United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 2, 2003 No. 79

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 2, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Sister Cecilia Thuy Nguyen, OP, Doctoral Candidate, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, we praise You for the wonders of Your creation, for the miracles You have wrought and will continue to work in our lives. We thank You for the great resources of this land and for the freedom which has been its heritage.

Lord, forgive us our sins that we as a Nation and as individuals have committed and give us a renewed hope in Your divine mercy.

Grant us a fruitful economy born of justice and charity. Inspire our President and all the officials of our government to serve the people of the United States with equity and integrity. Guide the Members of the House of Representatives gathered here today. Grant them the courage to speak with the voice of the people they represent. Bestow upon them the wisdom to seek what is pleasing in Your eyes and what is conformable with the freedom and happiness of the American people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 858. An act to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 878. An act to authorize an additional permanent judgeship in the district of Idaho, and for other purpose.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105–292, as amended by Public Law 105–55, and as further amended by Public Law 107–228, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individuals to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom:

Preeta D. Bansal of Nebraska, vice Charles Richard Stith, for a term of one year (May 15, 2003–May 14, 2004).

Most Reverend Ricardo Ramirez, C.S.B. of New Mexico, vice Dr. Firuz Kazemzadeh, for a term of two years (May 15, 2003–May 14, 2005).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2003.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 23, 2003 at 5:11 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 191.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. R. 192.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

MARTHA C. MORRISON,
Deputy Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Printed on recycled paper.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2003.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 23, 2003 at 3:17 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2185.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. Res. 51.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 23, 2003.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 23, 2003 at 12:10 p.m.

That the Senate agreed to conference report H.R. 2.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker pro tempore TOM DAVIS of Virginia signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution on Friday, May 23, 2003:

H.R. 2, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004;

H.R. 2185, to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002; and

H.J. Res. 51, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

MONUMENTAL DEFECT IN TAX BILL

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as the ink is now drying on the tax bill of 2 weeks ago, and as the President and the Republican Party were looting the Treasury and the Social Security System of this Nation on behalf of the wealthiest people in this Nation, we now see there is a monumental defect in this bill in terms of its unfairness and its greed, and that is that millions of working families making wages between $10,500 a year and $26,000 a year will not get to participate in the increase and in the child tax credit. That means they will not get their $400 increase this summer that families with children are entitled to get under the tax bill.

Why? Because Republicans simply decided that these people were not worthy of that tax cut, as though it was less expensive to raise their children or their children were not equal to the children of people making over $30,000 a year. An incredible act. An incredible act of greed. An incredible act of unfairness to hard-working families in this country.

TAX BILL CREATES NEW JOBS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak and say a few positive things about the tax bill that was so heavily attacked a moment ago. I had the opportunity in North Carolina over the past weekend to speak to a group concerning the positive aspects of this thing, the job-creation part of it.

As many of my colleagues in this body recognize, I own a small manufacturing company in Hickory, North Carolina; and the tax benefits in this program, with the increased appreciation, makes decisions much more likely to be made, at least as far as my own little company is concerned.

With that 50 percent tax break and depreciation allowance the first year, we have made a decision that we made today, before I left home, that we will purchase a machine that costs $150,000. That machine, the moment it is delivered to our company, will create six jobs.

I do not know what else anybody else knows about this tax bill, I know there is a whole bunch of discussion about taxes for the rich and taxes for the poor, but this idea of creating new jobs by our tax bill is first class, and I want to say I greatly appreciate it.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2003

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF IRMA RANGEL

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 159) expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 159

Whereas Irma Rangel, in 1977, became the first Mexican-American woman ever elected to the Texas House of Representatives;

Whereas Irma Rangel served the great State of Texas and the people of Kingsville with honor and distinction for 26 years as a Member of the Texas House of Representatives;

Whereas Irma Rangel was Chairwoman of the Texas House of Representatives Committee on Higher Education and was a tireless advocate of educational opportunities for all students;

Whereas Irma Rangel recognized the value of higher education for all young people of Texas and introduced the 10 percent rule legislation that entitled all highly motivated and successful Texas high school students who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school class to be admitted into Texas institutions of higher education, marking a shift in college admissions;

Whereas Irma Rangel recognized the importance of creating a professional school of pharmacy in South Texas and worked diligently to realize that vision;

Whereas Irma Rangel was a staunch supporter of Texas Grant 1 and Texas Grant 2, which provided tuition and fees for students who graduated under the recommended plan and extended those opportunities to community college students;

Whereas Irma Rangel dedicated her life to make Texas better for all its citizenry, improve the quality of life for the people she served, and especially expand educational opportunities for the young people of Texas;

Whereas the life and legacy of Irma Rangel serve as an inspiration for the young people of Texas and for the poor and powerless for whom she fought so passionately;

Whereas Irma Rangel was a role model for young Hispanic female students in achieving success;

Whereas Irma Rangel placed high value on self-empowerment, which enabled individuals to access opportunities to achieve their goals; and

Whereas Irma Rangel will forever be remembered for her signature phrase, ''Will this hurt or help?'' when addressing pending legislation before the Texas House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Irma Rangel on March 18, 2003, and extends condolences to her family;

(2) expresses its deep gratitude to Irma Rangel and her family for the service that she rendered to the State of Texas;

(3) recognizes with appreciation and respect Irma Rangel's exemplary commitment to public service and her constituents; and

(4) esteems Irma Rangel as a role model for generations to come in South Texas and the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 159, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 159, introduced by my distinguished colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), expresses profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a fitting tribute to the life and career of a remarkable public servant who passed away in March. Irma Rangel was the first Mexican American woman elected to the Texas State House of Representatives, and she was every bit as trailblazing as this distinction might suggest.

First elected in 1976, Representative Rangel was best known for her outspoken work on educational issues, largely because she was a schoolteacher and principal prior to her career in government. She rose to the Chair of the House Higher Education Committee in 1995 in Texas. Her political career was as well known for her humility as it was for her many accomplishments, as she delighted only in improving the lives of her Texas constituents.

Irma Rangel sadly lost her valiant struggle against cancer on March 18, 2003. The Texas Governor ordered all State office building flags to be flown at half mast on the day she passed away.

All Texans, and indeed all Americans, will miss Irma Rangel for her unrelenting passion and devotion to all people. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 159 that honors Representative Irma Rangel, and I thank my colleague from Texas for introducing this important measure.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), who is the originator of this bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN); our minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); and the Republican leadership for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

I rise today as the original sponsor of House Resolution 159 expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel, a courageous legislator and a great Texan.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor a true Texas legend. Irma Rangel was the first Mexican American woman elected to the Texas House of Representatives, where she served her South Texas constituents for 26 years. She served on the Higher Education Committee for most of her career and became chairwoman in 1995, a leadership position she held until Republicans won control of the House this year. She stayed on as vice chair of the committee until she passed away.

Her legacy includes over 25 years of working to improve minority access to higher education. During her 26-year tenure in the Texas House, Ms. Rangel devoted her efforts to increasing the educational attainment of Hispanics, bringing economic development to Texas, and empowering Texas youth with the tools they needed for success.

It was Irma Rangel's landmark legislation that ensured that all Texas high school seniors who graduate in the top 10 percent of their class would be able to attend any public university in the State of Texas, including the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University at College Station.

Representative Rangel was always ready to engage her colleagues, not only on the pressing issues of the day, but she also sought to raise issues that had been forgotten or ignored yet were important to average working families.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rangel was famous for her quote, ''Will it help or hurt?'' She was also known to say, ''Why not here? Why not in Kingsville?'' And after dialogue, she took action. She fought for her constituents to ensure their needs were addressed by the Texas legislature.

Her relentless efforts to help establish a school of pharmacy at Texas A&M University, Kingsville, the first professional school in South Texas, has emerged as one of her greatest contributions as a State representative.

Not only was Representative Rangel a great State leader, she was an exceptional and courageous example of how to live with cancer. She has survived two bouts of cancer before valiantly battling brain cancer, which ultimately took her life. Irma was a positive force in educating women who faced the same adversities. Her straight talk, get-it-done demeanor, helped open the dialogue on the issue of cancer and treatments.

Irma Rangel was preceded in death by her parents, Herminia L. Rangel and P.M. Rangel and her sister Olga Rangel Lumley. She is survived by her sister Minnie Rangel Henderson and her brother-in-law Howard A. Henderson, nieces Debbie Henderson and Margo Hoover and nephews Dino Henderson and Marc Lumley.

I hope my colleagues will join me in extending the condolences of this Congress to these surviving family members, expressing its deep gratitude to Irma Rangel and her family for the service that she rendered to the great State of Texas, recognizing with appreciation and respect her exemplary commitment to public service and to her constituents, and esteeming Irma Rangel as a role model for generations to come in South Texas and the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Texas will miss Irma's unique style and engaging dialogue. She will be remembered for her great contributions in making Texas a better State for all of its people.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for authoring this legislation. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will simply indicate that I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Texas in extolling the virtues of this pioneer who has contributed greatly to the development of pride and to education in her native Texas. She is indeed a role model, and I join with both my colleagues in extending condolences to her family.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to former Texas State Representative, Irma Rangel, who passed away after a long battle with cancer on March 18, 2003, at the age of 71.

Throughout her career, Irma Rangel was a trailblazer among Mexican-American women. Born in Kingsville, TX, in 1931, Irma was a pioneer advocating for women, minorities, and the poor, ensuring a voice for those who might otherwise remain voiceless. Continuing on her path of breaking down barriers, Irma became one of the first Hispanic female law clerks for Federal District Judge Adrian Spears.

In 1976, after 14 years of teaching in Texas and graduated from St. Mary's Law School, Irma became the first Mexican American woman to serve in the Texas House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this great leader spent much of her time in the Texas state house fighting for equal opportunity in education. In her fourth term, Irma joined the House Higher Education Committee, focusing on higher education because it was not guaranteed by the Texas Constitution. She once said her proudest moment was passing legislation in 2001, to establish a pharmacy school at Texas A&M University-Kingsville. In 1997, after the controversial Hopwood decision, the case that struck down affirmative action in college admission at the University of Texas, Irma passed legislation to allow all students in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating

class automatic admission to any of the State's colleges or universities.

Mr. Speaker, Irma fought tirelessly to the end of her life for improved education. Despite her illness, she waited an hour and a half to testify before a House Appropriations Committee hearing over proposed funding cuts for South Texas universities and community colleges.

I would like to especially thank my colleague and fellow Texan RUBÉN HINOJOSA for leading a special order in honor of Irma Rangel. Irma Rangel was a trailblazer and champion of Texas. Irma was not just a leader in Texas politics but also inspiration to all of us in the Texas delegation. I am certainly proud to have had an opportunity to serve with her and learn from her example. Irma was absolutely delightful, which made our working relationship so wonderful. I will miss her bubbly and cheerful spirit. The people of Texas and her constituents in Kingsville will miss her and her colleagues will fondly remember her courage, determination, humility, and devotion to public service.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my Texas colleague's resolution expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of State Representative Irma Rangel. On March 18, 2003, the Nation lost a leader, Texas lost a hero, and I lost a friend.

Irma was a veterans of the Texas House of Representatives, having been first elected in 1976. She was the first Mexican-American woman elected to the House and I was privileged to work and serve with Irma for almost 10 years.

She was a vocal proponent of higher education and services for the poor. During her 13 sessions in the House, Rangel spent most of her time and energy on minority and educational issues. She knew her issues, and she knew how to overcome any obstacle.

In response to the Hopwood v. Texas decision, which ended affirmative action at all Texas state colleges and universities, Irma sponsored the 10 percent law, which grants admission to State colleges and universities to students who graduate in the top 10 percent of their high school class.

Irma grew up in Kingsville. She was the daughter of a man who picked cotton, learned to read and write on his own and later owned two barbershops and several other businesses.

She taught for 14 years in schools in Robstown and Alice, in Venezuela and in Menlo Park, CA. In the later 1960s, Irma decided to pursue her lifelong dream of becoming an attorney. She received her law degree from St Mary's University School of Law and was admitted to the Texas Bar in 1969.

Irma worked as a law clerk for U.S. District Judge Adrian A Spears of San Antonio, who was the chief justice for the Western District of Texas.

She also worked as an assistant district attorney in Corpus Christi before returning to her hometown in 1973 to open her own law practice.

Irma was inducted into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame in 1994. She also received the Legislator of the Year award from the Mexican American Bar Association of Texas, the Women's Political Caucus' Texas Mexican-American Woman of the Year in 1979, the Unsung Heroines Award in 1991 from the Women's Advocacy Project, the Latina Lawyer of the Year from the Hispanic National Bar Association and the Texas Woman of the Century from the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Texas.

She the first Hispanic in the state to receive the Margaret Brent Women Lawyers of Achievement Award from the American Bar Association's Commission on Women in the profession.

Irma touched the lives of all those who were fortunate enough to know her. Her absence leaves a big hole in the Texas Legislature and in our hearts.

Our thoughts and prayers are with her sister, Herminia Rangel Henderson of Kingsville.

I would like to conclude my remarks by quoting from an editorial in the Houston Chronicle shortly after the announcement of her death: ''Irma Rangel was small in stature, but she was always a large force in the Legislature for all those underserved by government and needing help. She was a trailblazer with a strong voice for many in Texas who had been unheard.''

Irma was a trailblazer. The State of Texas is a much better place because of her work. She will be missed.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute today to my fellow Texan Irma Rangel, who passed away in March at age 71. Rangel was the first Hispanic woman to serve in the Texas legislature and, more importantly, worked tirelessly and courageously on behalf of the next generation of Texans, by vigorously supporting education and expanding economic opportunities for our youth.

Irma Rangel, who spent 26 years in the Texas House of Representatives and was Chairwoman of its Committee on Higher Education, is probably best known today for introducing the 10 percent rule legislation that entitled all highly motivated and successful Texas high school students who graduated in the top 10 percent of their class to be admitted into public institutions of higher education throughout Texas.

I urge all my colleagues to remember Irma Rangel and support House Resolution 159, which expresses the profound sorrow of this House on the occasion of her death. I would also like to thank my colleague, Congressman RUBÉN HINOJOSA, for offering this very appropriate resolution.

Irma Rangel was an inspiration to us all, in her commitment to helping working families, in her bravery as she faced cancer and in her dedication to public service.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas has lost one of its great voices, a leader with passion and energy working to improve the lives of the people she represented. We mourn the death of Texas Representative Irma Rangel who served nobly in the Texas Legislative for more than 25 years. She was a trailblazer as the first Hispanic woman to be elected to the Texas House of Representatives and the first woman to serve as chair of the Mexican American Legislative Caucus. We will miss her strength, courage, vision, and her straight talk.

A close friend, an advocate for poor families and women in South Texas, Representative Rangel consistently fought to improve the quality and accessibility of education for her constituents. Her advocacy helped create the school of pharmacy at Texas A&M University-Kingsville, the first professional school in South Texas. She also was a driving force in securing passage of the 10 percent plan, which makes the top 10 percent of students in every high school eligible for admission to any state college or university, in the wake of the devastating Hopwood decision.

Her commitment to the people and families of South Texas, especially in improving access to higher education, has left a lasting legacy, Irma Rangel will be remembered as a women who, through her lifetime of work and service, demonstrated her commitment to community. We will all miss her.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of H. Res. 159, expressing this Congress's sorrow at the passing of Texas State Representative Irma Rangel. Representative Rangel was a fighter for the rights of the economically disadvantaged in Texas and it is fitting that this Congress recognizes her contribution to our country.

In 1977 Irma became the first Mexican-American woman elected to the Texas Legislature. She served for 26 years the people of Kingsville in South Texas. She was a strong advocate for increasing access to education for the people of South Texas as well as for all Texans and she served as Chairwoman of the Texas House of Representatives Committee on Higher Education. Her relentless energy resulted in significant increases in higher education funding in South Texas, the expansion of the state's community college efforts and the creation of a much needed pharmacy school in her District.

Mr. Speaker, Irma Rangel was a Texas pioneer. Her tireless commitment to her job inspired many others, especially Hispanic women in Texas, to pursue a career in public service. I thank Congressman HINOJOSA for introducing this legislation and I yield back my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 159.

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. SOUDER. 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.

CONGRATULATING SAMMY SOSA OF CHICAGO CUBS FOR HITTING 500 MAJOR LEAGUE HOME RUNS

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 195) congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 195

Whereas Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs hit a home run in the seventh inning on Friday, April 3, 2003, against the Cincinnati Reds at the Great American Ball Park;

Whereas his home run was the 500th of his career, making Sammy Sosa only the 18th player in major league history to reach the mark and the first Latino to accomplish this outstanding feat;

Whereas Sammy Sosa's achievement is one of the most impressive and difficult to accomplish in baseball history, placing him in the very select company of the greatest home run hitters of all time, including Hank Aaron, Babe Ruth, Mickey Mantle, Willie Mays, Mel Ott, and Ernie Banks;

Whereas from his first home run off Roger Clemens in 1989 to today, Sammy Sosa has awed us with his ability and athletic prowess on the field and his dignity and selflessness off the field;

Whereas Sammy Sosa has showed us how powerful the combination of discipline and desire can be;

Whereas throughout his record-breaking career Sammy Sosa has embodied the talent, exuberance, team-spirit, and determination that Americans associate with the very best qualities of sports and athletic competition;

Whereas throughout the intense media scrutiny and public attention that has accompanied his historic career, Sammy Sosa has consistently conducted himself with modesty and humility that has been an inspiration to all Americans; and

Whereas as a native of the Dominican Republic, Sammy Sosa has proven to be an outstanding role model and source of pride for all residents of his native country, as well as all Latin Americans and all immigrants to the U.S. from across the globe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates and commends Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for his amazing accomplishment and thanks him for tearing down barriers for Latinos around the world, for being a role model and an inspiration, and for letting us dream as big as our hearts will allow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 195.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 195, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), celebrates and congratulates Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs. It is a unique honor to bring up this legislation to recognize the accomplishments of Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs, who certainly is one of the greatest ball players of our generation, and likely of all time.

While the resolution before us this afternoon congratulates him for hitting his 500th home run earlier this season, I believe it is also appropriate to recognize his many accomplishments, on and off the field, as a superlative hitter, goodwill ambassador for his native Dominican Republic and, most importantly, as the exemplification of the best qualities the game of baseball holds for every American.

Let me start with Sammy's formidable accomplishments and sustained excellence on the field. I am told that the record today literally will not hold a listing of each of his 500 career home runs. He is just the 18th player in the history of baseball to reach this milestone. He is the only player ever to get 60 or more home runs in three seasons. Sammy Sosa, Babe Ruth, and Mark McGwire are the only players ever to have had more than two seasons hitting 50 home runs. Sammy holds or shares 24 major league records and an additional 10 National League records.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a listing of those records as well as a summary of his accomplishments and listing by year of each of his career home runs.

In recent years, there have been other players who have arguably performed as well in one season, but no one has matched or sustained the overall level of excellence set by Sammy Sosa. But what is so extraordinary about these achievements is not their difficulty as an athletic accomplishment or place in the history of baseball. Sammy Sosa's success as a ball player and a citizen is a living testament to the possibilities that America can offer to anyone from any place or circumstance in the world.

Born in the Dominican Republic, he lost his father at an early age, and the family struggled. Sammy demonstrated the American values of perseverance, hard work, and honesty by working as a shoe-shine boy, washing cars and selling oranges to bring food to his mother and the rest of his family. The same circumstances led him to baseball.

While he played early in his career for the Texas Rangers and the Chicago White Sox, he did not truly find his home until the White Sox traded him to the Cubs for George Bell. Bell played 2 years for the White Sox and hit 38 home runs before retiring. Since the trade, Sammy has hit 476 home runs for the Cubs. While we are proud of President Bush in so many different areas, the President of the United States has openly acknowledged that he believes one of the biggest mistakes he ever made was trading Sammy from the Texas Rangers, when he was owner of that team.

