was honest, a successful person was hard-working, a successful person was faithful, was loyal, compassionate. And so really it had to do with qualities of virtue, and that is what success was.

Then he said about 50-60 years ago he began to notice a shift in the literature that he was reading. He noticed that at the present time and for the last 50 years or so that success is now defined in terms of material possessions, in terms of power, and in terms of prestige. So a successful person has money. He may not be an admirable person, but if he has enough money, he is successful. He may have influence and power, and if that is the case, he may not be a good person or an admirable person, but he is a successful person. He may be very popular. He may have people wanting his or her autograph, and he may not be a very good role model, but if he has popularity, he is labeled successful.

So success is no longer linked to character and that is an interesting shift in the way that our value system has come about.

In 1998, there was a poll done that indicated a very high approval rating for the President who was in office at that time. Even though that particular President had misbehaved rather badly with an intern in the Oval Office and had lied to the American public, he still enjoyed a very high approval rating.

□ 2115

The thing that really grabbed my attention was that there was a poll that was done and the question that was posed to the American public was this: Is there any correlation between job performance and private behavior? In other words, what you do in your private life, does that have anything to do with your job performance? Seventy percent of American adults say it has no connection, that there is no relation. You can be a bank president and do all kinds of unscrupulous things in your private life, and it does not affect your job. You can be a very unscrupulous coach, and it would not make any difference in how you did your job. It was amazing to me that this many people in the American public would say that there is no correlation between job performance and private behavior, because what we are saying here is that character really does not count, because what you do in private essentially is an issue of character. The value system has certainly changed in that regard.

In the business world, we have seen some changes. I would submit that WorldCom and Enron and Global Crossing were not isolated instances. These were not accidental happenings. It was simply a reflection of the shift that we have had in this culture to an all-out infatuation with material success. And so anything goes in those types of situations. The Great Wall of China, Mr. Speaker, was breached twice. It was several thousand miles long. It was believed to be impenetrable. As a result, it was built to keep out the barbarian hordes. Yet twice it was breached. In neither case was it a situation where the barbarians overran the wall, knocked it down or had a military victory. It was because they bribed the gatekeeper. What I would submit at the present time is that a lot of our gatekeepers at the present time have not been responsible. As a result, we see a lack of trust in our country today that is almost unprecedented. Many people no longer believe that some of the leaders that we have in various industries and politics and athletics and the business world can be trusted. Of course, the alarming thing here is that democracy is based on trust. When trust evaporates, then it is very difficult to run an effective democracy.

The predominant world view today, Mr. Speaker, is something called postmodernism. Postmodernism is a belief that there are no moral absolutes, that nothing is absolutely good or bad in and of itself. As a famous individual recently said, the Ten Commandments are irrelevant. And so everything is relative. Theft is justified at times. If you need what you are stealing bad enough, it can be justified. Everything is relative. Murder certainly could be justified if you happen to kill someone who is really not an admirable person. You can rationalize that it is okay. Adultery is certainly something that is acceptable if nobody

is going to find out. Even treason would be okay if you were angry enough or hated your country badly enough. Postmodernism has dominated our thought and I think has had a tremendous amount to do with the way our young people and our country begin to see things.

In view of the fact that we have had a family breakdown, we have had a decline of the culture and a shifting of values, this is an extremely difficult time for our young people. They are being asked to weave their way through a minefield. In this minefield, there is alcohol and drug abuse over here, there is harmful video games over here, there is wholesome music and television over here, there is promiscuity over here and gangs here, violent behavior and broken homes and all of those things; and somehow we are saying, you have got to get through this thing and you are probably going to have to do it by yourself because you are not going to get much parental support or adult support. And so we are asking our young people to do something that is very, very difficult and in some cases almost impossible. What we find is that our children's feet are not set on a rock but they are, rather, set on sand.

I think it is important we pay attention to these issues because a culture is never more than one generation away from dissolution. There is no permanence if the next generation coming up cannot pull it off. And so we need to think about this. De Tocqueville said something that was very interesting. It was a powerful sentence. He said, America is great because America is good. He said this probably 100, 150 years ago. He did not say that America was rich or powerful or perfect, but he said America was good and that is why America was great. I think America still is good, and I think America is great; but I would say that there are some signs on the horizon, some storm clouds that would lead us to wonder a little bit where we are headed and to cause us to sit up and pay attention.