Sammy Sosa became a national figure during the home run race of the 1998 season, which broadcaster Tim McCarver called ''the perfect season.'' Both Sosa and Mark McGwire assaulted the home run record of Roger Maris, which at that time had stood for 37 years and was widely believed to be unbreakable. McCarver astutely noted that not only Sosa and McGwire had pushed each other toward those accomplishments, but also that Sosa had understood that the race for the record was about far more than statistics.

McCarver wrote the following: ''I think it was Sosa who made McGwire realize they could be ambassadors for the game.'' Sosa said, ''I like the fact that baseball is touching the fans in their hearts.'' As America watched, a genuine bond of respect and affection formed between the white, privileged, former USC student and the black Spanish-speaking Sosa, who was so poor growing up in the Dominican Republic that he learned baseball while using rolled up socks for a ball, a milk carton for a glove, and a tree limb for a bat.

McGwire and Sosa, McCarver continued, would not dignify questions about their home run race having racial overtones and the notion that some fans were favoring one over the other, based solely on skin color or heritage. They became each other's greatest champions. America had rarely seen such sportsmanship, brotherhood, humility and class wrapped in a competitive cocoon. McGwire and Sosa transcended sports and entered the national consciousness.

Mr. Speaker, those are the values and contributions to America that we honor today in this resolution, which were also honored when Sammy Sosa stood in the gallery of this Chamber in 1999 to receive bipartisan praise and applause at the State of the Union address. He said in his autobiography, ''Here I was, once a humble kid from the Dominican Republic, and now the lawmakers of the United States were standing and applauding me in the halls of Congress. It was a great moment.''

In addition to his civic leadership, Sammy is also widely recognized for his never-ending goodwill and good humor, such as when he sprints to his position at the beginning of every game at Wrigley Field and taps his heart for the fans in the right field bleachers.

His is also a symbol for his native country, so much so that former Ambassador Bernardo Vega was quoted as saying, ''As far as I am concerned, he is the real Dominican ambassador. I just shuffle papers.'' But nothing speaks so eloquently to Sammy Sosa's contributions to both our culture and our sport as what he did during the Cubs' first game after the September 11 attacks when the Nation returned to baseball in a very small part of the national healing. Sammy Sosa hit a home run, and he carried a small American flag around the bases at Wrigley Field. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

SAMMY SOSA PROFESSIONAL STATISTICS AND CAREER TRANSACTIONS

Year—Team	Avg	G	AB	R	H	2B	3B	HR	RBI	SH	SF	HP	BB	SO	SB	CS
1986—Gulf Coast R	.275	61	229	38	63	[1]19	1	4	28	0	2	0	22	51	11	3
1987—Gastonia-A	.279	129	519	73	145	27	4	11	59	0	3	5	21	123	22	8
1988—Charlotte, FL–A	.229	131	507	70	116	13	[1]12	9	51	0	3	4	35	106	42	24
1989—Tulsa-AA	.297	66	273	45	81	15	4	7	31	2	2	3	15	52	16	11
Texas	.238	25	84	8	20	3	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	20	0	2
Oklahoma City-AAA	.103	10	39	2	4	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	7
Vancouver-AAA	.367	13	49	7	18	3	0	1	5	0	0	0	7	6	3	1
Chicago (AL)	.273	33	99	19	27	5	0	3	10	1	2	2	11	27	7	3
1990—Chicago (AL)	.233	153	532	72	124	26	10	15	70	2	6	6	33	150	32	16
1991—Vancouver-AAA	.267	32	116	19	31	7	2	3	19	0	3	1	17	32	9	3
Chicago (AL)	.203	116	316	39	64	10	1	10	33	5	1	2	14	98	13	6
1992—Iowa-AAA [3]	.316	5	19	3	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	0
Cubs	.260	67	262	41	68	7	2	8	25	4	2	4	19	63	15	7
1993—Cubs	.261	159	598	92	156	25	5	33	93	0	1	4	38	135	36	11
1994—Cubs	.300	105	426	59	128	17	6	25	70	1	4	2	25	92	22	13
1995—Cubs	.268	[2]144	564	89	151	17	3	36	119	0	2	5	58	134	34	7
1996—Cubs	.273	124	498	84	136	21	2	40	100	0	4	5	34	134	18	5
1997—Cubs	.251	[2]162	642	90	161	31	4	36	119	0	5	2	45	174	22	12
1998—Cubs	.308	159	643	[1]134	198	20	0	66	[1]158	0	5	1	73	171	18	9
1999—Cubs	.288	[2]162	625	114	180	24	2	63	141	0	6	3	78	171	7	8
2000—Cubs	.320	156	604	106	193	38	1	*50	138	0	8	2	91	168	7	4
2001—Cubs	.328	160	577	[1]146	189	34	5	64	[1]160	0	12	6	116	153	0	2
2002—Cubs	.288	150	556	[1]122	160	19	2	[1]49	108	0	4	3	103	144	2	0
N.L./Cubs Totals	.287	1,548	5,995	1,077	1,720	253	32	470	1,231	5	53	37	680	1,539	181	78
A.L. Totals	.228	327	1,031	138	235	44	11	29	116	12	9	10	58	295	52	27
Major League Totals	.278	1,875	7,026	1,215	1,955	297	43	499	1,347	17	62	47	738	1,834	233	105

[1] Led League.
[2] Tied for League Lead.
[3] Injury Rehabilitation Assignment.
Last sacrifice bunt: 5/16/94 vs. San Diego. SLG: 2002, .594, M.L. Career, .546. OBP: 2002, .399, M.L. Career, .348.

1985—Signed as non-drafted free agent by Texas (scouts: Omar Minaya and Amado Dinzey). 1989—Traded to Chicago (AL) 7/29 with P Wilson Alvarez and IF Scott Fletcher for OF Harold Baines and IF Fred Manrique. 1992—Traded to Cubs 3/30 with P Ken Patterson for OF George Bell. 1992—On disabled list 6/13—7/27 . . . fractured right hand . . . included injury rehab assignment to Iowa (7/21—7/27). 1992—On disabled list 8/7—9/16 . . . fractured left ankle. 1996—On disabled list 8/21—10/2 . . . fractured right hand.

SOSA AND THE RECORD BOOKS—THE 500-HOMER CLUB—PLUS ONE

	Name	No.
1.	Hank Aaron	755
2.	Babe Ruth	714
3.	Willie Mays	660
4.	Barry Bonds (46 in 2002)	613
5.	Frank Robinson	586
6.	Mark McGwire	583
7.	Harmon Killebrew	573
8.	Reggie Jackson	563
9.	Mike Schmidt	548
10.	Mickey Mantle	536
11.	Jimmie Foxx	534
12.	Willie McCovey	521
	Ted Williams	521
14.	Ernie Banks	512
	Eddie Matthews	512
16.	Mel Ott	511
17.	Eddie Murray	504
18.	SAMMY SOSA (49)	499

MAJOR LEAGUE RECORDS HELD OR SHARED BY SAMMY SOSA

Most 60-Homer Seasons: 3—1998, 1999, 2001

Most 50-Homer Seasons: 4—1998–2001 (shared with Babe Ruth 1920–1921/1927–1928 and Mark McGwire 1996–1999)

Most Consecutive 50-Homer Seasons: 4—1998–2001 (shared with Mark McGwire 1996–1999)

Most Homers, Five-Season Span: 292—1998–2002

Most Homers, Six-Season Span: 328—1997–2002

Most Homers, Seven-Season Span: 368—1996–2002

Most Homers, Eight-Season Span: 404—1995–2002

Most Homers, Nine-Season Span: 429—1994–2002

Most Total Bases, Four-Season Span: 1,621—1998–2001

Most 3-Homer Games, Career: 6—(shared with Johnny Mize)

Most Multi-Homer Games, Season: 11—1998 (shared with Hank Greenberg 1938)

Most 3-Homer Games, Season: 3—2001

Most Ballparks Homered In, Season: 18—1998 (shared with Mike Piazza 2000)

Most Extra-Base Hits, Right-Handed Batter, Season: 103—2001 (shared with Hank Greenberg 1937 and Albert Belle 1995)

Most Intentional Walks, Right-Handed Batter, Season: 37—2001

Most Homers, Any Month: 20—June 1998

Most Homers, June: 20—1998

Most Homers, October: 5—2001 (shared with Richie Sexson 2001)

Most Homers, 30-Day Span: 21—5/26–6/23/98

Most Homers, 10-Day Span: 9—5/25–6/7/98, 6/13–6/21/98

Grand Slams, Consecutive Games: 7/27–7/28/98 (shared with many)

Most 3-Run Homers, Game: 3—8/10/02 (shared with Walker Cooper 7/6/49)

Homers In Three Consecutive Innings—8/10/02 (shared with four others)

Most Homers, Inning: 2—5/16/96 (shared with many)

NATIONAL LEAGUE RECORDS HELD OR SHARED BY SAMMY SOSA—THE ABOVE PLUS

Most Consecutive 40-Homer Seasons: 5—1998–2002 (shared with Ralph Kiner 1947–1951 and Duke Snider 1953–1957)

Most Consecutive 100-RBI Seasons: 8—1995–2002 (shared with Mel Ott 1929–1936 and Willie Mays 1959–1966)

Most 150-Plus RBI Seasons: 2—1998, 2001 (shared with Hack Wilson 1929–1930)

Most Homers, Three-Season Span: 179—1998–2000

Most Homers, Four-Season Span: 243—1998–2001

Most Homers, 10-Season Span: 462—1993–2002

Most Homers, August: 17—2001 (shared with Willie Mays 1965)

Most Homers, Consecutive Series: 15—1998

Most Homers, Sunday-Saturday Calendar Week: 8—6/14–6/20/98 (shared with three others)

Most RBI, Consecutive Games: 14—8/10–8/11/02

CUBS RECORDS HELD OR SHARED BY SAMMY SOSA—ALL OF THE ABOVE PLUS

Most 30-Homer Seasons: 9—1993, 1995–2002

Most Multiple-Homer Games, Career: 57

Most Homers, Season: 66—1998

Most Extra-Base Hits, Season: 103—2001

Most Total Bases, Season: 425—2001

Highest Slugging Percentage, Season: .737—2001

Most Homers, Wrigley Field, Season: 35—1998

Most Homers, Road, Season: 31—1998

Strikeouts, Career: 1,539

Strikeouts, Season: 174—1997

Consecutive-Game Homer Streak: 5 games—6/3–6/8/98 (shared with two others)

Homers, Three Consecutive Games: 5—6/19–6/21/98, 8/10–8/12/02 (shared with two others)

Most Hits, Consecutive At-Bats: 9—6/30–7/2/93

Most Hits, Game: 6—7/2/93 (shared with several)

Most Homers, Game: 3—six times (shared with many)

Most Homers, Inning: 2—5/16/96—7th (shared with Mark Bellhorn 8/29/02—4th)

Most RBI, Game: 9—8/10/02 (shared with Heinie Zimmerman 6/11/11)

SOSA'S YEAR-BY-YEAR HOMER BREAKDOWNS

Year and team	Total	Home	Road	NL	AL	Solo	2-R	3-R	GS	2-HR	3-HR	4-HR	50+	40-49	30-39	RHP	LHP	Parks
1989 Texas	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
White Sox	3	1	2	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
1990 White Sox	15	10	5	0	15	9	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	5
1991 White Sox	10	3	7	0	10	4	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	1
1992 Cubs	8	4	4	8	0	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	3
1993 Cubs	33	23	10	33	0	18	13	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	10	5
1994 Cubs	25	11	14	25	0	16	6	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	4
1995 Cubs	36	19	17	36	0	15	13	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	9	2
1996 Cubs	40	26	14	40	0	16	16	8	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	32	8	1
1997 Cubs	36	25	11	36	0	19	13	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	12	0
1998 Cubs	66	35	31	66	0	37	19	7	3	10	1	0	1	0	0	54	12	3
1999 Cubs	63	33	30	63	0	36	18	9	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	45	18	0
2000 Cubs	50	22	28	50	0	25	12	12	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	42	8	3
2001 Cubs	64	34	30	64	0	36	21	5	2	7	3	0	1	0	0	51	13	3
2002 Cubs	49	24	25	49	0	26	15	7	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	38	11	1
Totals	499	270	229	470	29	264	156	72	7	52	6	0	4	2	3	370	129	37

SOSA HOMER-BY-HOMER—1998

HR#	Date	Game	Opponent	Pitcher	Inner	Type	Direction
1	4/4	5	Montreal	Marc Valdes	3	Solo	RF
2	4/11	11	@Montreal	Anthony Telford	7	Solo	RF
3	4/15	14	@New York	Dennis Cook	8	Solo	LF
4	4/23	21	San Diego	Dan Miceli	9	Solo	CF
5	4/24	22	@Los Angeles	Ismael Valdes	1	Solo	CF
6	4/27	25	@San Diego	Joey Hamilton	1	2-run	CF
7	5/3	30	St. Louis	Cliff Politte	1	Solo	LF
8	5/16	42	@Cincinnati	Scott Sullivan	3	3-run	CF
9	5/22	47	@Atlanta	Greg Maddox	1	Solo	CF
10	5/25	50	@Atlanta	Kevin Millwood	4	Solo	RF
11	5/25	50	@Atlanta	Mike Cather	8	3-run	CF
12	5/27	51	Philadelphia	Darrin Winston	8	Solo	LF
13	5/27	51	Philadelphia	Wayne Gomes	9	2-run	LF
14	6/1	56	Florida	Ryan Dempster	1	2-run	LF
15	6/1	56	Florida	Oscar Henriquez	8	3-run	CF
16	6/3	58	Florida	Livan Hernandez	5	2-run	LF
17	6/5	59	White Sox	Jim Parque	5	2-run	RF
18	6/6	60	White Sox	Carlos Castillo	7	Solo	CF
19	6/7	61	White Sox	James Baldwin	5	3-run	CF
20	6/8	62	@Minnesota	LaTroy Hawkins	3	Solo	RF
21	6/13	66	@Philadelphia	Mark Portugal	6	2-run	RF
22	6/15	68	Milwaukee	Carl Eldred	1	Solo	RF
23	6/15	68	Milwaukee	Carl Eldred	3	Solo	LF
24	6/15	68	Milwaukee	Carl Eldred	7	Solo	CF
25	6/17	70	Milwaukee	Bronswell Patrick	4	Solo	LF
26	6/19	72	Philadelphia	Carlton Loewer	1	Solo	LF
27	6/19	72	Philadelphia	Carlton Loewer	5	2-run	LF
28	6/20	73	Philadelphia	Matt Beech	3	2-run	LF
29	6/20	73	Philadelphia	Toby Borland	6	3-run	LF
30	6/21	74	Philadelphia	Tyler Green	4	Solo	RF
31	6/24	77	@Detroit	Seth Greisinger	1	Solo	LF
32	6/25	78	@Detroit	Brian Moehler	7	Solo	RF
33	6/30	82	Arizona	Alan Embree	8	Solo	LF
34	7/9	88	@Milwaukee	Jeff Juden	2	2-run	CF
35	7/10	89	@Milwaukee	Scott Karl	2	Solo	LF
36	7/17	95	@Florida	Kirt Ojala	6	2-run	CF
37	7/22	100	Montreal	Miguel Batista	8	3-run	RF
38	7/26	105	New York	Rick Reed	6	2-run	CF
39	7/27	106	@Arizona	Willie Blair	6	2-run	RF
40	7/27	106	@Arizona	Alan Embree	8	Grand Slam	CF
41	7/28	107	@Arizona	Bob Wolcott	5	Grand Slam	LF
42	7/31	110	Colorado	Jamey Wright	1	Solo	RF
43	8/5	115	Arizona	Andy Benes	3	2-run	LF
44	8/8	117	@St. Louis	Rick Croushore	9	2-run	LF
45	8/10	119	@San Francisco	Russ Ortiz	5	Solo	LF
46	8/10	119	@San Francisco	Chris Brock	7	Solo	CF
47	8/16	124	@Houston	Sean Bergman	4	Solo	RF
48	8/19	126	St. Louis	Kent Bottenfield	5	2-run	LF
49	8/21	128	San Francisco	Orel Hershiser	5	2-run	CF
50	8/23	130	Houston	Jose Lima	5	Solo	LF
51	8/23	130	Houston	Jose Lima	8	Solo	LF
52	8/26	133	@Cincinnati	Brett Tomko	3	Solo	LF
53	8/28	135	@Colorado	John Thomson	1	Solo	RF
54	8/30	137	@Colorado	Darryl Kile	1	2-run	LF
55	8/31	138	Cincinnati	Brett Tomko	3	2-run	LF
[1] 56	9/2	140	Cincinnati	Jason Bere	6	Solo	RF
57	9/4	141	@Pittsburgh	Jason Schmidt	1	Solo	RF
58	9/5	142	@Pittsburgh	Sean Lawrence	6	Solo	RF
59	9/11	148	Milwaukee	Bill Pulsipher	5	Solo	RF
[2] 60	9/12	149	Milwaukee	Valerio De Los Santos	7	3-run	LF
[3] 61	9/13	150	Milwaukee	Bronswell Patrick	5	2-run	LF
62	9/13	150	Milwaukee	Eric Plunk	9	Solo	LF
63	9/16	153	@San Diego	Brian Boehringer	8	Grand Slam	LF
64	9/23	159	@Milwaukee	Rafael Roque	5	Solo	RF
65	9/23	159	@Milwaukee	Rod Henderson	6	Solo	CF
66	9/25	160	@Houston	Jose Lima	4	Solo	LF

[1] 56—tied Hack Wilson's 1930 club record (Wilson hit his 56th homer in the Cubs' 153rd game).
[2] 60—tied Babe Ruth's 1927 total (Ruth hit his 60th homer in the Yankees' 154th game).
[3] 61—tied Roger Maris' 1961 total (Maris hit his 61st homer in the Yankees' 163rd game).

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 with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) in consideration of H. Res. 195, a bill congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering today, H. Res. 195, congratulates the Chicago Cubs' Sammy Sosa for reaching a major milestone in his remarkable and outstanding career.

On Friday, April 4, against the Cincinnati Reds, Sammy Sosa made baseball history during the top of the seventh inning when he drove a fastball over the right field fence. As he stepped on home plate, index fingers pointed at the sky, he also was stepping into some very select and special company.

With that historic home run, Sammy became the 18th player in major league history to hit 500 home runs and the first Latino to break the magical mark. His name will be etched alongside baseball legends Hank Aaron, Babe Ruth, Mickey Mantle, Willie Mays, Mel Ott, and Ernie Banks.

Mr. Speaker, sports writer Ralph Wiley wrote that ''The home run remains the American sporting accomplishment and expression, combining nearly everything we admire: lightning-quick strike, power and, above all, great spectacle, a sustained visual effect in one beautiful arc of life.'' It brings us to our feet, howling and high-fiving total strangers. We admire and are in awe of the individuals with the power and precision to hit home runs. And the notion of hitting 500 home runs remains one of the most impressive and most difficult accomplishments in sports.

It immediately conjures up images of baseball legends and of history, and for the select few who achieve this amazing and astounding feat, it truly exemplifies and embodies their enduring excellence.

With his 500th home run, Sammy will forever be associated with baseball greats and has permanently secured his place in the record books, but he is so

much more than just one remarkable and incredible accomplishment. Time and time again, Sammy has proven on and off the field to be a source of pride, joy and jubilation for all the residents of the Dominican Republic, as well as all Latin Americans and all immigrants to the United States from around the globe.

His story is so familiar so hopeful for so many immigrants in this country, men and women who, like Sammy, come to the United States to work hard, to provide for their families and loved ones, so that they, too, can live a better and safer life.

And that, in addition to his 500 home runs, is why this resolution is so important, deserving and justified. Throughout history people have associated baseball with the strengths of American culture and equated the game with the best of our country's character and resolve.

At no time was this more evident than after the tragedy of September 11. Across the United States, ball parks hosted moving and emotional attributes to the fallen heroes of that dreadful and heart-wrenching day. And perhaps no image was more poignant or more touching than Sammy Sosa running the bases waving an American flag after hitting a home run.