What can be done? It is easy to state the problems, we hear that all the time, particularly around here, what is wrong. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you do not leave an issue without at least setting out some possible solutions. One thing that I would submit that makes sense to me is the issue of mentoring. We cannot legislate strong families, we cannot legislate morality; but one thing that we can do is provide a mentor in the life of a young person who badly needs it. It is assumed that at the present time in our culture there are roughly 18 million young people who lack a stable, caring adult in their life and badly need a mentor. What is a mentor? A mentor, number one, is someone who cares, someone who has no ax to grind, someone who simply cares enough to show up and spend time with that person. He is not a father, not a mother, not a grandparent, not a preacher, not a teacher,

no one who is paid to do this; but it is someone who simply cares enough to be there with that child and provide stability and a caring environment and a stable relationship in the life of a young person who probably does not know what that looks like.

The second thing that a mentor does is he affirms. I guess I saw that very clearly in athletics. If you told a player that you really believed in him, that you really thought that he could amount to something, that someday he had a future with you, oftentimes he would grow into that which he did not know that he was even capable of being. On the other hand, if you said, you know, I really do not think that you are going to make it, son, we do not really think we have a place for you here, his performance would begin to tail off and pretty soon he would play down to that level of expectation and he would be gone. So affirmation is critical. No one can live without some type of affirmation, whether you are 50 years old or whether you are 30 or whether you are 10. A mentor is someone who says, I believe in you. I really think you can do this. And you are important to me. A mentor is one who affirms.

Also, thirdly, a mentor is one who provides some guidance. So many young people that we have today have never seen anyone in their immediate family or their immediate life who has graduated from high school, maybe no one who has held down a steady job, no one who has a concept of what it is like to be a good parent. A mentor is someone who provides some guidance and says, I believe in you. I think you can do this. I think you can graduate from high school. I think you could make it in this college, or I think you would be really good at this. Guidance is critical. Mentoring works. It reduces dropout rates by roughly 100 percent, reduces drug and alcohol abuse by 50 percent, teenage pregnancy by 40 percent, violent acts by roughly 30 percent, and improves relations with peers and parents, improves self-esteem. Even though it is not perfect, it is the best thing that we know of, the best opportunity that we have to begin to rectify some of those relationships that have been so badly broken and have damaged those young people so badly.

The President has proposed currently \$450 million over the next 3 years for mentoring. That is \$150 million a year; \$100 million would go for mentoring for all children and \$50 million would be designated for children of prisoners. If that program is enacted, and I hope Congress will do that, I hope it will be funded, that will reach 1 million young people. That still leaves 17 million that are not being reached. But mentoring is cost effective, because a good mentoring program will cost \$300 to \$500 per child per year. It costs \$30,000 to lock somebody up. As we mentioned earlier, a meth addict, someone who commits 130 crimes, would be almost difficult if not impossible to total up

the dollars. What we are doing in our society today is we are spending huge amounts of money on the back end, and we are losing person after person after person, the recidivism rate is about 85 percent, and we are not spending the money on the front end where we can really make a difference. Mentoring is something that we think is a possible solution, at least a partial solution.

The President has been talking about the Call to Service Act. This is legislation which encourages volunteerism in our country. One of the greatest resources that we have in this country today is our senior citizens. We have so many people who have retired in their late 50s or in their 60s, and they are going to live until they are 80 or 90 years old and they are still healthy and they are still vibrant. The greatest need that we have in our country today is extended family. Our kids growing up do not have grandparents, some do not have parents at all; and so we feel that the Call to Service Act can certainly be used to hook up people who will volunteer, who have some life experience to help our young people, to mentor them, to tutor them, to be supportive; and we think this is a tremendous opportunity.

The Internet gambling bill was passed today on this floor. I hope that it will have some success over in the other body. As a culture, we are trying to gamble our way to prosperity. The difficult thing is that it impoverishes those who can least afford to gamble, breaks up families, directs money from children's needs. It is tied to organized crime, and students are particularly susceptible. One thing that we noticed on Internet gambling is that the most high-risk group of people in our country is students. All you need is a computer and a credit card. Most college students and an awful lot of high school students have that and the more times that you gamble in a short period of time and the less troublesome it is to do it, which Internet gambling provides the optimal situation, the more addictive it becomes. For some it has the same addictive effect as crack cocaine. So a certain percentage of our young people are getting addicted very quickly. This is a powerful issue, and I believe that the Internet gambling bill if it is passed in the other body can certainly be a tremendous help.