Sometimes I believe it takes someone born elsewhere to sum up the most patriotic and powerful sentiments of our great Nation. No one loves and respects and admires America, their community or their profession more than Sammy Sosa.

□ 1430

Roberto Clemente once said, ''When I put on my uniform, I feel I am the proudest man on Earth.'' Sammy has approached the game with that same passion and purpose, with that same excitement and enthusiasm. And in doing so, he has shown us just how potent the combination of discipline and dedication and desire can be. I think the comparison between Sammy and Roberto Clemente is fitting and appropriate. Roberto Clemente was such a model, such an example and such an inspiration to so many people; and Sammy instills and encourages that same desire and dedication, that same commitment to be better, to reach higher, to succeed despite the odds.

From his first home run off Roger Clemens in 1989 to today, Sammy has awed us with his ability and athletic prowess on the field and his dignity and selflessness off the field. He has embodied the team spirit, talent, exuberance, and determination that we associate with the very best qualities of sports. He has been able to do so under the most intense media scrutiny and public attention.

Throughout his record-breaking career, Sammy has consistently conducted himself with a level of modesty and humility that has been a source of motivation to people around the world. After his historic 500th home run, the standing ovations and the praise and accolades, Sammy stated, ''I'm very happy, very blessed. I've been working hard all my life to be where I am.''

Mr. Speaker, it is all of us that I believe are blessed. We are blessed to have men and women like Mr. Sosa to inspire our imaginations and to encourage us to make the most of our ambitions and our aspirations. From the child finding safety and sanctuary in a game of stickball in the heart of the inner city, to the dusty little league field in our most desolate and isolated countryside, countless young men and women can look at Sammy's accomplishments, at his fervor, and at his fortitude and say, I too can achieve, I too can dream, and I too can overcome obstacles. I too can break down barriers on the playing field, in the classroom, and indeed in life.

So today, Mr. Speaker, it is with great reverence and great respect that I say thank you, Sammy. Thank you for tearing down barriers for Latinos around the world. Thank you for being a role model and an inspiration; and thank you for letting us dream as big as our hearts will allow. And congratulations on this magnificent and memorable achievement. We look forward to another 500 home runs.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have just heard, Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs entered the 1998 baseball season as a relatively unknown player. That is, until his riveting race with Mark McGwire of the St. Louis Cardinals for the Major League single-season home run record. In 1998, Sosa finished second to McGwire with 66 home runs, five more than the previous record.

Sammy Sosa was born in the Dominican Republic in 1968. His mother raised him, his four brothers and two sisters after her husband died. Sosa recalls, ''We were poor. We definitely were poor.'' Sosa sold oranges for 10 cents, shined shoes for 25 cents, and worked as a janitor in a shoe factory to help with the family's finances.

In the spring of 1986, Sosa, who did not know how to speak English, came to the United States for the first time. Within 3 years, he was playing in the major leagues, appearing in 25 games for the Rangers in 1989, batting .238. Later that year, Texas traded Sosa to the Chicago White Sox. In 1992, the White Sox traded Sosa to the Cubs. I do not know why they did that. The White Sox are in my district and the Cubs are not; and perhaps had the White Sox not traded Sosa, their fortunes would have been even greater. But the rest is history in the making. On April 4, Sosa hit the 500th home run of his career, making him only the 18th player in Major League history to reach the mark and the first Latino to accomplish this outstanding feat.

He is indeed in the select company of great home run hitters, which includes Hank Aaron, Babe Ruth, Mickey Mantle, Willie Mays, Mel Ott, and fellow Cub Ernie Banks. Sammy Sosa is indeed a source of pride for his native country and is an inspiration to all Americans that with hard work and commitment, anything is possible. He demonstrates that it is not always so important where you come from in life, but what is really important is where you are going. He has gone to the top and is still climbing.

I join with my colleagues in commending and congratulating him.

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

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

I want to again thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for introducing this important legislation. I have to admit it has not been the easiest bill for me to handle. I have a Heartland statue of longtime Mr. Cub Ernie Banks in my office; my father was a Cubs fan; my former boss, House Member and Senator Dan Coats was such a Cubs fan that on the second day of his honeymoon he went to a Cubs game; and my subcommittee staff director, Chris Donesa, is not only a Cubs fan and fanatic, he is a Sammy Sosa fanatic. But I am a White Sox fan like my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS); and it is not without a little heartburn that we are paying such tribute, because if he were in the White Sox outfield today, we might be national champions. I hope the Cubs can do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 195, a resolution to congratulate Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs.

I am proud to honor Sammy because he embodies the Latino values of family, hard work, and perseverance, and for being a great role model for all children, Latino and non-Latino alike.

Sammy has overcome tremendous obstacles to achieve greatness. He was born the fifth of seven children in a poor family. When his father died, Sammy was only seven and he had to support his family by selling orange juice and shining shoes to help his family keep food on the table.

He learned baseball like most kids in his poverty stricken neighborhood, fielding with gloves made out of milk cartons, batting with a tree branch, and hitting a tightly rolled and taped sock. Who knew that he would grow up to be the baseball star that he his today?

Sammy demonstrates what we can do when we try hard enough. Despite being sent back to the minors several times, he worked hard to improve himself. In 1989, he batted .238 an only hit 2 home run in 84 turns at bat. But just four years later, he showed us that hard work pays off when he hit 33 homeruns, 93 RBI's and made the All-Star Team.

Today we congratulate Sammy Sosa not only for being a great ball player or for his great story of personal triumph, but we also give tribute to him as a humanitarian. In 1998, he worked with Red Cross to send those suffering from Hurricane Georges 60,000 pounds of rice and beans and barrels of potable

water. He helped rebuild countless homes with his financial assistance. Moved by the suffering in his homeland, he created a charitable foundation to further the education and health of poor children in his native land of the Dominican Republic and in his new home, the United States.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I stand in strong support of this resolution. We must congratulate Sammy for what he is—a model of hard work and perseverance first, a distinguished humanitarian second and a stellar baseball player third.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 195, Commemorating the 500th Major League Home run, by the great Sammy Sosa of our Chicago Cubs.

With his blast on April 4, 2003 against the Cincinnati Reds at the Great American Ball Park, Sammy joined one of the most exclusive in baseball history, becoming only the 18th player to join the 500 home run club. This club includes such legends as Hank Aaron, Babe Ruth, and Chicago's own Mr. Cub, Ernie Banks.

While proudly representing his beloved native Dominican Republic, Sammy Sosa has become as much a part of Chicago as the stuffed pizza and Navy Pier. His pride in his native roots is but one example of the cultural diversity that makes Chicago the great city it is.

The bat that Sammy used to hit his 500th home run is now on display at Chicago's Field Museum as part of the National Baseball Hall of Fame's roving exhibit, Baseball As America exhibit. I urge all Chicagoans to visit this celebration of how baseball has been woven into the fabric of our nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GUTIERREZ and my other colleagues for introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor today. I applaud the first place Cubs and wish them luck this weekend against the New York Yankees, in the Yankees first visit to Wrigley Field since the 1938 World Series. And I wish Sammy luck against Roger Clemens on Saturday, whom Sammy hit his home run off of in 1989. For these reasons, I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 195.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 195.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL CHARLES GABRIEL POST OFFICE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1465) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 27 in Iron Station, North Carolina, as the ''General Charles Gabriel Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1465

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

SECTION 1. GENERAL CHARLES GABRIEL POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 27 in Iron Station, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the ''General Charles Gabriel 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 General Charles Gabriel Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1465, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 27 in Iron Station, North Carolina, as the General Charles Gabriel Post Office. The entire delegation from the State of North Carolina has cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, General Charles Gabriel was the 11th chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force. A lifelong North Carolina resident, he graduated with a bachelor's degree from the U.S. Military Academy in 1950 and was commissioned in the Air Force. He subsequently began studying to be a pilot and completed advanced training in December 1951. By August 1980, Charles Gabriel eventually had worked his way up to the position of commander in chief of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe at Ramstein Air Base in Germany. From that position, he was named Air Force chief of staff and moved to Washington, D.C. in July 1982. General Gabriel retired 4 years later on July 1, 1986.

Mr. Speaker, General Charles Gabriel's decorated career in our Nation's Air Force is worthy of commendation by this House. I am proud to be part of the proceedings that honor General Charles Gabriel. I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1465. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for introducing this important legislation.

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, H.R. 1465, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 27 in Iron Station, North Carolina, as the General Charles Gabriel Post Office, was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) on March 27, 2003. It names a postal facility in Iron Station, North Carolina, after General Charles Gabriel. The bill has met the committee policy and has been supported and approved by all members of the North Carolina delegation.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Charles Gabriel was a command pilot and the recipient of numerous military decorations and awards. He retired from the military in 1986. He is indeed one who is deserving of such an honor. I commend my colleague for seeking to honor General Gabriel in this manner.

I urge the swift passage of H.R. 1465.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BALLENGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has been the home of many brave men and women who have served their country to the utmost of their ability. Today I would like to honor retired General Charles A. Gabriel, who served as chief of staff of the United States Air Force from July 1982 to July 1986 by naming the United States Post Office in Iron Station, North Carolina, in his honor. I have chosen the Iron Station post office because General Gabriel's father worked in the same facility for 44 years.

General Charles Gabriel was born in 1928 in Lincolnton, North Carolina, as one of five children to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gabriel. He graduated from Lincolnton High School in 1944 at the age of 16 and entered Catawba College as a star member of the football program. In recognition of his outstanding academic and athletic ability, he was recruited to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point at the age of 18 where he was named quarterback for the military academy's football team, the Black Knights. He earned his commission and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1950. While on active duty, he continued his education and in 1963 received a Master of Science degree in engineering management from George Washington University.

General Gabriel served a long and commendable career as a combat fighter pilot and later in various staff positions. He was first assigned to South Korea where he flew over 100 combat

missions in the Korean War. He then flew 150 combat missions after being stationed at Udorn Royal Thai Air Force Base from 1970 to 1972 during the Vietnam conflict. In 1979 he became the deputy chief of staff of operations, plans and readiness. In 1980 he was appointed commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe, and commander of Allied Air Forces Central Europe until his appointment in 1982 as chief of staff of the Air Force.

General Gabriel has received numerous awards and decorations, including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Air Force Distinguished Service Medal, and the Legion of Merit. He also has attended both the command and staff school at the Naval War College and the Industrial College of Armed Forces in Washington, D.C.

I ask my fellow colleagues to please join me in tribute to this great North Carolinian by naming the U.S. post office in Iron Station, North Carolina, in his honor.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for introducing this important legislation. I urge all Members to support the adoption of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1465.

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. SOUDER. 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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 231) supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 231

Whereas the well-being of all people of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 700,000 law enforcement personnel, at great risk to their personal safety, serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front line in preserving the right of the children of the United States to receive an education in a crime-free environment, a right that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas more than 147 peace officers across the Nation were killed in the line of duty during 2002, well below the decade-long average of 165 deaths annually, and a major drop from 2001 when 230 officers were killed, including 72 officers in the September 11th terrorist attacks;

Whereas every year, 1 out of every 9 peace officers is assaulted, 1 out of every 25 peace officers is injured, and 1 out of every 4,400 peace officers is killed in the line of duty;

Whereas section 136 of title 36, United States Code, requests that the President issue each year a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

Whereas on May 15, 2003, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, D.C. to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day to honor Federal, State, and local peace officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 231.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 231, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), supports the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, I am particularly pleased that the House is considering this resolution to honor Federal, State and local law enforcement officers killed or disabled in the line of duty. Right now, there are over 700,000 law enforcement officers serving this Nation. Their sacrifices are among the most valuable that any citizen can give to this country, and sadly, as the text of this resolution states, on average 165 peace officers give the ultimate sacrifice each year while serving their local communities.

On October 1, 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed House Joint Resolution 730 into law during the 87th Congress. This resolution established a Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15 of every year that could honor the selfless devotion of members of the law enforcement community who are injured or killed in the line of duty. That was a very meaningful resolution then, and I feel this extremely worthwhile resolution is also very meaningful now.

This year, on Peace Officers Memorial Day, the President led a memorial service on the lawn of the U.S. Capitol that honored the lives of those law enforcement officers lost in the past year. Nearly 20,000 people were in attendance.

Mr. Speaker, peace officers protect every single one of us and literally put their lives on the line every day to protect our homes, families and communities. I hope this resolution can serve as a small reminder to all law enforcement officers that this country appreciates their service.

We have had several tragic losses in my home communities as well. I have worked with City Counsel President John Crawford in the city of Fort Wayne, Indiana, and supported his efforts to build a memorial in Fort Wayne for peace officers and other public servants who have fallen in the line of duty. We can never thank them enough for their service.

Therefore, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 231, and I thank my colleague from Colorado for introducing this worthy measure.

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 in support of H. Res. 231, a bill supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day, and to indicate that I was pleased indeed to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961, President John F. Kennedy requested that Congress designate May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which it falls, Law Enforcement Appreciation Week. Since then, each May, police officers from the Nation's Capital to small communities across America pause to honor the sacrifices made by their fellow officers. This year, 377 names were added to the National Law Enforcement Memorial, including 148 who were killed in the line of duty in 2002. The death of a peace officer is a reminder of two things: one, the value of life; and, two, the high cost of peace.

More than 700,000 Americans serve as peace officers and put their lives on the line for us each and every day. To keep the peace, they go into the most volatile of situations. We owe them and their families a debt of gratitude for their service and valor.

The depth of their commitment and willingness to do the job is reflected in this police officer's prayer from the Ellis, Kansas, Police Department:

Lord, I ask for courage: Courage to face and conquer my own fears; courage to take me where others will not go.

I ask for strength: Strength of body to protect others, and strength of spirit to lead others.

I ask for dedication: Dedication to my job, to do it well; dedication to my community, to keep it safe.

And please, Lord, through it all, be by my side.

This prayer reflects the danger, but also the commitment and dedication, the willingness to give of themselves, expressed by so many peace officers throughout the Nation.

I certainly would want to add a debt of thanks to the men and women, especially in Chicago, in Cook County and the surrounding areas where I live, for the outstanding work that they have done and continue to do.

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

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all Members working together on this very, very important resolution, House Resolution 231.

My grandfather, my father and brother-in-law all served as police officers, and, thank the Lord, they did so without injury or death. But there are thousands who have sacrificed their lives in order to protect the peace and tranquility of our community.

The President spoke last week here on our Capitol grounds relative to a tribute to fallen police officers, and it is fitting that we now memorialize this on the House floor.

There is no finer occupation, and I am torn between several that I admire greatly, with public education and teachers being one. But law enforcement personnel and fire fighters are true heroes in the sense that they go to work each and every day not knowing what to anticipate at the end of their shift or during their shift. They patrol back alleys, they come across frightening situations. They are constantly putting their lives on the line for the betterment of humanity.

Young fire fighters and police officers went racing up the World Trade Center without worrying about their own lives, but making certain they served those who were trapped, and tried to rescue as many as possible. Those are heroes.

Whether it is helping a student across a playground or a crossing zone, or intercepting a murderer, or more recently, the 21-year-old police officer that apprehended the Atlanta bomber, these are vigilant, dedicated, risk-taking public servants whose first goal is to make certain we are safe.

So I hope, as we vote on this resolution, that those listening to our voices take a moment to thank those serving today, who have made it through without risk of injury or death, thank their family members who sacrifice each and every day, for their husband or wife, for their son or daughter, sister, brother, who choose to do this work and arm themselves to protect the citizens of our communities, give them a thumb's up and a hearty handshake and thanks for their job well done.

For those who rest in peace, your sacrifice and devotion to our Nation and the security of this Nation will never be forgotten.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for introducing this important legislation honoring the peace officers of America. I urge all Members to support the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), who has a tremendous amount of interest in law enforcement and has dedicated much of his life and work in that area.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the peace officers from around the country who came to Washington on May 15th to commemorate and honor the 147 peace officers who died last year in the line of duty. Today we recognize National Peace Officers Memorial Day and pay tribute to the commitment, sacrifice, and public safety services these officers provide on a daily basis.

As we all know, September 11th, 2001 stands out as one of the most tragic days in American history. That fateful Tuesday, we lost 72 police officers, the largest loss of law enforcement personnel in a single day.

While September 11th offered an extreme glimpse of law enforcement service and sacrifice, similar acts of heroism and valor are performed every day by police officers across our nation.

Last year, more than 147 peace officers across this Nation were killed in the line of duty during 2002. Thankfully, the 147 peace officers killed last year is well below the decade long average of 165 deaths and a major drop from 2001 when 230 officers were killed.

Peace officers in every community have an admirable record of service and sacrifice, yet too many Americans lack a true understanding and appreciation of law enforcement's worth. That is why I worked a few years ago to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum in Washington, D.C.

Unlike any other job, peace officers face unprecedented risks while bravely protecting our communities and our freedoms. I hope my colleagues will join me today in paying tribute to our nation's fallen officers and expressing our gratitude for the work these men and women performed.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 231. The resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Peace Officer's Memorial Day.

One hundred and forty eight law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty this past year, including ten officers from my home state of California. Their names are inscribed upon the National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial, in Washington, D.C., forever visible, to the public in recognition of the sacrifices peace officers make for our safety.

We must not forget that law enforcement officers are vital to our Homeland Security. Like our veterans, law enforcement officers are involved in a battle to protect our communities. Like our veterans, peace officers deserve our continued support and recognition for their sacrifices.

Our law enforcement officers deserve respect and gratitude for protecting our communities. We must honor and remember the sacrifices that they make, especially if they lose their lives in the line of duty. We must preserve their memory and let their families know their deaths were not in vain.

I support H. Res. 231 in honor of the many men and women who have lost their lives enforcing the law and preserving the safety of our nation.

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

Mr. SOUDER. 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 Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 231.

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. SOUDER. 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.

SUPPORTING 20TH ANNUAL NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 172) supporting the 20th Annual National Tourism Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 172

Whereas travel and tourism has a major impact on the economy of the United States as the 3rd largest retail sales industry in the Nation;

Whereas 1 out of every 7 people employed in the United States civilian labor force is directly or indirectly employed in the travel and tourism industry;

Whereas international travel to the United States is the largest service export, having generated a trade surplus for 14 consecutive years;

Whereas domestic and international travel generated an estimated $537.2 billion in expenditures in 2002, supporting more than 7.9 million jobs, and creating more than $98.7 billion in tax revenue for Federal, State, and local governments;

Whereas the slowing of the United States economy and international conflicts have had a tremendous negative effect on the tourism industry;

Whereas the Department of Commerce has released the 2002 international year-end arrivals data, revealing that the level of international travel to the United States declined an additional 7 percent between 2001 and 2002;

Whereas tourism contributes substantially to personal growth, education, appreciation of intercultural differences, and the enhancement of international understanding and good will;

Whereas the abundant natural and man-made attractions of the United States and the hospitality of the American people establish the United States as the preeminent destination for both foreign and domestic travelers;

Whereas National Tourism Week was established by Congress in 1983, and first celebrated in May 1984, when President Ronald

Reagan signed a proclamation urging citizens to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities;

Whereas, since 1984, National Tourism Week has been celebrated each May by the travel and tourism community, travel industry associations, as well as many States, cities, and localities throughout the Nation; and

Whereas May 10 through 18, 2003, is the 20th Annual National Tourism Week: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports National Tourism Week; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Tourism Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 172.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 172, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. FOLEY), supports the 20th annual National Tourism Week.

Mr. Speaker, the travel and tourism industry has promoted National Tourism Week every year since 1984, and rightfully so. The tourism industry provides nearly 8 million jobs and almost $100 million every year in tax revenue to this country.

Just like the Peace Officers Memorial Day, National Tourism Week was first proclaimed by a great President. President Ronald Reagan signed into law a resolution that urged citizens to commemorate National Tourism Week each May and encouraged appropriate ceremony and activities. Twenty years later it is timely to consider the anniversary of this resolution, because the recent lull in the world economy has devastated the travel business in this country. Overall, hopefully the next 20 years can be as successful for this giant industry as the last 20 have within.

I thank my colleague from Florida, where they host a great portion of our country's tourism, and many of our tourist dollars, including mine, for introducing this important measure.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the House Concurrent Resolution 172.

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, National Tourism Week was established in 1983 when the U.S. Congress passed a joint resolution designating the week to be celebrated in May of 1984. In a White House ceremony, President Ronald Reagan signed a Presidential proclamation urging citizens to observe the week with the appropriate ceremonies and activities. Industry leaders and public relations professionals were the first volunteers to manage the annual event.

By 1986, industry leaders had formed a permanent coalition which later became the Tourism Works for America Council. They opened a full-time office and expanded the concept into a year-round tourism awareness program. By then, hundreds of communities across the Nation were participating in the celebration and more participate each year.

The message during National Tourism Week is, come to see America and celebrate its vistas, its heroes, its culture and its heritage. National Tourism Week also serves to promote a wider understanding of the importance of travel and tourism as a major U.S. industry that is vital to the economic stability and growth of our Nation.

The interesting thing about tourism, Mr. Speaker, is that no matter where you go, there is always some additional interest, there is always a place. I have been amazed that no matter where I have gone throughout this country or throughout the world, there was something to see, something to learn, something to know, something to better understand. So the promotion of tourism is not only an economic, but also an educational enterprise.

I commend the gentleman for introducing this resolution and urge its swift passage.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), elected in the same class in 1994, a tireless supporter for tourism and the arts here in the Congress since he arrived and the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the tourism and hospitality industry is important to the State of Florida. I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 172, a bill I introduced along with my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), recognizing the 20th annual National Tourism Week.

I see the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has joined us on the floor today.

□ 1500

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and I from Florida both have worked with our colleagues to try to educate them about the importance of travel and tourism. It is the lifeblood of many States, like Florida and California, New York, and Nevada, to just name a few.

There are currently 7.4 million people in the food service, hospitality, and travel-related industries that rely on America's vibrant and thriving travel industry, which generates $170 billion in travel-related payroll.

National Tourism Week was first established in 1983, when the U.S. Congress passed a joint resolution designating the week to be celebrated in May, 1984. This annual event gives us an opportunity to recognize the significant importance that the travel and tourism industry has on our economy.

As America's third largest retail sales industry, $96 billion was generated in tax revenues for our local, State, and Federal governments in 2002 alone. In addition, there were $7.5 billion in balance of trade surplus for the United States, making the industry one of our largest service exports.

It is clear, every congressional district is impacted, that is, every district with a restaurant, and all have them; a hotel, and all have them; a museum, and I am certain most have them; national parks; stadiums; theaters; campgrounds; and beaches. All obviously help local economies and local communities thrive.

As some of us begin our summer travel, let us remember the tremendous impact that the travel and tourism industry makes on all of our lives. I want to spend a moment, too, to commend this administration, President Bush; and the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary Evans; Brenda Becker, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Senator TED STEVENS; as well as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), in our recent quest to put $50 million in the budget in order to help stimulate, if you will, international tourism back to the United States.

As I am sure the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) will tell us, our States have been hurt badly by September 11 and terrorism in general. People are nervous and they are fearful. We are doing everything we can to ensure airline safety and that when they arrive at a destination that they will be safe.

But we have lost, in Orlando alone, some 35 percent of the business that was occurring in that region of the State; so this is a very important issue. It is an important topic. It is one we are wrestling with.

Also, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) talks about his idea that he brought to us that hopefully will catch on where each Member of Congress writes in a book, if you will, a destination that they favor; they may not want to be that specific, but some of the joys and bounties and benefits of living in that community.

I know I have some of the greatest beaches. I have the Everglades. We have agricultural tourism, ecotourism. Certainly, we have things throughout the State, like Busch Gardens and Universal Theme Park and Disney. We

have the Latin music industry, where the capital of the world is Miami. We have South Beach.

I could go on and on, but now I am going to get in trouble because I am probably missing some of the important destinations: Destin; and all of the beaches in Jacksonville.

But suffice it to say that tourism is an important, important industry. Whether one is the CEO of a company or doing dishes in a restaurant, as I did when I was 13 years old, we are all playing a critical role in people's impressions of our State, whether they had a good visit, whether they enjoyed themselves, whether they will return again.

So I salute everyone, from the bellboy to the bell hop to the rental car agencies, who make the traveling experience fun, productive, and enjoyable for America's families and those visitors from outside the Continental United States.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his indulgence and certainly thank the committee for reporting this to the floor. I urge all Members to support this 20th Annual National Tourism Week represented by House Concurrent Resolution 172.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding time to me, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) for his kind remarks about our being co-chairs of the Congressional Tourism Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the 20th anniversary of National Tourism Week. As cochair of the House Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), in proclaiming the 20th anniversary of National Tourism Week.

Tourism is the leading industry in America. In fact, it is the largest employer in America. I think oftentimes people do not think of it because it has never been defined as an industry, like the automobile industry, like the steel industry, like the electronics industry. This industry is made up of so many factors. It is made up of restaurants and museums and car rental companies and hotels and motels and sports arenas, ski shops, beaches, concert halls, parks, historic landmarks, campgrounds, and the list goes on and on.

If we put all of those together, we will have what we call the tourism industry. It is one of the most diverse sectors in the entire economy, with the single goal of making the United States the greatest place to travel, not only just to see, but to enjoy the incredible diversity and cultures of great America.

I do not think people just come to America from other countries to visit our beautiful spots, which obviously lure them, as we are lured to other beautiful places in the world. But they also come to know the culture of Americans and learn about how this country functions.

I happen to live in one of those towns, Carmel, California. I just got back from a trip to Europe; and everywhere I went, when I said where I lived in California, people knew where it was, though it is a small town of 4,000 people. I do not think it is just because Clint Eastwood was the mayor of my town. People have actually been going there for years and years. The city is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year.

But the point is that the mayor of Carmel told me that the number one request of the tourists of that town, of the city, was a copy of their zoning ordinance. So people are not just tourists for purposes of spending money and enjoying beautiful places; they are also thinking and they are looking and they are listening. In that way we are able to share this bounty of America and the bounty of the people.

The travel and tourism industry has faced unprecedented challenges in the last couple of years, first with the decline of confidence in the safety of air travel as a result of September 11, and then the struggling economy, which has diminished business travel budgets and decreased household discretionary income. If that were not enough, then we are more recently faced with the uncertainties of the war in Iraq, and SARS has taken its toll on this industry.

Congress has done something about it, though. It is not just enacting this resolution celebrating our National Tourism Week. We also last week had given a tax cut to the very wealthy in this country, and essentially the purpose of that tax cut was to leave money in people's hands so they would spend it.

I cannot think of a better way to spend it than for people to take their new money that they are going to get from the Federal Government in the middle of the summer and take their family on a vacation, or take friends, staff, and employees out to lunch or to dinner to thank them for working with them, and tell our friends how much we enjoy being their friend by celebrating in a place outside our homes, in a way that we can spend it with others.

Remember, these are also areas that are labor-intensive, where people are employed. It takes a lot of people to change beds, serve food, wash dishes, drive us around in buses, and so on. When we see these people, we should thank them for being in the travel and tourism industry. With that little bit of extra tax money, we should give them a bigger tip than we would have the year before. They need it, especially those families who lost the child care tax credits. Those poor kids are not going to be able to go to Disneyland, yet many people will be annually able to go to the very wealthy areas, Nantucket and so on.

I am hoping that the tax bill will end up being a good bill and end up putting more money in the economy, getting the tourism industry back on its feet, and certainly continue to be the largest employing industry in the United States, and an industry that will take care of everybody, so the rising tide will raise all ships. That is what I think the tax cut is supposed to do.

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

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Lisa Barkovic from my staff is with me. She, as well as your staff, I know have done a tremendous job in organizing several of our events.

I was remiss for not recognizing our individual staff. She is on the floor with me today. I know we have worked very closely with the gentleman's office; and the professional staff, those who work in our offices, do a tremendous job in helping us get ready for floor activity. I wanted to share that with the gentleman and with her, as well.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman very much. At the same time I recognize my staff, Tom Tucker, who came to me from being a concierge in a hotel, a great person to have as a staff member in the travel and tourism industry.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California and say that I am sure that having a fistful of dollars would not hurt his town; and if we had more fistfuls, there would be more tourism. I think this is a great piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the dynamic economy of the United States that hopefully will be fueled additionally by this tax cut has provided a level of success in the United States that our forefathers really did not know. John Adams once said that he worked hard so his kids could enjoy their leisure time and could learn more about arts and history and see their Nation. In fact, that is what we can do today.

We have heard from the sponsors of this resolution about the beauties of Monterey and Carmel, California, pronounced ''Carm-el'' in Indiana, and the beauty of Florida and Palm Beach and the beaches of Florida. But tourism is important to each of our districts.

I grew up in the small town of Grabill, Indiana. We had a retail furniture industry, a furniture store there. When we realized we had more people coming in from Texas, in fact from Houston, Texas, than we had from the neighboring town of Leo, we decided that the Amish in the area were

drawing more tourists than regular shoppers, so we now have antique centers there and shops for people who visit relatives who come through the State of Indiana.

We have many beautiful things in my home State, as well. Tourism is a critical component for all of us in the United States. I represent the leading area for the majority of the RV manufacturers in America.

Nothing could be more important than putting more dollars in the hands of those who pay taxes. The people who pay the taxes get the tax dollars back. No longer is the Federal Government taking as much of their check. Now they have money to spend. They can get an RV, they can travel.

If we can also reopen the gasoline and energy markets of the United States and the world so that the travel dollars and costs go down, combined with the economic growth, combined with the tax cut, combined with people keeping more of their own money, hopefully we can get the RV industry back up, we can get the tourism industry back up, we can get the airlines back up, and we can help the hotel and restaurant industries of the United States.

This resolution, the 20th anniversary of National Tourism Week, is an important hallmark as we move towards an economic revitalization, and during these summer months towards America once again exploring the highways and areas of the most wonderful country in the world, the United States of America.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Tourism Week. As a Representative from the State of Nevada, I understand first hand the importance of travel and tourism to the United States and our economy.

My hometown of Las Vegas is considered one of the most traveled to destinations in the world, earning its designation as the Entertainment Capital of the world long ago. Las Vegas has something to offer people of all ages. Everything from world class resort-casinos, to first class restaurants and shopping, and entertainment which includes concerts, production shows, and magic acts.

In 2002, more than 35 million people visited Las Vegas. Of that number, 5 million were convention and trade show delegates who left behind $5.9 billion in non-gaming revenue alone, helping to maintain the destination's year-round average occupancy rate at 84 percent. Tourism is the largest employer in the Las Vegas metropolitan area, with more than 25 percent of the population directly employed by the hospitality, gaming and recreation industries.

National Tourism Week is Las Vegas's annual opportunity to spotlight the role that tourism plays in the Nevada economy and to educate residents about the organizations that market Las Vegas to the nation and the world.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 172.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 159, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 195, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 1465, by the yeas and nays.

Further proceedings on H. Res. 231 will resume tomorrow.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

EXPRESSING PROFOUND SORROW ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF IRMA RANGEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 159.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 159, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 0, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 227]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons

Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—60

Ackerman
Becerra
Bereuter
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Conyers
Deal (GA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Dingell
Engel
Everett
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lowey
McCrery
McKeon
McNulty
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Ortiz
Pallone
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Ross
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Shimkus
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Toomey
Towns
Velazquez
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes to record their vote.

□ 1853

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING SAMMY SOSA OF THE CHICAGO CUBS FOR HITTING 500 MAJOR LEAGUE HOME RUNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 195.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 195, 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 372, nays 0, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—372

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—61

Ackerman
Becerra
Bereuter
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Conyers
Deal (GA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Dingell
Engel
Everett
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lowey
McCrery
McKeon
McNulty
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Ortiz
Pallone
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Ross
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Shimkus
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Toomey
Towns
Velazquez
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes to record their vote.

□ 1900

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1902

GENERAL CHARLES GABRIEL POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1465.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1465, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 0, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—371

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman

Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—62

Ackerman
Becerra
Bereuter
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Conyers
Deal (GA)
DeMint
Deutsch
Dingell
Engel
Everett
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lowey
McCrery
McKeon
McNulty
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Ortiz
Pallone
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Ross
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Shimkus
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Toomey
Towns
Velazquez
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that they have 2 minutes to record their votes.

□ 1916

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcalls 227, 228, and 229. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on each of those rollcalls.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for legislative business on Monday, June 2, 2003 I would have voted ''yea'' on the following rollcall votes: rollcall No. 227, H. Res. 159, Expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel; rollcall No. 228, H. Res. 195, Congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs; and rollcall No. 229, H.R. 1465, Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service in Iron Station, North Carolina as the ''General Charles Gabriel Post Office.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: ''yea'' on H. Res. 159: expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel, rollcall No. 227; ''yea'' on H. Res. 195: congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs, rollcall No. 228; and ''yea'' on H.R. 1465; to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4832 East Highway 27 in Iron Station, North Carolina, as the ''General Charles Gabriel Post Office'', rollcall No. 229.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 4, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–136) on the resolution (H. Res. 255) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1119, FAMILY TIME FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet later this week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1119, the Family Time Flexibility Act. The Committee on Education and the Workforce ordered the bill reported on April 9, 2003, and filed its report with the House on May 22, 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 4. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND LIFE OF THE LATE CHARLES ''BO'' HARRISON, PASCO COUNTY POLICE FORCE

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor Charles ''Bo'' Harrison, who this weekend became the first Pasco County Deputy to be killed in the line of

duty since 1922. On behalf of the Pasco County Police Force, I extend my deepest condolences to his friends and family, and want to take a moment before this body to honor his service and his life.

Deputy Harrison was a 31-year veteran of the Pasco County Police Force and was the highest ranking African American on the force. He was a Vietnam veteran and a former Army Ranger, and was slated to retire later this month.

Sometime around 2 a.m. Sunday morning while doing surveillance work outside a night club, Deputy Harrison was shot. His colleagues heard the shots fired and found Deputy Harrison in his squad car. Thinking that he had a heart attack, they tried to offer CPR, but realized upon removing his shirt that he had been shot in the back. Then he was rushed to the hospital, where he was pronounced dead a short time later.

The people of Pasco County will remember Deputy Harrison as a loving father, a family man, a softball coach, an active community member, and an upstanding citizen and friend. He will be sorely missed by all those who loved him, and his honor will forever remain with the Pasco County Police Force.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). 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.

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

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

INEQUITY OF RECENT TAX CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an issue of great concern to America's families, an issue of equity and financial security. Only a few weeks ago, Congress passed a tax bill with an official cost of $350 billion. The real cost, after accounting for budget gimmicks and the expiring provisions, which will almost certainly be extended, will actually exceed $1 trillion.

During that debate, some of us discussed the inequity of the tax cuts, that the vast majority of these benefits went to families who quite simply did not need this tax cut. People who earn in excess of $1 million per year will receive a $93,000 tax break.

As much as I believe the body of this bill was misguided, there was one provision in the bill that I supported wholeheartedly. That was the provision which allowed low-income working families to receive the child tax credit, which was increased from $600 to $1,000 per year. After we fought hard, the majority agreed to make that $400 increase refundable for those who did not earn enough to pay $400 in income taxes, though they pay other taxes, like payroll taxes. This one provision alone would have assisted the families of nearly 12 million children.

So it was with shock and disappointment that we learned that the refundability provision had been quietly stripped out of the bill at the 11th hour. In a $350 billion bill, this one provision to help nearly 12 million children of the poorest Americans would have cost $3.5 billion, 1 percent of the entire tax package. These are families with incomes between $10,500 and $26,625, families who really need this tax cut. But it was removed from the bill in the dead of night.

This one action speaks volumes about the priorities of the Republican leadership who claim to ''leave no child behind.'' But no matter how you slice it, this bill left almost 12 million children behind. It shows what one writer today called ''outright hostility towards America's poor and working classes.''

It did not have to be this way. There was bipartisan support for increasing the child tax credit, making it available to the families that need it most, that is, the families that earn too little to pay income taxes. And, I will repeat, these families do pay taxes; they pay payroll taxes. In fact, Members of both parties fought for the refundability provision after it was left out of President Bush's original plan.

Now exposed for having effectively abandoned these families and their children, the White House disingenuously says that the President would have signed this provision into law had it been in the legislation, as if the White House had not been involved in the drafting of the final bill and had no responsibility for removing it.

Vice President CHENEY was the one who brokered the final deal with Congressional negotiators before he cast the tie-breaking vote in the Senate. He was the White House's lead negotiator, ''The Deal Closer,'' as this week's Congressional Quarterly Weekly calls him on its cover. The deal closer on Capitol Hill, CHENEY is the President's right hand and the fractious GOP's trusted broker.

In fact, Senator GRASSLEY went so far as to say, ''Without DICK CHENEY's intervention, there would not be a bill.'' So to suggest this provision was dropped without his input or approval is, frankly, not believable.

It is interesting to track the evolution of excuses coming from the other side. First they argue that the limits on the overall size of the tax cut set by Members of the Senate require that something had to go. But if they wanted the child tax credit to survive, there were any number of provisions the Vice President could have insisted upon substituting in its place. If the majority had wanted, they could have easily paid for the provision by lowering the top tax bracket to 35.3 percent instead of 35 percent, or cracked down on the offshore tax havens for companies like Enron. No, these are the special interests that are their strongest supporters.

When that excuse failed, the President's spokesman said they never intended to give tax relief to those families. He said only taxpayers could get tax relief, despite the fact that these families, like every other family, pay over 7 percent of their income in payroll taxes.

So, let us not fool ourselves; the White House and the Republican majority knew exactly what they were doing when they dropped this provision in the final bill.

This sort of reckless, shameful disregard for working people in this country is becoming a pattern with this administration. In addition to the nearly 12 million children left out of this bill, when you include the 8 million kids that were kept from benefiting from any increase in the child tax credit, you end up with 20 million children who have been utterly and totally ignored by this President and his economic policies.

This is about values. The character of this issue raises questions about the values that this majority has and the underlying policy of their budget and economic policies. It is wrong, and we are going to turn it around.

MARRIED COUPLES TO BENEFIT FROM RECENT TAX CUTS

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, 42 million married couples got good news this past week when President Bush signed into law the jobs and economic growth package, legislation that wiped out the marriage tax penalty for 42 million married working couples this year.

This is an issue that we have been working so hard over the last several years to address, and that is fairness in the Tax Code affecting married couples. In the case of a husband and wife who are both in the workforce, because they file their taxes jointly, combining their income, in many cases, most cases, all cases, they are pushed into a higher tax bracket. That average married tax penalty for 42 million couples is almost $1,700 a year.

Well, thanks to the President's stroke of a pen just a few days ago, the marriage tax penalty for the vast majority of those who suffered, almost all of them, will be eliminated this year.

□ 1930

Let me give an example of a married couple in the district that I represent,

the south suburbs of Chicago, the town of Joliet, Jose and Magdalena Castillo and their son, Eduardo, and their little daughter, Carolina. They are an example of a typical married couple in Illinois who suffer the marriage tax penalty.

In fact, for Jose and Magdalena, they are both construction workers. They are laborers, and they work hard for a living. For them, the marriage tax penalty is about $1,400 each year. Thanks to this legislation, the jobs and economic growth package, 42 million married couples just like Jose and Magdalena Castillo will see their marriage tax penalty eliminated this year.

Think about it: $1,700, that is chump change here in Washington, where people are coming up with all sorts of creative ways to spend billions and trillions of dollars over the next decade. But for married couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, $1,400, in their case that is several months' worth of car payments, that is a couple months' worth of mortgage payments on their home, that is several months of day care for little Eduardo and Carolina, their children, while they are at work. It is real money for real people.

As everyone knows, in the Bush tax cut of 2001, we began the process of eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Unfortunately, under the Bush tax cut of 2001, for the marriage tax penalty for married couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo, it was phased out over the decade, which meant the marriage tax penalty continued to be there. It just got a little smaller each year.