We eliminated the marriage tax penalty which was certainly countercultural to tell people that if you live together, you are going to have less tax consequences, it is going to save you \$1,000 or \$1,500 a year as opposed to if you were married just makes no sense, because marriage is the basic family unit in this country. We have rectified to some degree that particular marriage penalty.

I think it is really critical that we fund drug prevention programs. Let me just mention one here, Mr. Speaker. Byrne grants. Byrne grants go out to fight meth. It is amazing how much

methamphetamines cost. If you find a meth lab, to get that dismantled and all the chemicals disposed of costs thousands and thousands of dollars. So if we do not fund this, and right now it is not scheduled to be funded, this is a tremendous blow to our culture and particularly to our rural areas where most of these meth labs occur. We need to make sure that we are giving people the tools that they need.

H.R. 669, the Protect Children From Video Game Sex and Violence Act of 2003. I am its cosponsor. I think this is certainly one that can correct some of the problems of video games. H.R. 756, the Child Modeling Exploitation Prevention Act, addresses the issue of some people trying to get around the child pornography statutes by having children pose as models in provocative poses, and so this addresses that.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we need a fundamental shift in the way that we address first amendment rights in the courts. This is a dangerous statement for somebody to make, that we have got to watch out for the first amendment. Everybody is in favor of free speech and the first amendment, and I certainly go along with that as well; but I would like to point out some things that have happened in the courts in recent years that I think have been very damaging to this culture.

In 1996, Congress passed the Communications Decency Act that made it illegal to send indecent material to children via the Internet. Listen to what happened to that, Mr. Speaker. In June of 1997, the Supreme Court overturned portions of the law and made this statement. They said, indecent material is protected by the first amendment. And so what we are saying is those who produce indecent material have protection, and yet those children who receive that material and are influenced by it have no protection.

In 1996, the Child Pornography Prevention Act outlawed child pornography, including visual depictions that appeared to be of a minor and so it may not actually be a minor involved; but it could be a computer-generated image, or it could be an adult posing as a minor and how do you know? The Supreme Court ruled that unconstitutional and overturned the law banning computer graphics showing child pornography.

In October 1998, the Children Online Protection Act was signed into law to prohibit the communication of harmful material to children on publicly accessible Web sites. It makes sense that you should not be able to on publicly accessible Web sites send pornography to children. Yet the Supreme Court refused to rule on the 1998 law. As a result, it was never enacted; and it still sits there today and is void.

The 106th Congress passed the Child Internet Protection Act to require schools and libraries that receive Federal funds to use Internet filtering to protect minors from harmful material on the Internet.

□ 2130

In May of 2002, the Federal court declared the law unconstitutional. Free speech is protected, while women and children are attacked.

It is important to note that 80 to 90 percent of rapists and pedophiles reported using pornography usually right before they commit the act, and they will admit that this has shaped their behavior and made a difference. It seems to me our women and children ought to have rights and freedoms as well, and yet it seems the way we have phrased the argument that they are being victimized, whereas others who are perpetrators are being given freedoms to do so.

The Court has often ruled against school prayer. I would not do so necessarily, but some have traced some of the cultural decline I have mentioned tonight to the absence of school prayer, which began I believe in the 1960s. But there have been some decisions that really caused me to wonder. I will mention some of these.

In 1992, the Supreme Court declared an invocation and benediction at a graduation ceremony unconstitutional. On the floor of this House, every day we start with a prayer. In many public places, prayer is used. And yet at a school graduation it is not legitimate to have a minister, a priest, a rabbi, a cleric say a prayer. Again, this seems to fly in the face of the way our country was founded.

The Court also has held that a minute of silence in school is unconstitutional. Now, a child may spend a minute of silence and may say a prayer, may look out the window, may think about the upcoming test. He is not forced to believe in any doctrine. He is not forced to pray. Yet the Court said that a minute of silence is unconstitutional.

The Court also ruled not long ago that a student-led prayer at a football game was unconstitutional. The students voted in this particular student body to have a prayer. They wanted a student-led prayer before the game. The Court said this would really violate the rights of the football players who had to be there and also some of the cheerleaders required to be there. Yet this violated the rights I think of those who chose to have the prayer, the students themselves.