Clearly, one of the greatest accomplishments of the jobs and economic growth package is we eliminate the marriage tax penalty this year for married couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo.

We do it two ways. For those who do not itemize their taxes, maybe they do not give a lot of money to their church or charity, or do not own a home so they do not have the home interest mortgage deduction, they benefit because we double the standard deduction for joint filers, married couples, to twice that of singles. So for those who do not itemize, we eliminate their marriage tax penalty.

For those who do itemize, married couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, who are homeowners, and of course give to their church and charity, they itemize their taxes, we eliminate the marriage tax penalty for them by widening the 15 percent tax bracket, which is the basic middle class tax bracket, so those who are among the married couples will be able to earn twice as much as a single person and stay in that 15 percent tax bracket.

The bottom line for Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, is we eliminate their marriage tax penalty this year, clearly one of the greatest accomplishments of the jobs and economic growth package that President Bush signed just this week.

So if we think about it, for 42 million married working couples, $1,700 they will be able to have this year to spend at home to meet their own needs. In the case of Jose and Magdalena Castillo, for their children Eduardo and Carolina, that will be extra money for back to school; extra money for making some improvements to their house; maybe even take a family vacation, perhaps for the first time in their lives.

But the bottom line is, as we are working to get this economy moving again, by giving good working people like Jose and Magdalena Castillo what is really their money by eliminating an unfairness in the Tax Code this year, that is extra money that is going to be spent in Joliet, Illinois, in the district that I represent. Like 42 million other married working couples, that extra money they are going to spend in their home towns is going to help create jobs. When they go to the local store and they spend some money to improve their home or they make an improvement to their car or they do some home improvements, that creates jobs for their neighbors and their friends.

That is what this was all about. The most important thing we can be doing today is revitalizing this economy here at home; and by eliminating the marriage tax penalty this year, thanks to this Republican majority in the Congress and our good President down at the White House, President George W. Bush, we eliminate the marriage tax penalty this year for couples like Jose and Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois.

CHILD CREDIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Illinois, I, too, have families that I represent. The gentleman spoke about a family who got a tax credit. I would like to talk about Renita Jackson-Keys, who works as a cook for the Chicago public schools. She earned $14,144 in 2002, raising four children from the ages of 18, 15, 12, and 4, separated from her husband, but not divorced yet. She receives no child support.

If the child tax credit provision expansion had included families like hers, she would have received an increase of about $182, but she was not a priority. Renita said she could have used a $182 increase to help pay for her $540 monthly mortgage.

In the final hour, the demand for a large dividend tax and more corporate welfare pushed away the child credit from low-income workers like Renita and her children.

Renita does not just work as a way to pass the time of her day while she waits for her dividend check; she works because that is a value that we hold up in America. Her four children see her go to work every day. Work defines who we are as Americans.

I worked in a White House that doubled the size of the earned income tax credit, which was first passed by Ronald Reagan in 1986. In 1997, in the balanced budget amendment, we balanced the budget, cut taxes for working people and corporations and also in the capital gains area, we provided a $50 per child tax credit, and provided 10 million children health care, whose parents worked full time and did not have health care.

We did it while balancing our budget, and we did it because those were our values, and they were the right values. They speak to who we are as Americans, trying to raise our children to know right from wrong, with the right set of values.

Now we have a tax cut that takes the value of respecting families, respecting hard work, and turns it upside down and inverts it. Somehow, nobody ever seems to complain about a corporation that does not pay taxes. Yet, all of a sudden, there are some who claim the reason we did not include these children of working parents is because they do not pay taxes. Nobody seems to complain when corporations do not pay taxes.

First of all, they do pay taxes. As a percentage of income, one of the largest pieces of their income is drawn from taxes for paying Social Security and Medicare. So they do pay taxes. They pay more taxes, in fact, than the corporations that are sitting in Bermuda pay.

There is a sense about this: we did not just come here to be a vote, we came here to be a voice for those values. We have turned those values backwards. What is it about those corporations and these wealthy individuals that they somehow got more protection than these children of working parents?

President Kennedy said, to govern is to choose. I think people the other week we were here made the wrong choice. Now Republicans are saying they did not know what was in the bill, that the child credit does not help working Americans. The Vice President was in the room. He has been talked about as the enforcer, about the man who was actually in the room, va-boom, va-boom. Corporations got taken care of, but a boom landed on the heads of our children. Somehow SUVs got covered for a tax credit.

We have a depreciation deduction for investments in equipment and facilities. Yet through that depreciation, we have not found the time to appreciate our children. These 12 million children are Americans, too. Their parents, their mother or their father or both, are hardworking. They deserve the same type of respect that we have given to offshore companies, the same type of respect and appreciation we

have given to equipment and machinery, because they, too, represent our future.

I did not support this last tax cut, and I did not support the tax cut of 2001. I have supported tax cuts in 1993 and 1997 when we balanced the budget. We did not make it an either/or choice.

We can do right by our children; and in fact, when we balanced the budget, cut taxes for working families and middle-class families, and helped them go to college and pay for college, and gave health care to the uninsured children of working parents, we saw a decrease in our rolls of poverty. We saw a decrease in our welfare rolls.

Those are our values that have been enshrined in this country. When we speak to those common set of values that define who we are, we can do right by this country, right by our children, and have those parents dream the American Dream for their children. We should not turn our backs.

What happened here the other day is a shame. People now are pointing fingers. Rather than having pointed fingers, if they had the common decency to think of the children of America, of American families who also, like other families who will get that tax credit, these children deserve the tax credit. They deserve to be held up with the same type of respect that we have held up for corporations that needed to deduct for SUVs, corporations like Enron that needed to be taken care of, corporations that went overseas or deducted for their SUVs.

These children deserve our care and protection. We have not provided them the health care. In fact, we withdrew the money from the States to provide health care for the children of working parents. We do not have a health care plan for the 45 million uninsured. We do not have an agenda for the $300 billion in unfunded assets.

We have a higher education tax credit that will expire in 2005, just at a time college costs are going up at 10 percent annually. We have inflation in health care rising by 20 percent. Yet all we did was provide corporations a way to depreciate their interest or other forms of tax cuts, but we left 12 million children of working parents out.

Those are not the values that my mother raised us to have, and those are not the values that hold us together as Americans. We can do better. We need to do better. We can put our children first and leave not one of them behind. When it comes to compassion, more than millionaires need compassion; our children need our compassion.

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

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

REPUBLICANS' BID TO PRIVATIZE MEDICARE WILL DEGRADE IT

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, Members may have read in this morning's Roll Call about the personal videotape President Bush sent urging Republicans to seize the moment and overhaul Medicare. Even though privatization will increase costs and degrade the quality of coverage that seniors receive, the President unapologetically is promoting Medicare privatization.

Medicare is enduringly popular with most Americans, including Main Street Republicans; but Medicare is a thorn in the side of conservative extremists. They call it Big Government.

For the majority of Americans who value Medicare, the problem is that those same extremists are now in power. They are using tactics familiar to anyone who has followed the history of another public program, Federal Rail Service. For years, conservative ideologues in office have underfunded Amtrak, the passenger rail system. As train service declines, conservatives insist that Amtrak deserves less funding. Even though every nation in the world subsidizes its public transportation, Congress inadequately invests in and dutifully undermines our national rail system.

In their unrelenting 20-year-old effort to privatize Medicare, begun during the salad days of the Reagan administration, the far right has honed the Amtrak strategy to a science: underfund Medicare; make it more inflexible and bureaucratic; cut basic consumer service functions; lure, then coerce, seniors into private insurance; set this popular program up for failure; then blame any failures on the fact that it is a public program.

When Medicare was enacted in 1965, only 22 Republicans in the House and Senate supported it. Bob Dole, Republican Congressman, voted against it. Donald Rumsfeld, a Republican Congressman, voted against creating Medicare. Gerald Ford, a Republican Congressman then, voted against creating Medicare. Senator Strom Thurman, a Republican Senator then, voted against creating Medicare.

Then in 1995, when the GOP majority had its first chance to reform Medicare, Speaker Gingrich, predicting that Medicare would wither on the vine, attempted to cut $270 billion from Medicare to make room, get this, for several hundred billion dollars of tax cuts. Sound familiar?

Then came Mediscare. This GOP campaign, launched in the late 1990s, aimed to convince Americans that Medicare is going broke and the only way to save Medicare is to turn it over to private investors. Medicare, they call it Mediscare, Medicare is no more at risk of going broke than is the Defense Department. They are both funded with public dollars.

Forcing Medicare beneficiaries into private insurance plans will not reduce Federal outlays. Per capita spending on Medicare is lower than that on private health insurance, and has been lower than the supposed ''efficient'' private health service for 30 years. But the push to privatize Medicare has never been grounded in facts; it is an ideological campaign, pure and simple.

Republican leadership simply does not like Medicare. The idea of luring seniors into private health plans grew out of the Medicare+Choice experiment. The +Choice debacle started out innocently enough. The theory was HMOs could operate much more efficiently than traditional Medicare, so they could provide both basic and enhanced benefits for less than the traditional Medicare plan.

It did not work out that way. By selectively enrolling the healthiest seniors, HMOs earned a windfall on the taxpayers' dime. Eventually, that windfall was outstripped by the cost of providing extra benefits. HMOs turned around and asked Congress for more money. The Republican Congress then poured more money into these private managed-care plans, which never covered more than one-sixth of the population, leaving less for the 86 percent of seniors who are enrolled in traditional Medicare.

In other words, Republicans invest more in seniors who agree to join private plans than in six-sevenths of the people in the Medicare plan who stay in traditional Medicare.

President Bush has embraced the Amtrak strategy with even more abandon than his predecessors. Get this: he has proposed establishing a new Medicare prescription drug benefit, but only for seniors who agree to leave traditional Medicare and join private HMO insurance programs. While promoting additional dollars for HMOs, President Bush has taken steps to cut Medicare's already-meager operating funds, to curtail its consumer service functions, and to restrict coverage for medical breakthroughs.

Then Republican leaders in this and the other body dutifully berate Medicare for being inefficient, for being unresponsive, and for being too slow to adapt to 21st century medicine. The Republicans should be ashamed. Medicare has withstood a 30-year Republican effort to dismantle it, but this President is pulling out all the stops. He is preaching Medicare insolvency, he is engaging in Mediscare tactics, he is selling private plans, he is undercutting traditional Medicare, and he is managing traditional Medicare into the ground.

□ 1945

Before the Bush administration privatization train leaves the station, American seniors and those who care about them need to blow the whistle.

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

WHAT INFORMATION LED US INTO IRAQ?

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, not many weeks ago, we sent our sons and daughters into a war where many lost their lives, and in fact, our soldiers are currently under threat in Iraq, and just last week, others were killed.

There is a remaining question in the minds of many Americans as to exactly what information led us to make this decision to go into Iraq as we did, and in Sunday's edition of the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, there was a column written by Nicholas Kristof who writes for the New York Times, and the headline for his column is this: ''U.S. Intelligence Officials Incensed Over Manipulating Their Data to Invade Iraq.''

Mr. Kristof begins his column, ''On Thursday, Day 71 of the hunt for Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, once again nothing turned up. Maybe we'll do better on Day 72 or 73 or 74. But we might have better luck searching for something just as alarming: the growing evidence that the administration grossly manipulated intelligence about those weapons of mass destruction in the run-up to the Iraq war.''

Then Mr. Kristof says this, A column that he had written earlier in the month ''drew a torrent of covert communications from indignant spooks who say that administration officials leaned on them to exaggerate the Iraqi threat and deceive the public.''

He continues, '''The American people were manipulated,' bluntly declared one person from the Defense Intelligence Agency who says he was privy to all of the intelligence there on Iraq. These people are fiercely proud of the deepest ethic in the intelligence world—that it should be nonpolitical—and are disgusted at efforts to turn them into propagandists.''

He quotes, '''The al Qaeda connection and nuclear weapons issue were the only two ways that you could link Iraq to an imminent security threat to the U.S.,' said Greg Thielmann, who retired in September after 25 years in the State Department.'' The last four of those years he was in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. He said, ''The administration was grossly distorting the intelligence on both things.

''The outrage among the intelligence professionals is so widespread that they have formed a group, Veterans Intelligence Professionals for Sanity,'' and they wrote President Bush this month to protest what they called ''a policy and intelligence fiasco of monumental proportions.

'''While there have been occasions in the past when intelligence has been deliberately warped for political purposes,' the letter said, 'never before has such warping been used in such a systematic way to mislead our elected representatives into voting to authorize the launching of a war.'''

''Some say,'' according to Mr. Kristof, ''that top Pentagon officials cast about for the most sensational tidbits about Iraq and then used them to bludgeon Secretary of State Colin Powell and seduce the President. The Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, has been generally liked and respected within the agency ranks, but in the past year, particularly in the intelligence directorate, people say that he has kowtowed to Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld and compromised the integrity of his organization.''

Now, Mr. Kristof emphasizes that ''The CIA is examining its record, and that's welcome. But the atmosphere within the intelligence community is so poisonous, and the stakes are so high—for the credibility of America's word and the soundness of information on which we base American foreign policy—that an outside examination is essential.''

Mr. Kristof concludes his column by saying, ''Congress must provide greater oversight, and President Bush should invite Brent Scowcroft, the head of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board and a man trusted by all sides, to lead an inquiry'' in a public report so that we can restore confidence in America's intelligence agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue. The American people are paying attention, and the President needs to provide us with some answers.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

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. Mr. Speaker, politics in the making of public policy is about choices. Every day we are called upon to make a choice, but a horrible choice was made by the Republican majority when they wrote the most recent tax bill, a horrible choice that works against millions of families and the children in those families as the Republicans decided that they would not allow those families, families making between $10,500 a year and $26,000 a year, they would not allow them to have the increase in the child tax credit. A $400 a year increase to offset the cost of raising children, that this Congress made a decision about over many years, was proper to do with families to help hold families together, to allow some people to stay home with their children if they chose to do so, the purpose of that credit.

Rather than spend the $3 billion on those individuals, they chose to spend it on people making over $1 million a year. People making over $1 million a year will now get $93,000 a year in a tax cut. If we had chosen to take care of those 12 million children who will not get the tax cut because their families earn less than $26,000 a year, those same millionaires would have gotten a tax cut of $88,000.

The Republicans made a choice. They chose America's millionaires over America's children. Somehow they decided that the children in upper-income families and middle-class families are more important than those families who are working their tails off going to work every day, all year long and still coming home earning between $10,000 and $26,000. They made a decision that they were going to support the Bush-Cheney class in America over the working class in America. They made a decision that they were going to support millionaires over the children of America.

They said when they were caught at these shenanigans over the last few days, when the press discovered what was in the legislation, they said, well, we designed it only for those people who are paying income tax; they are the only ones who should benefit from that. It is rather interesting because they decided they were also going to give the tax benefits of this bill to a number of corporations who pay no income taxes, corporations that have fled America, changed their corporate citizenship for the sole purposes of not paying taxes, and yet we would give them additional tax breaks under this bill.

They wanted to say that they wanted to end the double taxation on dividends and that corporations that paid taxes could get a deduction for dividends. By the time the bill was done, corporations that have paid no taxes will get a deduction for dividends, but if someone were a poor family, if they were a poor family and they are working every day and they are making between $10,000 and $26,000 a year and they have children, they are not going to get the increase in that deduction. But these people do pay taxes.

The Republicans have it all wrong. They have it all wrong in fairness. They have it all wrong in greed. They have it all wrong in the value of our children and our families in this Nation. This is an incredibly harmful policy to those families who are struggling in and around these wages.

The Republicans will not increase the minimum wage to help them support their families. They will not give them the child tax credit to help them support their families. They will not increase the Earned Income Tax credit to help them support their families. Poor people just are not entitled to this. What they get to make is they get to make an increased sacrifice on behalf of the rich.

Somebody once said, one would think the Republicans think that the rich have too little money and the poor have too much. It is an incredible policy. The Republicans rail against class

warfare, and they declared war on the very survival of these families who are working at the margins. We see them every day. These are people who work hard in difficult jobs, in jobs that most people do not want. They get up and they ride transit, and they go to work and they work and they work and they come home, and at the end of the year they continue to be poor.

Past Congresses gave them the child tax credit, and this year when we decided we would give an increase in the child tax credit, we did not decide. The Republicans decided in the back rooms, they decided they would declare their own private war, their own private class warfare on these individuals. They decided to do it on the last night, in the back room, with the lights turned out and with Vice President CHENEY casting the deciding vote, who now declares he is ignorant on this. Then how did he vote for it? How did he vote for it?

Class warfare, the most mean-spirited, the most greedy action of class warfare we have seen was just committed by the Republican Party in the tax bill against struggling, working, lower-income families in this country.

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

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

RESTRICTION OF CIVIC PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEDIA

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission today struck a very hard and damaging blow against democracy. They did so in a very close four to three ruling that will allow media corporations to own more and more of the public information distribution system that we all rely upon for the information upon which we base our civic decisions, the information upon which we base our votes for Members of Congress and for other offices all across the country.

What is happening here? Why is it that the Republicans in the Federal Communications Commission are voting to restrict the voice of the American people while the Democrats are opposed to it? This is an issue that has been going on in this country now for almost three decades.

In 1987, the Federal Communications Commission of Ronald Reagan stripped the fairness doctrine or the equal access clause from the FCC rules. The fairness doctrine was a simple provision that was placed in the FCC rules early on in the 1930s. It stipulates that if someone who owns a broadcast station, then a radio station, but now radio or television, has a political opinion and they express it editorially they have to provide for an alternative opinion by others in that community who may feel differently. That was stricken in 1987.

In 1996, the Telecommunications Act was passed, fashioned by the Republican majority in this House, which gave rise to the commission decision today to restrict civic public access to the media and allow it to be controlled by an increasingly smaller number of people, a handful of people.

This is damaging and dangerous to every democratic principle. It is damaging and dangerous to the future of this democratic republic.

□ 2000

Countries and governments such as ours, free countries, rely upon the open, free exchange of information. If you have a handful of people controlling the way information is distributed, you are not going to have a free and open exchange. That is dangerous to our country.

What did the ruling do today? Under the new rules, a national television network may now acquire dozens of local broadcast stations and control up to 90 percent of the national television market. A single corporation may now acquire, in one city, up to three television stations, eight radio stations, the cable television system, numerous cable television stations, and the daily newspaper as well. No diversity. No contrary opinion. One voice speaking to the public in community after community after community across this country.

When the Federal Communications Commission was established by this Congress, it was established in order to require that there be diversity and that the American people have access to the airwaves, which they own. The airwaves are owned by all the American people; they are not owned by one corporation or several corporations. Those corporations only lease them for periods of time. We need to return to a system where the American people have access to the means of communication in our Nation.

If we are going to preserve this democratic Republic, if we are going to save the essence of American democracy, we are going to have to have the opportunity to discuss different opinions on important political social issues, whether they are foreign or domestic, in the open so that everybody has a chance to have their voice heard. Not just the elite, not just the big corporations, not just the people with all the money and the power.

What is going on here? Why is there this connection and relationship between the Republican Party establishment here in Washington and the media corporations across the country? Republicans out there do not want to see this happen, groups as diverse as the National Consumer Network, the National Rifle Association, the Catholic Bishops, and a host of others have come out against this recent Federal Communication decision. The people of this country, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, are opposed to it; but the Republican establishment here in Washington is creating a situation where people do not have access to their own airwaves, do not have access to their own media.

We are introducing legislation that is going to put a stop to this and reverse what has been going on now since at least 1987; and the sooner that legislation is passed, the sooner the American democracy will be saved.

FCC'S VOTE ON MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). 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 also to express my strong opposition to the recent vote that was taken today by the FCC. The three-two vote by the commission will allow for the concentration of media ownership in the hands of the very few and privileged and will reduce the diversity of viewpoints. This does not sound too American to me.