As most people understand, the words "under God" were struck from the Pledge of Allegiance by the Ninth Circuit court. Most of the framers of the Constitution obviously mentioned time and time again their dependence upon God, and yet we are trying to strip this away also from our Pledge of Allegiance.

I am not going to get into the abortion issue at any great length. It is very controversial. I realize there are many people on both sides of the issue. But I will mention one thing.

Just recently Congress and this House passed the partial-birth abortion ban. The reason I do not think this is

particularly controversial is that this particular ban I believe drew something like 84 votes in the affirmative on the Senate side, and we had a fairly large majority here, and we saw a great many people who are for abortion, who are pro-choice, in quotes, vote for this ban. They were beginning to get the idea of how barbaric it really is.

So this was something where there has been a real shift. Currently 70-some percent of Americans do not favor partial-birth abortion; and many of them, as I said earlier, are in favor of abortion. Yet this particular law, I am sure, will be challenged in the courts, and there is a fair chance it may be overturned as somehow being unconstitutional.

So we have seen a steady erosion of the culture by some decisions that have been made in the courts. The reason I think this is so important to bring up today is that some people cannot understand why there is so much controversy over in the other body regarding the appointment of judges and justices; and the reason is that what is at stake, I believe, is the future course in many of these issues, particularly in moral issues, that our country is going to take. So these are monumental issues, and the shape of the Supreme Court, the shape of our district courts, our courts of appeal, are going to go a long ways in deciding what this country abides by in upcoming years.

Mr. Speaker, this country was founded upon principles of dependence upon God, a recognition that life is sacred, the importance of sound character, and the fact that children are our most important assets. There is no question that we are involved in a cultural and spiritual struggle of Titanic proportions. This struggle may present the greatest crisis facing the United States today, as I have outlined I think fairly clearly.

As Congress addresses critical issues such as national defense, the economy and health care, which we certainly need to spend a lot of time on, it is critical that we not lose sight of the fact that our Nation's survival is directly linked to the character of our people, and particularly our young people. I say it again, our Nation's survival, long-term, will rest primarily upon the character of our people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of personal reasons.

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. RANGEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MATSUI, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HONDA, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 The following Members (at the request of Mr. KIRK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:
 Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 17.
 Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 11.
 Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, June 11 and 12.
 Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
 The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2588. A letter from the Director, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service is initiating an A-76 Competition of the Marine Corps Accounting function, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2589. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Transportation of Supplies by Sea — Commercial Items [DFARS Case 2002-D019] received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2590. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting an annual report for the period January 1, 2002, through December 31, 2002 regarding any exceptions granted, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3121 nt.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2591. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting an annual report on material violations of regulations, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3121 nt.; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2592. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System,

transmitting the Annual Report on Retail Fees and Services of Depository Institutions, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1811 note. Public Law 103—322, section 108(a) (108 Stat. 2361); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2593. A letter from the Deputy Congressional Liaison, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Availability of Funds and Collection of Checks [Regulation CC; Docket No. R-1150] received May 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2594. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change in Flood Elevation Determinations — received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2595. A letter from the Acting General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2596. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Books and Records Requirements for Brokers and Dealers Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No. 34-47910] received May 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2597. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2598. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Money Penalties: Procedures for Investigations, Imposition of Penalties, and Hearings (RIN: 0938-AM63) received April 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2599. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on employment of U.S. citizens by certain international organizations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276c—4; to the Committee on International Relations.

2600. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution to keep the Congress informed on clashes between Liberian government and rebel forces in the vicinity of the United States Embassy in Monrovia, Liberia; (H. Doc. No. 108—82); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2601. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting the personal financial disclosure statements of Board members statements, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—732 and 1—734(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2602. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting notification regarding the Coeur d'Alene Basin, Idaho, Superfund site, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 253(c)(7); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2603. A letter from the Interim CEO, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 2002 Annual Report, pursuant to Public Law 105—225 section 803 112