The decades-old rules that will be altered under today's vote were intended to provide for multiple media owners and voices in our market. Today's vote that was taken will reduce the assortment of voices and opinions that are essential to our healthy democracy. Allowing one company in a city to control the most popular newspaper and TV station will give the company excessive control over the local news and the information that the public sees and hears. It would also reduce the diversity of cultural and political disclosure in our communities.

Studies that I have seen indicate that, under these rules, mergers will be allowed in 140 local concentrated markets. In as many as 100 of these local markets, representing nearly half of the national population, there will probably be one dominant newspaper. A merger between a dominant newspaper and a large TV station would create a local news giant that would threaten alternative views and news.

Today's decision will have a detrimental impact on minority communities, including the Nation's fast-growing Latino population, the Spanish-language population. It will dramatically reduce competition in Spanish-language media and opportunities for Latino media ownership. Dominance in the Spanish-language media by one corporation can have the same negative effects for many Latinos as the dominance of English-language media can have for the general population.

Today's ruling by the FCC means less diverse programming, news sources, and smaller points of view. We need to look only at the radio industry to see the ill effects that today's vote will have on the diversity in media.

Since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, the overall number of radio station owners has decreased by at least 30 percent. And according to a study by the Department of Commerce, in the year 2000 minorities owned 248 AM stations and 178 FM stations. That represented 4 percent of the country's 10,577 commercial AM and FM stations.

I am especially disappointed that the public, the very people who own the airwaves, were not offered the time to express their concerns about this very important issue. How undemocratic of the FCC to keep the public in the dark on this very critical matter and not to afford the American people of this country, whom we represent, the opportunity to comment directly on the impact that the new specific policies will have on competition, localism, access to multiple sources of information, and minority participation.

Unfortunately, the amount of network coverage on this important issue has been minimal. We could not even get people from the media to show up to cover a press conference that we had last week to disclose what was happening with this vote that was taking place today. The public is largely unaware of the possible impact these changes will have on their lives; and it is discouraging, especially when millions of Americans have reacted in recent days with amazement at the FCC's plans. The FCC should have listened to the public, not the megacorporations.

Liberals and conservatives alike, consumer groups, labor groups, the National Rifle Association and others, have rallied around the cause and urged the FCC to allow more time for the public to comment on this critical matter.

When it comes down to it, today's vote was just another example of the Bush administration's catering to corporate greed. It is one more example of corporate welfare. It is a Bush-backed gift to the major corporations and their bank accounts. At the expense of whom? The public.

The FCC was created to serve the public interest and to ensure diverse voices in it. The commission failed on both accounts today. I urge this Chamber to consider legislation to reverse the commission's ruling and to allow the public greater opportunity to learn about this critical issue and weigh in with their important thoughts.

ADMINISTRATION WILL NOT TELL THE TRUTH

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when you have been away from this House for a week, sometimes it is hard to tell what subject you ought to talk about first, because this administration is the gang that cannot shoot straight. They cannot tell anybody the truth about anything.

Whether it is weapons of mass destruction, where we have heard every story in the whole world, yet everywhere you look people do not believe the President of the United States, they do not believe our Secretary of War or anybody else when they talk about those weapons of mass destruction. Or we could talk about Medicare, or we could talk about the tax bill.

My colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), got up here and told the game that was run on the people in this House when they slammed the bill through here, this rubber stamp Congress. They did it in one 2-hour period. Bang, they passed out $350 billion, but could not find $3.5 billion to cover the kids of the working poor in this country. They could give money to millionaires, $93,000; but they could not give even $400 to the children of the working people of this country.

Now, there is an overarching question here and that is this whole question of whether you can solve this country's problems by tax cuts. You know, it takes the British. You have to read the British newspapers to find out what is going on in this country. If you read the Financial Times of London, they tell us that our President hid something from us when we were passing this bill. He hid from us a report done by his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. O'Neill. Remember him? He was the guy before the one we have now. The one now is Snow, so I guess we will get Snow jobs. But the guy before was O'Neill.

Mr. O'Neill said to his staff, suppose the government could get its hands on all the revenue it could expect to collect in the future but had to use it today to pay off future expenditures, including debt service. Would the present value of the future revenues cover the present value of the future expenditures? Very simple question. He asked a guy from the Federal Reserve and his own assistant secretary to sit down and do this report. They did the report, and they came back with some pretty ugly facts. This thing was supposed to go into the budget to talk about what the future of this country was about, about those kids that cannot even get $400 this year. This was a report that was supposed to go in about the future.

Their answer was, no, we cannot pay for it with the money that we need. We will be $44 trillion in debt; $44 trillion in debt because of what they are doing right now. Now, that is a number that, if you are sitting at home and you are thinking to yourself, my God, how much is $44 trillion, well, think of it this way: imagine that everyone in this country worked for 4 years, every single day went to work for 4 years, everybody in the country, and handed over every penny to cover this $44 trillion deficit. That is what it would take. Every man, woman and child. Even those little kids that they could not find $400 for now.

They are creating a problem out there that when their fathers and their mothers come to Medicare and come to Social Security, they will say, well, gee, we would like to help you out, but it is all gone. They are creating it right here in front of us. And it is bad enough, I mean, people voted, we did talk a little bit about it out here, people talked about it; but what is awful about this is that they knew these figures and they kept them from us.

Just like the weapons of mass destruction. There is a kind of a pattern, you see, in this administration. Feed the people the facts you want them to know, keep snapping your fingers so they will look up here, and meanwhile take away from them down here. They did it with weapons of mass destruction. We were assured. Our President said he has them. Our Secretary of State said he has them. He went to the United Nations and put up charts and graphs and all kinds of pictures. We have them, he said. The Secretary of War, Mr. Rumsfeld, he said the same thing. One after another these guys went down the line telling us what they knew was not true.

The Voice of America carried a very interesting interview with a man who came out of the Iraq situation. He was in the United States, and he said there were no weapons of mass destruction after 1991. This administration will not tell you the truth, but you are in for one awful problem dealing with $44 trillion all of a sudden.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND RANSOM HOWARD

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in great sadness to honor my friend, Reverend Ransom Howard, the pastor for almost 4½ decades of First Sixth Street Baptist Church in Port Arthur, Texas. Reverend Ransom Howard died on Thursday, May 29.

Reverend Howard was a remarkable man who was committed to his community, to his country, and, above all, to his family. Reverend Howard was a long-time civic and community leader. He was always a man who believed in equality and justice. He fought hard for civil rights when it was not an easy thing to do, although it is never an easy thing to do. His impact on the community could be felt everywhere, but you could certainly say he was a positive force for all of southeast Texas.

Rev, as we called him, was instrumental in the integration of the Port Arthur public schools and city businesses. He served as youth director for the YMCA, was a past president of the NAACP, and president of the Concerned Citizens of the Port Arthur Association. He was of the utmost character, and his attributes of selflessness

and commitment to others are rare gifts that this Nation was lucky to have.

It was interesting that one of the times I saw him, probably 25, maybe 30 years ago, I saw him in coveralls working around a building that was being demolished. He was cleaning bricks and had several people working with him.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, what I found was interesting, that he believed that godly men and women should serve their communities and should be role models for others within their communities, and he did that. Regardless of what the job might be, he was willing to work the dirtiest, the hardest, perhaps the lowest of jobs to encourage someone else to be a better person within his community.

He was a man who served his community with a great deal of pride and with a great deal of devotion. He was my friend. Interestingly, also, Reverend Howard would not want us to mourn today, so I ask Members to celebrate his life, that we should come together as Americans and continue to work toward the principles by which he lived which are so very important to each and every one of us and to our freedoms.

It is important that current and future generations understand the history of African Americans, of their struggle for freedom and the part that people like Martin Luther King, Jr., like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and, yes, like Reverend Ransom Howard played, the awesome part that they played.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Ransom Howard was part of the fiber of Southeast Texas and, with his passing, a great loss will be felt in the spirit and the heart of our community. It has been said about some people, he knew his flock and his flock knew him; and in this case, they dearly loved him and will truly miss this great gentleman.

FCC VOTE ON MEDIA CROSS-OWNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my utmost frustration and disappointment with the Federal Communication Commission's vote today to relax media cross-ownership rules. I am frustrated by the process through which the Republican-controlled commission sought to manipulate its rulemaking by limiting public input and discussion. I am frustrated that the majority on the commission chose to ignore the overwhelming public opposition to the proposed rules, and I am disappointed that these commissioners failed to learn from existing evidence, especially in the area of radio ownership, the dangerous impacts of unfettered media consolidation.

By voting to radically deregulate media ownership, this administration has created the most unimaginable atmosphere for further national and local concentration of media outlets, leading to the erosion of localism, diversity and competition so essential to a healthy democracy. I fear that as the media conglomerates move forward with the rulings and gobble up more and more independent outlets, not only will the consumers suffer from the lack of diverse voices on our airwaves, but the core values of what it means to live in a free and open society will be greatly demolished.

Many of my colleagues in both Chambers of Congress have expressed a great deal of skepticism toward today's FCC rule. Close to 150 Members of this House, including the Congressional Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus and Asian and Pacific American Caucus have asked the FCC to delay its decision. That came in addition to nearly 750,000 e-mails, letters and phone calls from the public to the FCC expressing their opposition to the current rulemaking process and the rule. All of them, including a letter I sent on behalf of 28 other Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, have fallen on deaf ears.

Over the entire course of the rulemaking process, FCC Chairman Powell has held only two public hearings while meeting 71 times, I repeat, 71 times, with top broadcasters behind closed doors. How can we say that the FCC is following Congressional statutory guidance to serve the public's interest? How is the FCC performing its special duty as mandated by the Supreme Court to protect an uninhibited marketplace of ideas?

Chairman Powell says that the rule changes will help preserve free, over-the-air television, but free, over-the-air television is alive and well. Advertising revenues for free, over-the-air television were up 15 percent last year. However, it is not the job of the FCC to make sure that every network in this country makes a lot of money. It is the job of the FCC to make sure that Americans get a variety and diversity of viewpoints.

The bottom line is that as the rule changes lead to greater media consolidation, small and independent companies will be drowned out. Some critics have called it ''the Wal-Mart effect,'' ''the emergence of a 21st century Citizen Kane,'' as noted by Commissioner Adelstein. The big five media companies, Disney, Viacom, AOL-Time Warner, News Corp. and General Electric Company will end up squeezing out the small companies. It is already happening. The new rules will only speed up the process.

Ted Turner is right in saying that when small businesses get hurt, big ideas get lost. When the next Watergate happens, Americans need to know that a truly independent third estate will be up to the task of conducting a free and independent investigation. Minorities are deeply suspicious of the rule changes. There is ample precedent for their feelings since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act which resulted in a frenzy of media consolidation, radio station ownership has decreased by 30 percent. Many of the stations gobbled up were minority owned.

It was a bad decision at the FCC today.

Minority broadcasters believe that media consolidation has all but eliminated opportunities they need to expand their media companies. They can't expand or compete with the big players and are often left with one alternative: To sell.

It would have been prudent for the FCC to allow more time for public hearings as well as congressional input. We have been presented with a backroom deal that will dramatically change the structure of our media marketplace, significantly impact media diversity, and inhibit the free flow of information.

Today's adoption of media ownership rules represent a giant step backward for consumers, and as members of Congress we have a responsibility to exercise our legislative oversight role. As Commissioner Copps said today, this is only the beginning. I strongly urge my colleagues and the public to take up this important debate.

EXORBITANT PHARMACEUTICAL PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and myself are going to be talking this hour about the problems that we have in this country with exorbitant pharmaceutical prices.

We all believe in the free enterprise system, and we believe that private industry ought to make a profit, but we also believe the American people ought to get the best bang for their buck. Unfortunately, the pharmaceutical industry has been taking advantage of Americans for a long, long time, and it is just now becoming evident.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) made this chart up originally, and this chart, I know it is difficult for my colleagues to see, but it shows the disparity between pharmaceutical products purchased in the United States and those purchased in Canada. In some cases, products, pharmaceutical products manufactured here in the United States that are sold in other parts of the world, sell for one-tenth the price that they sell for here in the United States; and yet the American people, when they try to buy those products abroad through the

Internet, are being criticized for that, and the Food and Drug Administration, hiding behind the veil of protecting the public from products that might harm them, are saying that they are not going to allow these Internet sites to sell these products. The very same products sold here in the United States, they are not allowing them to be purchased from Canada or other countries so the American consumer can save as much as 50 percent of their pharmaceutical costs.

I have a constituent who was paying $1,300 a month or $1,200 a month for pharmaceutical products, and he bought the very same products on the Internet from Canada for less than half that amount, so he was saving $7,000 a year by purchasing them from Canada. And now the FDA, along with the pharmaceutical companies, are trying to stop him from doing that.

We have over a million people in this country, probably closer to 2 million, who are buying their pharmaceutical products from Canada over the Internet. But the pharmaceutical companies and the FDA are trying to stop the American people from saving money and getting the products at a fair market price.

Today, in the New York Times there is an article, and I do not quote from the New York Times very often, but there is an article talking about the exorbitant amount of money that the pharmaceutical industry is going to be spending over the next year to influence Congress, State legislators, government agencies and so forth to keep the prices of pharmaceutical products very high in the United States and prohibit the importation or reimportation of their products from other countries where they are selling them much cheaper.

In 1990, PhRMA spent $2.3 million in that cycle here in Washington and around the country. In 1992, it more than doubled to $4.9 million. In 1994, it went to $5.2 million; and in 1996 it went to $9.2 million. In the year 2000, it jumped up to almost $20 million, and it was over $20 million in the year 2002.

Let me read what was in the New York Times today. ''Lobbyists for the drug industry are stepping up spending to influence Congress, the States and even foreign governments as the debate intensifies over how to provide prescription drugs benefits to the elderly, industry executives say.''

The article goes on to say, ''The documents show that the trade association, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, known as PhRMA, will spend at least $150 million this year. That represents an increase of their total budget of 23 percent over last year which was $121.7 million. Directors of the trade association approved the new budget, together with an increase in membership dues, to pay for an expanded lobbying campaign at a meeting last week. They have over 600 lobbyists in Washington, D.C.''

Here is what they say: ''Unless we achieve enactment this year of market-based Medicare drug coverage for seniors, the industry's vulnerability will increase in the remainder of 2003 and in the 2004 election year,'' and it will demonize the industry if they do not get this done.

Now, we are for market-based pricing. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) has said that many, many times. But that should be across the spectrum, not just here in the United States of America. I mean, in Canada if you can buy a product for $70, why should it cost $122 here in the United States right across the border, just a mile apart? And the reason is they are charging an exorbitant amount of money to the Americans, and they are loading the research and development and everything else on the back of American consumers instead of spreading it across the world.

If they are talking about market-based drug coverage for seniors, then the burden should be spread equally across the spectrum, not just here in the United States but across Canada and Europe. If we did that, the price for all Americans would go down dramatically.

The drug trade group plans to spend $1 million for an intellectual echo chamber of economists, a standing network of economists and thought-leaders, to speak against Federal price control regulations through articles and testimony, and to serve as a rapid-response team. A rapid-response team, that sounds like a military action. Well, we want to make sure that we do not have to have price controls.

□ 2030

If we had fair pricing across the spectrum, around the world, then I think the Americans would get a fair price when they buy their products. But unfortunately, the products are a lot lower in other countries, in Europe, in Germany, in France, in Spain, in Canada, in Mexico; much, much less than they are here. Yet they want to keep those prices higher here in the United States so they can keep their profits high.

The trade association and its tactics have become an issue. In debate on the floor of the Senate last summer, Senator DURBIN, Democrat of Illinois, said PhRMA, this lobby has a death grip on Congress. After seeing what I have seen over the past month, month and a half, I am not so sure he is wrong. The influence that the pharmaceutical industry has in the halls of Congress and in the executive branch mystifies me. We are supposed to be sent here to represent the people of this country, to make sure they get a fair shake across the board. Yet the pharmaceutical industry has been loading huge, huge profits on the backs of the American people while making much smaller profits right across the border in Canada by selling their products at a more competitive rate.

If Americans try to buy them up there now, now they are trying to stop them. The day after the pharmaceutical giant GlaxoSmithKline said they were going to pull out of Canadian pharmacies that were selling across the border through the Internet, the FDA I think the next day or the day after said there may be a concern about the safety of these pharmaceutical products. And so they were marching in lockstep with the pharmaceutical industry to stop Americans from getting these lower-priced pharmaceutical products, the same products they can get here, from Canada.

Dues from the pharmaceutical industry will go to $144 million, an increase of 24 percent or $28.3 million over this year's dues. In its budget for the fiscal year that begins July 1, the pharmaceutical lobby earmarks $72.7 million for advocacy at the Federal level directed mainly at, you guessed it, the Congress of the United States. $72.7 million to lobby us; $4.9 million to lobby the Food and Drug Administration. I do not know if they have to spend that much because I think the FDA is pretty much in their pocket already. And $48.7 million for advocacy at the State level. In addition, the budget sets aside $17.5 million to fight price controls and protect patent rights in foreign countries and in trade negotiations. The PhRMA budget allocates $1 million to change the Canadian health care system and $450,000 to stem the flow of low-priced prescription drugs from online pharmacies in Canada to customers through the Internet here in the United States. I think it is kind of funny. They are going to spend $73 million to lobby Congress and only a million to do it in Canada. I think that is because they feel like it is a lost cause up there.

In a memorandum for the PhRMA board, it says the industry is on the defensive, facing a perfect storm whipped up by several factors, expanding government price controls abroad, resulting in politically unstable crossborder pricing differences; increasing availability of medicines from abroad via Internet sales; State ballot initiatives to make drugs more affordable in the United States; increasing State demands for drug discounts in the Medicaid program; and false perceptions that drug prices are increasing by 20 percent a year. I do not know whether they are going up 20 percent a year, but they are a heck of a lot more here than they are in Mexico, in Canada, in Spain, in Germany, in France and elsewhere.

Let me go into this breakdown a little bit further, and then I will yield to my colleagues. At least $2 million, and perhaps $2.5 million, in payments to research and policy organizations to build intellectual capital and generate a higher volume of messages from credible sources sympathetic to the industry. They are going to hire a bunch of people to be their mouthpieces that are supposedly credible to convince us that we ought to let the American people be saddled with these huge prices while

these same products can be sold elsewhere for a lot less.

$9.4 million for public relations, including $1 million for inside-the-Beltway advertising. $555,000 for placement of op-eds. They are going to buy the op-ed pieces in the newspapers? $555,000 for placement of op-eds and articles by third parties. They are going to hire people to put these articles in and pay them $555,000. I suppose if I wanted to, I could write an op-ed on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry, and they would pay me to do it.

$600,000 for polling; $1.3 million for local publicity in 15 States. I suppose that is congressional districts. For instance, in my district this last week, PhRMA went into Kokomo, Indiana, and talked to one of the writers; and they went to the Louisville Courier Journal, on both ends of my congressional district, to try to make the case that I did not know what I was talking about and that I was hurting the people of this country by trying to make sure they get a fair shake on these pharmaceutical prices, and they did that to try to discredit me and hurt me in my congressional district. I have to tell you something, PhRMA PR people, you are making a big mistake. A big mistake.

The Federal affairs staff at PhRMA has quadrupled since 1999. The organization plans to spend $5 million for outside lobbyists at the Federal level. In their campaign contributions, drug companies have favored Republican candidates, but PhRMA has retained a diverse group of lobbyists to ensure access to Democrats as well. I am sure of that. I will not go into who some of their lobbyists are, but my colleagues in the House know that we have a lot of our former colleagues out there that are on the payroll of the pharmaceutical companies. Big, big bucks.

The State government affairs division of PhRMA will spend $3.1 million to retain more than 60 lobbyists in 50 States. The number of State legislative proposals dealing with prescription drugs has doubled since 1999. The drug industry says many of these bills are seriously negative, have a high probability of enactment, and require major attention on our part. They want to get it stopped.

They hire 600 lobbyists here in Washington, D.C. That is more lobbyists than we have in Members of the House and the Senate. That is overkill. They only need one for each one of us. What are they going to do with the other 65? I guess they will all go to lunch, have a triple martini lunch. I hope PhRMA is watching this. I really do.

PhRMA said it would spend $12.3 million to develop coalitions and strategic alliances with doctors, patients, universities, and influential members of minority groups. The organization has earmarked several million dollars to foster ties with groups like the National Black Caucus of State Legislators; the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators; and the National Medical Association, which represents the interests of African American doctors. The budget includes $500,000 for efforts to educate and activate Hispanic-Latino organizations at a State and Federal level.

In other words, my colleagues, and I think my colleagues who are here on the floor tonight already know this, they are pulling out all the stops to keep their profits very high here in the United States, to saddle the American people with huge prices while they are selling these pharmaceutical products for a lot lower elsewhere, and they are going to lobby us to death to try to make sure those profits remain high.

I am a free enterprise advocate. I believe in keeping our nose out of the private sector as much as possible; but when an industry starts beating American taxpayers to death and American consumers to death with exorbitantly high prices while at the same time they are selling these same products around the world for less and still making a profit and then they say, we cannot buy them abroad and they threaten the people who sell them to us from abroad with closing them down, then that is wrong. That is bullyism and that is something that cannot be tolerated.

The free enterprise system, God bless it, should not tolerate that kind of activity from any industry. I will say to the pharmaceutical industry right now and I believe the pharmaceutical products have given us the highest quality of health care in the history of mankind, and God bless you for that; but you have gone too far when you start raping the American people; and that is what is going on with these prices right now and it ain't going to work.

The Internet is here to stay. If you push in on one side of the balloon, it is going to pop out someplace else and you better get with the program. Make a profit, but make sure it is fair for everybody. Make sure it is fair for everybody. If you do that, I will be one of your biggest supporters as I have been in the past, and I am sure my colleagues will as well.

We have the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) here, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON). Let me get this straight here. I want to make sure that everybody that is paying attention in their office understands this. Congressman ALLEN is a Democrat. I am a Republican. Congressman SANDERS is an Independent. I am a Republican. Congressman GUTKNECHT, God bless him, is a Republican. I am a Republican. I like you a lot. And Congresswoman WATSON is a Democrat from California. But we all see eye to eye on this. This is not a partisan issue. That is why I think the pharmaceutical industry spending hundreds of millions of dollars ain't going to win this battle because they cannot beat us when we are united.

With that, let me yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his enormous courage and directness and integrity in bringing this issue forward. This is an unusual event tonight, to have Democrats, Republicans, and our Independent from Vermont all on the floor during a Special Order talking about the same subject and agreeing with each other. I had the pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for the last 6 years on the Committee on Government Reform of which he was chairman. I am very pleased to be here tonight.

Over the last week, I rode part of the way on a bus trip, on a bus in Maine chartered by Maine seniors to go up to Canada, we are close as you know, to go up to Canada to buy their prescription drugs. They go to Calais in Maine and get a prescription and then go over the border and find enormous savings. The 18 or 20 people on that bus must have saved thousands of dollars as others have before. People in Maine generally now, many of them, are ordering prescription drugs over the Internet from Canada because that is the only way they can both eat and have their prescription medications. It is a scandal what is happening in this country right now. The richest, most powerful country in the world finds that those people who do not have prescription drug coverage in this country are paying the highest prices in the world.

Several years ago we started a series of studies to find out just how great the difference is. Those studies showed basically that for drugs that on average cost, let us say $100 a month here in the United States, the cost in other industrialized countries is around $61 or $62. In other words, there is about a 40 percent difference on average for the drugs that are taken most frequently by people on Medicare, our seniors and the disabled.

That is why I introduced a bill that basically would cap the price that the industry could charge in this country to what we call the average foreign price, that is, the average price at which the same drug is sold in Canada, in Japan, Britain, France, Germany and Italy, the other countries of the G–7.

But however we go at this issue, and Mr. GUTKNECHT, of course, from Minnesota has been one of the leads with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on the whole issue of reimportation, however we go at this issue, we have to recognize that the people without insurance and the people on Medicare pay the highest prices in the world. I happen to have a health insurance plan for Federal employees in the State of Maine through Anthem Blue Cross. I know that the premium that I pay is lower than it would otherwise be because Anthem Blue Cross negotiates with the pharmaceutical industry to reduce the price of the drugs

that are purchased for beneficiaries. But if you are on Medicare in this country, if you are on the biggest health care plan in the entire country, you cannot get any discount like that.

In Maine, we took steps to try to rectify that problem. We passed a program in the year 2000 called Maine Rx. Just a few days ago, on May 19, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against PhRMA. The Supreme Court ruled that you could not stop the Maine Rx program before it was even implemented. What it did was essentially to say that the State of Maine will enter into negotiations with the pharmaceutical industry to reduce prices on their drugs sold to anyone who does not have prescription drug insurance in Maine. That is certainly all those on Medicare who do not have prescription drug insurance and all of the uninsured who obviously do not have prescription drug insurance because they do not have health insurance; and the industry would have to reduce their prices to that group, or the State would eventually set up a commission and deal with it directly. But in doing that, the State of Maine is really not doing anything different than we do through the Federal Government for Medicaid, certainly not different than what we do for our veterans, not different than what Kaiser Permanente or Aetna or Cigna or United do for their beneficiaries, negotiate lower prices so their beneficiaries are not paying the highest prices in the world. That is really the scandal.

The gentleman from Indiana mentioned the article in The New York Times the other day. It is an amazing article because the author, Robert Pear, had access to confidential budget documents from PhRMA. I will not go back to everything that the gentleman from Indiana mentioned, but I loved this entry. Here it is, the Canadian health care system where they have lower prices, and just to give you one example, Tamoxifen, a drug to deal with breast cancer, is one-tenth the cost in Canada as it is in the United States.

□ 2045

Here is what PhRMA is planning to do. They have allocated $1 million, according to their documents, to ''change the Canadian health care system.'' Can you believe that? They would like the Canadian system to be like ours, where they can charge whatever they want to the Canadian public and where they wind up spending $150 million a year to lobby Canadian legislators. And they think that is what the American people want as well. It just takes your breath away.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back and thank you for including me in this special order tonight, and I thank you for your courage in standing up for your constituents.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before the gentleman departs, let me just say there are five of us here tonight, and I hope that we will all use our influence to educate the rest of our colleagues who are not as conversant with this problem as we might be. You, being one of the leaders on the Democrat side, I hope you will talk to your colleagues, along with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON.)

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for putting this special order together tonight, and I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for joining us.

As has been mentioned, this is not a matter of right versus left, this is right versus wrong, and it is wrong to force Americans to pay the highest prices in the world.

The gentleman from Maine was talking about Tamoxifen. I am also now the chairman of the Congressional Study Group on Germany, so I was in Germany about a month ago. While we were there, we went to the pharmacy at the Munich Airport and we bought some of the most commonly prescribed drugs. Now, most people know that if you want to get a bargain, you probably do not go to the airport to buy it, so this is probably not the cheapest place in Germany to buy drugs.

Incidentally, compared to what you hear all the time, Germany really does not have price controls in the sense of setting the prices that the pharmacist in Germany can sell the drugs for. What they do allow is for German pharmacists to shop to get the best price. If they can buy their Tamoxifen cheaper in Sweden, they buy it in Sweden. If they can buy it cheaper in Spain, they buy it in Spain. They use market forces to help keep prices down in Germany.

We bought this Tamoxifen. It is 100 tabs of 20 milligrams. I am going to tell the whole story about Tamoxifen. We bought it at the Munich Airport pharmacy for $59.05 American. This same box of drugs here in the United States sells for $360; $60 in Germany, $360 here.

What makes the story even worse about this particular drug is, this was developed with taxpayers' dollars. This was developed essentially by the National Institutes of Health. Almost all of the research and development costs were paid for by the taxpayers.

As the vice chairman of the Committee on Science, here is something we should all be proud of. We in the United States represent less than 6 percent of the world's population, but we represent over 50 percent of the basic research done in the world. This year, this Congress will authorize and spend $29 billion taxpayer dollars on basic research.

In fact, there was a study done, and I want to recommend a book, if you have not seen this book, I hope every one of my colleagues will pick up a copy of this book. The title is ''The Big Fix.'' The subtitle is ''How the Pharmaceutical Industry Rips Off American Consumers.'' It is written by Katharine Greider. What is in this book is compelling, and every American ought to read some of the things that are in here.

You talk about the research. A study was done by the Boston Globe just a few years ago, and they found that of the 35 largest selling drugs in the United States, 33 of them had most of their research and development costs paid for by the taxpayers.

Now, it is one thing to say we have all these research costs, and therefore American consumers have to pay all the freight. But the bottom line is, we subsidize the pharmaceutical industry in three separate ways.

First of all, in that $29 billion we will spend this year in basic research through the NIH, the National Science Foundation and even DOD; we do an awful lot of basic research in the DOD that ultimately benefits the pharmaceutical industry. We do all of that on that side.

Secondly, we subsidize them in the Tax Code. They get very generous write-offs for the amount of research and the other expenses that they have.

Finally, we subsidize them in the prices we pay.

Let me share with you some of the other prices that we got at the pharmacy at the Munich Airport in Munich, Germany.

Glucophage, a miracle drug. I want to pay homage to the people who helped develop it. Millions and millions of Americans and people around the world are living better quality lives because of Glucophage. So I am not here to beat up on the pharmaceutical industry. They have done a lot of wonderful things.

But how do you justify this difference? This package of Glucophage here in the United States, we checked the price, is $29.95. We bought this one month ago in Munich, Germany, for $5 American.

Let us look at Cipro. We all know a little more about Cipro in the last couple of years because of what happened with the anthrax scare. We bought Cipro in Germany. This is actually made by a German company called Bayer. They also make aspirin. But Bayer makes this drug. We bought Cipro in Germany for $35.12. Here in the United States this same package sells for $55. $20 does not seem like much, but it adds up.

We bought Coumadin. My 86-year-old father takes Coumadin. This package of Coumadin we bought in Germany, we paid about $14 for this drug. Here in the United States, it is about $64. Those numbers just go on and on.

Zocor, very commonly prescribed, we bought it for $41.20. Here in the United States, $89.95.

As Will Rogers said, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. Well, read the newspapers. Read today's Wall Street Journal, the front page, about what the drug companies and PhRMA are doing, not only to make certain

that Americans keep paying the highest prices in the world, but they are literally now saying to sub-Saharan Africa, well, we will subsidize AIDS drugs for you, but we will not let you have access to many other drugs, including insulin.

Right now, you cannot get insulin in Chad at any price. Read the article. In fact, if I have time, I will read one of the paragraphs here, just a few sentences.

They talk about how all of the countries, 148 countries in the world, were ready to come up with a trade agreement, some language, to deal with some of these problems about drugs going across borders. But last December, when all of the other 148 countries in the World Trade Organization had lined up behind a new plan on the trade of medicines, the United States blocked the proposal. As you read, it gets worse, why they blocked it. It was all about the big pharmaceutical companies afraid that they might lose some profits.

This is not a matter of right versus left; this is right versus wrong. The time has come for Congress to stand up and say we are not going to be played the fool any longer. It is time that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. That is not too much to ask. That is not a Republican idea, that is not a Democrat idea; that is an American idea.

We have what is called NAFTA. Many of us believe in free trade. But, it is interesting, we have free trade when it comes to plantains, have free trade when it comes to pork bellies, we have free trade with things called pears. In fact, we import hundreds of thousands of tons of fruits and vegetables every year, hundreds of thousands of tons; and that is regulated by a group called the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration.

Do you know how much inspection they do of all of those fruits and vegetables crossing our borders every year? Almost none. Do you know how many people get sick every year from imported fruits and vegetables? Thousands. In fact, one estimate is, thousands die as a result of eating contaminated foods that have come from other countries, that have food-borne pathogens. The FDA's own study said that 2 percent of all fruits and vegetables that come into the United States are contaminated with food-borne pathogens, including things like salmonella. Salmonella will kill you.

But we have to stop these prescription drugs because our own research says people could get sick and die. Do you know how many people have died? The FDA keeps records of all the people who have taken legal FDA-approved drugs coming in from other countries. It is an easy number to remember. It is a nice round number. It is zero. Zero.

More importantly, we are going to introduce a bill sometime by the end of the week that is going to require the FDA to begin to put counterfeit-proof blister packs in place, whether they come from the United States or wherever they come from.

Once we begin to require this, this whole safety thing just goes out the window, and we begin to realize it is not about safety, it is about profits; it is about making American consumers pay the highest prices in the world.

Let me just close with one other thing, because I say, shame on us. I do not say, shame on the pharmaceutical industry; shame on us. We let this thing happen. But the most shaming thing of all was a study done by the Kaiser Foundation a few years ago. What they found out was 29 percent of seniors say that they have let prescriptions go unfilled because they could not afford them.

Two weeks ago, I spoke to the Community Pharmacists, and I asked them, we had hundreds of pharmacists from around the country here in Washington, and I asked them, has this ever happened to you, where a little old lady comes up, hands you a prescription, and you tell her how much it is going to be, and she drops her head and she says, well, maybe I will be back tomorrow, and she never comes back. And every head in that place shook like this.

It has happened. It happens every day. And I do not say, shame on the pharmaceutical industry as much as I say, shame on us, because we have the power to do something about that.

Twenty-nine percent of prescriptions go unfilled. That is an outrage, and we can do something about it. And the reason is they cannot afford it. They can afford $14 for Coumadin; they cannot afford $64.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague, who has been the leader on this issue for a long time, we all appreciate your hard work. And I understand your saying, shame on us. But the Food and Drug Administration, which we pay for with taxpayers' dollars, should not be protecting the pharmaceutical industry and making sure that these exorbitant profits are made year in and year out, and then coming to the rescue of the pharmaceutical industry when they are trying to stop the reimportation of pharmaceutical products from Canada by saying that there is a safety issue.

It is unconscionable what they are doing over there, and we need to keep the heat on them. So maybe not, shame on the pharmaceutical industry by itself, but shame on them and the FDA and us for not being more responsive.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could have one additional minute, I do want to mention to all my colleagues, we have been working for a year trying to come up with a bill that would make sense. We think we have it. It is called the Pharmaceutical Affordability Act of 2003. Now, some may not like the acronym; it works out to PHARMAA. But the bottom line is, we think we have come up with language which really deals with the issues that people have raised, ultimately safety. I hope that Members will join me in cosponsoring that bill. Hopefully, if we put enough pressure on all of the people here in this body, we will get a vote on it this year. If we do, it will pass.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that needs to be dealt with along with the prescription drugs benefits we are going to talk about. I do not want to pass a prescription drug benefit that is going to guarantee the taxpayer paying for these huge profits being realized by the pharmaceutical industry.

Let me go to my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, and then go to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON). The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has been working on this for a long time as well.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I am at a disadvantage. After hearing you and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and I am sure the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) soon after, there is not much that I can add to what you have said.

Let me reiterate a point that you made. I hope the viewers appreciate this.

You are a Republican, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is a Democrat, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is a Republican, I am independent, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is a Democrat. Two Democrats, two Republicans and an Independent. And there are a lot more of us who are not here tonight.

What that should tell the American people is that there is widespread anger, frustration and disgust with what the pharmaceutical industry is doing to the people of this country.

Three years ago, I became the first Member of Congress to take a group of American citizens over the Canadian border in order to buy medicine. We went to Montreal. The reason that we did that is, I wanted not only to help hard-pressed Vermonters, mostly women, who are having a very difficult time paying for their prescription drugs, but I wanted to help show the country the absurdity of the situation, where the same exact medicine manufactured by the same exact company is sold in Canada for a fraction of the price that it is sold in the United States.

□ 2100

As we have discussed, it is not just Canada. It is Europe; it is Mexico. The American people pay, by far, the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. In that trip to Canada, one of the moments that I will not forget is that we had women with us who were struggling with breast cancer, something I know the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) has a personal interest in. Women fighting for their lives were able to pick up Tamoxifen, a

widely prescribed breast cancer drug, for one-tenth of the price that is being charged in the United States of America. Of course, it is not just Tamoxifen; it is drug after drug after drug sold for a fraction of the price.

I think the gentleman said it well, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) made the point, too, and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), it seems to me we are looking at two separate things.

On the one hand, we are seeing researchers who are making enormous breakthroughs; and the result of that is that we are saving lives, we are easing pain, we are prolonging life. That is the good news. All of us here have a great deal of respect for those researchers in the drug companies and in the United States Government, in universities, foundations who are doing that work. I thank them so much for what they are doing.

But then there is another side of the pharmaceutical industry. Those are the people who sit at the heads of these corporations who are concerned about one thing alone, that is, making as much money as they possibly can. They do not lose a night's sleep if elderly people die because they cannot afford the medicine they need or if their health deteriorates.

Of the many outrages that we have talked about here, the huge amount, hundreds of millions of dollars, that floods Washington or State capitals in order to maintain high prices, there is another outrage that I do not think has been mentioned tonight. While elderly people cannot afford the high price of medicine, the CEOs and the top dogs of these companies receive huge compensation packages.

In 2001, C.A. Heimbold, Jr., former chairman and CEO of Bristol-Meyers-Squibb, ended up his compensation with $74,890,000. Not bad; but that is not all. Mr. Heimbold also received stock options that same year amounting to over $76 million. One year, one man, $150 million. Then they tell us they just cannot lower the cost of medicine so that seniors in Vermont or Indiana can ease their pain or protect their lives.

Year after year while we continue to pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, year after year the pharmaceutical industry is the most profitable industry in the country. More profitable than media, more profitable than banks. The pharmaceutical industry leads the list.

The issue here, and the gentleman has touched on this, I say to the chairman, the issue really here is will the United States Congress have the guts, and it is going to take some guts, to stand up to what I believe is the most powerful force in the United States of America.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, to hear the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) say they have already gone down to Indiana and tried to work against him because of his willingness to stand up on this issue. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) told the same story, that they had gone to Minnesota, as well.

The gentleman and I know that when Members of Congress fight hard for consumers, lots of money comes into a campaign, mostly against Democrats; but I am sure they will go after Republicans, as well.

What we have to deal with now is to ask our colleagues in the Congress to have the guts to stand up to the campaign contributions, the advertising, the visiting of the editorial boards, the TV ads, all that we will see, the unlimited sums of money, hundreds of millions of dollars. Do we have the courage to say no to those people and protect the American consumer?

I believe that if tonight is an example of the potential of what we can do, standing together, regardless of philosophy or party, we can protect the American people and take on this industry. I thank the gentleman very much for calling this Special Order.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and I would like to say to my colleagues that not this Thursday but next Thursday we are going to have a hearing in the Subcommittee on Wellness and Human Rights of the Committee on Government Reform.

I anticipate and hope we will all be there, because we are going to have some witnesses come in from the pharmaceutical industry, and more witnesses come in from areas that can show that these products will be safe coming into the United States. We are going to have people from HHS and FDA there. I think it will be a very illuminating meeting; plus, we have some surprise information that will be coming out of that meeting, as well.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) has been very patient. I thank her very much for being with us. She has been a leader in California on a number of issues involving health. I am happy to say she is my ranking member on our committee, and she does a great job. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. I am very proud of that, Mr. Speaker. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), for his courage.

I will just restate the problem that we see in the pricing of U.S. pharmaceuticals, which has such an enormous consequence to millions of Americans who need affordable access to prescription drugs. Americans pay substantially more for prescription drugs than purchasers in other countries, and it has been demonstrated to us this evening.

We have failed in Congress to establish a Medicare prescription drug benefit, so seniors who do not have private prescription drug coverage must pay for prescription drugs out of their pockets. Research by the staff of the Committee on Government Reform has shown that seniors in congressional districts across the country pay twice as much for prescription drugs as their counterparts in other countries. For some drugs, they pay as much as 10 times as their foreign counterparts.

Lower drug prices abroad have led millions of Americans to purchase drugs from foreign sources. Internet pharmacies facilitate these transactions, and their recent proliferation has raised serious concerns about whether American consumers are receiving appropriate medical supervision.