stat. 1362; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2604. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the Commission's notification regarding the Minnesota State Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2605. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting notification that by reason of the public debt limit, the Secretary will be unable to fully invest the the portion of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF) not immediately required to pay beneficiaries, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8348(l)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2606. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Service's final rule — Customs Broker License Examination Dates [T.D. 03-23] (RIN: 1515-AD28) received June 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2607. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Service's final rule — Settlement Position Lease Stripping Transactions [UIL 9300.03-00] received May 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2608. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Unrelated Business Taxable Income (Rev. Rul. 2003-64) received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2609. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Unrelated Business Taxable Income (Rev. Rul. 2003-64) received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2610. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Exempt Bond Mediation Dispute Resolution Pilot Program (Announcement 2003-36) received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2611. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — LMSB/Appeals Fast Track Settlement Procedure (Revenue Procedure 2003-40) received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2612. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disclosure of Return Information to the Department of Agriculture [TD 9060] (RIN: 1545-BB91) received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2613. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — SB/SE-Appeals Fast Track Mediation Procedure (Revenue Procedure 2002-41) June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2614. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2003-30] received June 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2615. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Employee Plans Compliance Resolution System (Rev. Proc. 2003-44) received June 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2616. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule — Cafeteria Plans (Rev. Rul. 2003-62) received June 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2617. A letter from the Director and Assistant Secretary, Office of Personnel Management and Department of Defense, transmitting the joint evaluation by the Department of Defense and Office of Personnel Management of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Demonstration: Second Report to Congress, pursuant to Section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

2618. A letter from the Director, Financial Management and Assurance, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled, "Congressional Award Foundation's Fiscal Years 2002 and 2001 Financial Statements," pursuant to 2 U.S.C. section 807(a); jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Government Reform.

2619. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting notification that the Department of Energy requires an additional 45 days to transmit the implementation plan for addressing the issues described in the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's Recommendation 2002-3, Requirements for the Design, Implementation, and Maintenance of Administrative Controls; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

2620. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report assessing the voting practices of the governments of UN members states in the General Assembly and Security Council for 2002, and evaluating the actions and responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States, pursuant to Public Law 101-167, section 527(a) (103 Stat. 1222); Public Law 101-246, section 406(a) (104 Stat. 66); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

2621. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, National Ocean Research Leadership Council, March 2003 Annual Report, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7901(b)(2)(B); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Resources, and Science.

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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 265. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-146). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2122. A bill to enhance research, development, procurement, and use of biomedical countermeasures to respond to public health; Rept. 108-147, Part 1, referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than June 11, 2003, pursuant to clause 1(c), rule X.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2122. Referral to the Committee on Government Reform and Homeland Security (Select) extended for a period ending not later than June 13, 2003.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2397. A bill to designate a portion of the White Salmon River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2398. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 2399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA):

H.R. 2400. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam for the purposes of clarifying the local judicial structure of Guam; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2401. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2402. A bill to expand the number of individuals and families with health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Rules, 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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2403. A bill to expand the powers of the Attorney General to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Attorney General to include firearm products and nonpowder firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. NEY, Mr. KAN-

JORSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 2404. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centenary of the bestowal of the Nobel Peace Prize on President Theodore Roosevelt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 2405. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit video voyeurism in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2406. A bill to support the domestic shrimping industry by eliminating taxpayer subsidies for certain competitors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and International Relations, 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. RUSH (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 2407. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act and other banking laws to protect consumers who avail themselves of payday loans from usurious interest rates and exorbitant fees, perpetual debt, the use of criminal actions to collect debts, and other unfair practices by payday lenders, to encourage the States to license and closely regulate payday lenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 2408. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2409. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that inpatient drug prices charged to certain public hospitals are included in the best price exemptions for the Medicaid drug rebate program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 2410. A bill to prohibit the importation for sale of foreign-made flags of the

United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2411. A bill to decrease the matching funds requirement and authorize further appropriations for Keweenaw National Historical Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2412. A bill to require any amounts appropriated for Members' Representational Allowances for the House of Representatives for a session of Congress that remain after all payments are made from such Allowances for the session to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive retired pay for non-regular service; to provide TRICARE eligibility for members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and their families; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 2414. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of chiropractors in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FEENEY (for himself, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 214. Concurrent resolution concerning the national cheerleading championship of the University of Central Florida Varsity Cheerleading Team; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Res. 264. A resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck Algeria on May 21, 2003; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 266. A resolution commending the Clemson University Tigers men's golf team for winning the 2003 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Golf Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RENZI, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H. Res. 267. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there is a need to protect and strengthen Medicare beneficiaries' access to quality health care in rural America; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mr. FILNER:

H. Res. 268. A resolution urging the President to authorize the transfer of ownership of one of the bells taken from the town of Balangiga on the island of Samar, Philippines, which are currently displayed at F.E. Warren Air Force Base, to the people of the Philippines; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

76. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 2 memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Northwest Power Act and other appropriate federal statutes so that Northwest communities can be eligible for economic grants to assist communities impacted by Endangered Species Act fish recovery programs; to the Committee on Resources.

77. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 4 memorializing the United States Congress to sponsor and support legislation to create a new Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals for better regional representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

78. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 11 memorializing the United States Congress that the Legislature finds the failure to provide prompt medical care is a failure to provide care, that it is not acceptable, and we urgently request that the members of the Idaho congressional delegation address the appropriations necessary to provide timely access to health care for our valued veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

79. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 8 memorializing the United States Congress that the Legislature supports the President, the President's cabinet, and the men and women of the United States Armed Forces for their courage and the decision to remove Saddam Hussein from power; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

80. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 1 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the members of the Idaho Congressional delegation to support the passage of legislation similar to S. 2873 as introduced by Senator Grassley that removes the geographic disparity in Medicare reimbursements; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII:

Mr. LATOURETTE introduced a bill (H.R. 2415) for the relief of Zdenko Lisak; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 91: Mr. BONILLA.
 H.R. 106: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 111: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 236: Mr. HOLT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CASE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 303: Mr. HONDA, Mr. BALLANCE, and Mr. GINGREY.
 H.R. 371: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 438: Mr. THOMAS and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 440: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 442: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 466: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 548: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 584: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 660: Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 745: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 754: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
 H.R. 785: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 817: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. BELL.
 H.R. 850: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 857: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 876: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MOORE.
 H.R. 879: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 886: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 898: Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 919: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
 H.R. 937: Mr. DICKS and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 942: Mr. CANTOR.
 H.R. 953: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
 H.R. 965: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 977: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 980: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1125: Mr. HULSHOF and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 1157: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1182: Mr. JENKINS.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1225: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 1231: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. COLE and Mr. BURNS.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1334: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1359: Ms. BALDWIN.
 H.R. 1377: Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 1385: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. DOYLE.

- H.R. 1421: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1422: Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 1429: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1489: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 1508: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1511: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1530: Mr. JENKINS and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1532: Mr. FORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1536: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1551: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1567: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1587: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1616: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1673: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1675: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1676: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 1700: Mr. WALSH and Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 1708: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1710: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WU, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BELL, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1713: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1715: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1724: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1736: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1738: Mr. BALLANCE and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1767: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 1769: Mr. WICKER, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1778: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 11784: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 1787: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1807: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1819: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1821: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BURNS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. PRYCE OF OHIO, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 1839: Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1861: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1865: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1873: Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 1889: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 1902: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1913: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1914: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1930: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1933: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1943: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1951: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1956: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 1963: Mr. SHAW, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 1964: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1999: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 2009: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2030: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2032: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2034: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2038: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2060: Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2066: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2068: Mr. HOLT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2069: Mr. HOLT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2124: Mr. BELL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2163: Ms. HART.
H.R. 2182: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 2198: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2205: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2210: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2211: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2233: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2242: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2262: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2284: Mr. WEXLER and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 2286: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. REYES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2291: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 2292: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 2295: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2330: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2333: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 2351: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2361: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2365: Mr. CARDIN.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. NORWOOD.
H. Con. Res. 111: Ms. NORTON and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H. Con. Res. 126: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. PAUL and Mr. SKELTON.
H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. WEXLER.
H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. BURNS, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. PLATTS.
H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. LANTOS.
H. Con. Res. 196: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Con. Res. 200: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 208: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H. Con. Res. 213: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. REYES, and Mr. SABO.
H. Res. 28: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H. Res. 58: Ms. LEE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. BELL.
H. Res. 177: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H. Res. 194: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BELL.
H. Res. 198: Mr. PENCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. FEENEY.
H. Res. 199: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 234: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H. Res. 237: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. CLAY.
H. Res. 242: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCINNIS.
H. Res. 259: Mr. FROST, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H. Res. 260: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FILNER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 660: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. GRIJALVA.