In October of 2000, Congress attempted to address international prescription drug pricing disparities by signing into law the Medicine Equity and Drug Safety Act. The MEDS Act sought to permit U.S. consumers, pharmacists, and wholesalers to purchase FDA-approved prescription drugs on the international market.

Opponents of the legislation, including President Clinton, noted that the MEDS Act was doomed to fail from the outset. The act stipulates that the Secretary of Health and Human Services must verify that implementation would pose no additional risk to public health and safety and would lead to a significant reduction in the cost of drugs to the United States consumer.

To the surprise of no one, the HHS Secretary, under both the Clinton and Bush administrations, has been unable to fulfill this stipulation. As a result, the MEDS Act has had zero effect on the pricing practices of drug manufacturers. In fact, U.S. prices for the five most popular drugs used by seniors increased by an average 16 percent in the 20 months following enactment.

The MEDS Act has, however, had other effects. In response to the bill's enactment, drug makers began requiring Canadian wholesalers and pharmacies to accept contract provisions prohibiting them from selling their products on the U.S. market or to Canadian pharmacies that sell to U.S. customers.

GlaxoSmithKline's unilateral efforts to enforce its policies earned it well-publicized condemnation from U.S. consumer and Canadian pharmaceutical groups. The failure of the MEDS Act prompted the introduction of similar, but narrower, proposals in the 107th Congress.

In the 108th Congress, the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and our colleague on the Subcommittee on Wellness and Human Rights, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), have introduced Preserving Access to Safe, Affordable Canadian Medicines Act, or H.R. 847, which would prohibit drug manufacturers from using contract provisions, limitations on supply, or any other measure to limit the access to American consumers to safe, affordable prescription drugs from the Canadian market.

Mr. Speaker, despite incessant pharmaceutical industry complaints to the

contrary, research by the committee's staff demonstrates that international pricing disparities are not explained either by the duration and the cost of the FDA approval process or by disproportionate U.S. research and development cost. It is within our power to correct this problem if we have the will.

Mr. Speaker, I know with the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the other Members who have testified in front of me, we will be heeding the call of the American people and delivering a prescription drug benefit for Medicare. Congress must look at a blanket solution for fixing our broken health care delivery system, and Congress must act now.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, while the gentlewoman was talking, I talked to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), and one of the things in the law that the gentlewoman cited was that the FDA had to show that the products coming in were safe.

Why do we not turn that around by amendment and say that the FDA has the burden of proof placed upon it to prove that pharmaceutical products coming into the country are not safe? And if we did that, that would open up the borders so people could buy these pharmaceutical products, and the FDA would have the burden of proof on its shoulders to prove they are not safe in order to stop them from coming in.

Ms. WATSON. I think that is a great idea, Mr. Speaker. Maybe there are some amendments.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I will have a bill drafted; and if Members would be willing, I would like them to cosponsor this change.

Mr. SANDERS. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I think the point the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) made and we all made is that over 1 million Americans now purchase their meds in Canada, and the number is growing every day.

The chairman and I and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), we said to the gentleman from the FDA who was before the subcommittee, okay, you tell us you are very concerned about the safety aspect. We have a million Americans. Tell us how many of them have been made sick by receiving adulterated or counterfeit medicine. Out of 1 million people, the answer is zero.

Now, we are all going to sign or we are on a request to the GAO to do something a little different. I think that if the FDA is concerned about health and safety, they should do a study telling us how many Americans are dying or seeing a deterioration of their health because they cannot afford the prices that the industry is charging them today. I have the feeling we are going to see a number a heck of a lot larger than zero. So maybe the FDA should worry about health and safety in terms of prices, rather than hounding people who are buying affordable and safe medicines in Canada.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think maybe that would be a good idea. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a great idea to make the FDA respond by having a GAO study that does exactly what the gentleman is saying, to show how many people have suffered or died or worse because they could not get the prescription drug benefits. So that should be in our request to GAO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATSON. Amazingly, the USDA has sided with Glaxo and seems to think the crossborder sales should be stopped. They also cite safety concerns.

I want Members to know, they can only point to a single case, Mr. Speaker, in Oregon where there may have been a problem, only one case.

Mr. William Hubbard, senior associate commissioner of the FDA, has threatened both civil and criminal penalties to anyone who facilitates Americans' efforts to import prescription drugs from Canadian pharmacies, health plans, or insurance companies.

Even senior citizens who fill their own prescriptions in Canada because they cannot afford American prices are breaking the law, according to Mr. Hubbard. His contribution to the debate is to scare senior citizens, disabled people, and low-income people, and to cut them off from a supply of affordable prescription drugs.

□ 2115

So we definitely need to look at that amendment, and I think my colleague is going to see the unity that he described in the beginning coming together to get a good bill. I thank him so much for his concern.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. We are just about out of time, but the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) came down to the floor and requested a few minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) for their work and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) their tripartisan effort tonight to point out some of the things that PhRMA is doing and so many of the problems in providing a prescription drug benefit, but more importantly, what exactly the drug companies are doing to win over people in the body, to win over people in State legislatures.

I would point out, earlier in the evening the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and several others were talking about the drug companies stepping up their efforts to lobby Congress, to lobby State legislatures, even to lobby foreign countries. I know that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), as I have, have taken bus loads of seniors to Canada to buy prescriptions, same drug, same dosage, same manufacturer, all that, but for one-half, one-third, sometimes one-fourth the price.

The drug companies, as they kick their budgets up, the PhRMA effort to try to get their way all over the world, they plan to spend $72 million for advocacy at the Federal level, mostly in Congress; $4.9 million in lobbying the Food and Drug Administration; $48 million for advocacy at the State level; $17 million in foreign countries and much of that directed to the Canadians because the Canadians stand up to the drug companies and actually sell drugs at decent, affordable prices.

Something jumped out in my State. There is an effort in my State among consumer groups and groups advocating for the elderly and labor organizations to pass a drug benefit not too different from the gentleman from Maine's (Mr. ALLEN) legislation in the State of Maine.

The drug companies have in their budget, the PhRMA budget, according to the New York Times of Sunday, $15.8 million to fight ''a union-driven, get-out-the-vote ballot initiative in Ohio,'' which would lower drug prices for people who do not have drug insurance. They are spending that money, one, to keep the issue off the ballot in Ohio. They are going to board of elections after board of elections after board of elections to try to kill the signatures, to try to disqualify and invalidate signatures so they do not get on the ballot; but then, if it does get on the ballot, because hundreds of thousands of Ohioans have already signed the petition, people in both parties in all 88 counties, if it does get on the ballot, the drug companies are going to spend that kind of money to defeat it, even though it is clearly in the best interests of the overwhelming majority of the public.

I wanted to bring that to people's attention, that $15 million is more than both candidates spent running for governor in 2002, $15 million in a State of fewer than 11 million people. It is outrageous to do this. That is why I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for coming down and joining us. We hope that he, along with a lot of our colleagues on both sides, will join with us in this fight to get this job done.

We are just about out of time. If the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) needs time, I will yield to him.

Let me just say one more time to the PhRMA people, if they happen to be following this discussion tonight, the people in the pharmaceutical industry, we all agree that they have done a great deal for mankind and they have

given us the highest quality of health in the history of man; but at the same time, there is a limit to how much they can expect out of our veins as far as the price of pharmaceutical products, especially when we know those products are being sold for a lot less elsewhere. This fight is not going to end until we obtain victory.

I want to tell them there are a lot of people here, besides those tonight, who are committed to making sure that we get these prices of pharmaceutical products down to a level that is acceptable for the American people, as they are in other parts of the world. No matter how much money the pharmaceutical companies spend or PhRMA spends, they ain't going to win this battle.

So I think they need to get with the program instead of trying to stop Niagara Falls with a sieve. It is not going to work. I think Lincoln said it the best. He said, ''You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time,'' and this is so transparent the American people are going to get it and they are going to get it very quickly.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman quoted one of my favorite Presidents. Let me quote another one. Ronald Reagan said, ''Markets are more powerful than armies.'' This idea that American consumers should be charged $360 for these pills when we can buy them in Munich, Germany, at the airport pharmacy for $59.05.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. One-sixth.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. One-sixth. That will not stand. That is defending the indefensible, and sooner or later, it may not happen this year, may not happen next year, but sooner or later this wall will collapse just like the walls of Jericho.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. As I said at the beginning, this is not a matter of right versus left. This is right versus wrong. This is wrong, and we should do something to stop it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleagues, and we will be taking special orders in the future. I hope they will join with me when we do that, and I look forward to even the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), if he has the time, to come to our hearing, which is a week from Thursday, because it is going to be a very important hearing on this entire subject.

CONCENTRATION OF OWNERSHIP IN MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the issue that we are now going to be discussing, which is the concentration of ownership in the media and the implication of more media deregulation as proposed by the Bush administration and passed today by a three to two vote by the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, is, to my mind, one of the very most important issues facing our country.

The reason for that is very clear. Today, we have a handful of very large corporations who, to a very significant degree, control what we see, hear and read; and I think this chart tells the story, and it is a story that not a lot of Americans are totally familiar with.

When people watch television they say, well, there is CBS, there is a company called CBS. Wrong. CBS is owned by Viacom, and Viacom owns not only the CBS network but UPN Network, MTV, Nickelodeon and many other television networks. Viacom owns Paramount Pictures, MTV Films, Nickelodeon Films. They own Simon & Shuster, Nickelodeon Books, Pocket Books, Scribner, Touchstone, heavy into publishing.

Viacom owns not only television and film and book publishing, they own 180 Infinity radio stations; they own television stations. And that is the same story that we see with all of the major media conglomerates, whether it is AOL Time Warner, which is heavy into the Internet, cable TV, TV networks; whether it is Rupert Murdoch's news corporation, owning 22 TV stations, owning Fox, owning various other types of publications. Clear Channel radio now owns 1,200 radio stations. Disney, that is the Mickey Mouse company, owns ABC; they own many, many other aspects of media.

And as bad as the situation is today with a handful, it is likely to become much worse as a result of the disastrous decision, three-to-two vote, by the FCC earlier today.

In terms of national concentration as a result of this vote, a national television network, we believe, may now be able to acquire dozens of lawful broadcaster stations and control up to 90 percent of the national television market. As a result of the decision today, as we understand it, a single corporation may now acquire in one city up to three television station, eight radio stations, the cable TV system, numerous cable TV stations and the only daily newspaper.

I come from a rural State, the State of Vermont, and what we are going to see in rural America, in small city after small city, town after town, is one company owning the radio station, the television station and the newspaper; and that does not to me seem and feel like the democratic Nation that we are supposed to be, because what democracy is about and what the framers of our Constitution had in mind is a strong First Amendment, a country where people had different ideas, and those ideas clashed, and we learned from the differing points of view.

Today, increasingly, we are hearing one point of view, and that is the corporate point of view, the point of view of large multinational corporations like General Electric who owns NBC or Disney who owns ABC, who have deeply vested conflicts of interest; and we will talk more about that later.

The key issue here is, do we think it is a healthy situation for a democracy to have a handful of huge, multibillion dollar conglomerates owning and controlling what the American people see, hear and read. I think it is not healthy.

There are many conservative organizations who, like the National Rifle Association, spoke out against it; Bill Safire, conservative columnist for New York Times; TRENT LOTT, conservative Senator, spoke out against it. Progressives, moderates, conservatives understand and appreciate that democracy is not about a handful of corporations controlling the media.

I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), and I want to thank him for all of his good work on this issue.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am pleased to be here tonight.

This was a very important decision that the FCC made today on a three-to-two party line vote, and I found one of the significant aspects of the decision was that it was made in spite of what the newspaper says is 500,000 comments in opposition, and it would have been fairly simple for the FCC to agree to hold a hearing, absolutely just to have a hearing so that people could speak out in public. But that is not way the chairman, Mr. Powell, decided to proceed. He wanted this over and done as quickly as possible so that it did not become an issue.

It has not become a major issue in the major networks. I wonder why. Could it be that perhaps all those broadcasters, who pride themselves on their independence, are a little uneasy about telling a story that might be critical of their ownership? There is, as my colleague mentioned, increasing concentration in the major news organizations.

It was just 1996 when the Telecommunications Act was passed. If we added together the two largest groups of owners of radio stations in the country, their collective ownership would come to, I think it was something like 214. I may have that a little wrong. That may be too high, but no more than 214 radio stations across the country. Today, Clear Channel alone owns 1,200 radio stations, and yesterday and Saturday evening Garrison Keillor on Public Radio had a comment about this.

He was doing a little skit there, talking with someone who appeared to be complaining about Clear Channel Communications and changing over a local broadcast channel to Clear Channel. And he said, Look, Clear Channel owns 1,200 radio stations in this country; we cannot expect them to have a human being in every single radio station.

That is the point. Those who have been advocating this, like Mr. Powell at the FCC, would say, Well, there will be inefficiencies of scale. There will be inefficiencies, and it will jeopardize the ability of small businesses to start up, to own radio stations.

□ 2130

It will jeopardize the ability of people in a local area to hear local news, not something that is canned, prerecorded, from somewhere else in the country. This decision is basically starting to strangle the diversity of opinion that is fundamental to a democracy. It is ultimately a very dangerous decision; and we in the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, need to stand up and say that at the core of this democracy, what makes it work is diversity of opinion.

Thomas Jefferson said a long time ago, if I were given a choice between having newspapers and no government, or government and no newspapers, I should not hesitate to choose newspapers and no government. Obviously, we need both; but the media is, in all of its different forms today, absolutely fundamental to the health of this democracy. And with this decision today, the FCC has made our democracy weaker. It is a bad decision, and the Congress should reverse it.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me this time.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has long been involved in this issue, and we are pleased to have him with us this evening.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), on his leadership, his unparalleled leadership here in the Congress on the issue of a fair media, a diverse media with diverse programming, and a competitive media where a small number of large corporations do not make the decisions about information that the public and our country sees and hears.

As the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) said, it was a 3–2 party line decision, similar to so much of what has happened from the Supreme Court in the year 2000 Presidential election, to vote after vote in this body. The Bush administration, the Bush Federal Communication Commission has thrown sound public interest and market principles out the window, allowing America's biggest companies to decide what you hear, when you hear it, what you see, and, in some ways, what you think.

Without a doubt, when you look at the kind of response that the FCC got to this issue, you can see that it really was back-room politics at its worst, as the gentleman from Maine mentioned, 500,000 postcards and e-mail messages almost uniformly against this rule change. A number of comments were examined by a group, a group called the Future of Music Coalition, a group representing artists from country music to rock and roll, artists that almost everyone in this country listens to. They released a report after examining 10,000 comments at random from the FCC that were made public on its Web site; and 9,065 of these 10,000, unaffiliated with any corporate media these 10,000, and 9,065 said they were opposed to changing the resume. Only 11 individuals wrote in support of the FCC.

So on one side there were 9,065; on the other side 11 people. It was a ratio of 824 to 1. Nonetheless, the three Republican commissioners voted with the 11 rather than 9,065. As I said, 500,000 postcards were received overall, and they were equally uniformly against this rule change.

As we said, it was another back-room deal. It only fuels the public perception that the Bush administration has a policy of giving corporations what they want regardless of consequences to the Nation. Enron writes energy policy for this administration. Wall Street writes Social Security privatization legislation. The insurance companies write Medicare legislation. The drug industry writes legislation overseeing the drug industry. It is issue after issue after issue. The chemical companies and the oil companies write legislation dealing with the environment.

About 2 weeks ago, the group of us who opposed this rule, a group of about 15 Democratic Members of Congress and an Independent, held a news conference, a news conference which, if that many Members of Congress put one on almost always is attended by The New York Times; The Washington Post; the L.A. Times; a couple of networks, AP, Fox, perhaps. A whole group of what we would call the corporate media. And we held this news conference in the middle of the day when the media were not that busy, yet we had zero turnout from those corporate media. Congress Daily, a couple of in-house newspapers around here showed up; but none of the big corporate media, none of the mainstream, quoted-unquote mainstream, generally corporate-owned conservative media in this Nation showed up.

That tells you a little bit about how much press coverage they really want for this. The large corporate media in this country do not really want the public to think about this, do not really want the public to know about this because they are the ones lobbying the FCC, they are the ones contributing to President Bush's campaign, they are the ones that contribute to Republican campaigns and Republican leadership; and they want their way with the FCC. Their way with the FCC is fewer companies, fewer corporations controlling the largest amount of media in this country, 1,200 radio stations owned by one company. The CEO of that company, the leaders of that company, good friends of the President from San Antonio, Texas.

It makes you wonder if the FCC is maybe next week, after this decision, going to change its name to instead of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, maybe to Furthering Corporate Control. Because furthering corporate control is what they have done. They have clearly acted against the public interest.

I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, if they really do believe in competition, if they believe in diversity, if they believe in a competitive leveling of the playing field in America like they say they do, then we should enact legislation undoing this FCC ruling.

I thank my friend from Vermont for his terrific leadership.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio could remain for a moment on this issue, because I want to dialogue with him on something that is interesting.

I think there may be citizens of our country who think, well, yes, this is an inside-the-Beltway issue; it really does not affect me very, very much. But I want to mention to my friend from Ohio on issues that I know he and I share similar concerns just what the implications of concentration of media are.

I know that my friend from Ohio is deeply concerned about our trade policy, a policy which now has over a $400 billion trade deficit, a policy which has cost this country millions of decent-paying jobs as large corporations throw American workers out on the street, move to China, move to Mexico.

I would ask my friend from Ohio, how often has he seen discussions of the issue of the deindustrialization of America and the loss of good paying jobs on television or in the editorial pages of newspapers?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is a very good question, and the answer is, rarely or never. The more detailed answer is lots of discussion about tax cuts, lots of discussion about Laci Peterson, lots of discussion about issues that really do not affect people's lives, but almost no discussion about York Manufacturing in my district, 400 good-paying jobs, closed shop, moved to Mexico. Little discussion about trade policy generally.

In fact, if my colleague will remember, during the NAFTA debate, some of us did some surveys of editorials in this country; and we found that editorial opinion was almost unanimous in support of the North American Free Trade Agreement, even though poll after poll after poll showed the majority of the public opposed it. The largest newspaper in the country that opposed NAFTA was the Toledo Blade, a fine newspaper in northwest Ohio, but perhaps the 50th or 60th size newspaper in the country, I am not sure, but clearly not one of the largest newspapers in the country. But that was the largest newspaper that actually opposed NAFTA.

But it is not just the editorial policy. We also did surveys of The Washington Post; and if there is a corporate-controlled medium in this country, it is it;

and The Washington Post op-ed pages were overwhelmingly in support of the North American Free Trade Agreement even though we sent in numerous articles. And to add to that, the Democratic whip, the majority whip, sent a letter to the editor of The Washington Post in those days outlining the number of articles, editorial opinions in support of NAFTA and against NAFTA; and they actually censored his letter to the editor and said we are not going to run that part, we will only run another part.

So it is pretty clear that the editorial page, the other opinion articles, the letters to the editor, and even the news coverage is slanted towards a corporate media, because that is what it is. It is a large corporation. Of course, just like General Motors is a conservative company, they care about their profits, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and all these corporate media are similar.

Mr. SANDERS. Just dealing with General Electric, the point here again is that sometimes people turn on the television and they say there is NBC. Well, no, it is not NBC. This is a subsidiary of General Electric.

For many, many years, General Electric has been an anti-union company. The fact of the matter is that if you are a member of a union in the United States today, you earn approximately 25 percent more than an American worker doing similar work who is not a member of a union. That is just a fact.

I would ask my friend from Ohio how often he has seen programs on General Electric's media or in fact any other media talking about the advantages of being a member of a union? Now, I myself have never seen a program like that. Maybe my friend has.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I come from an area, Ohio, which is a pretty unionized State, but I do not see them there either. My colleague comes from a State that is a little more rural; maybe you would not see it there. You would think you would see it in Ohio, but you do not see it in Ohio. It is pretty clear there are not a lot of labor unions owning newspapers or owning radio stations.

There is a show once a week out of a Cleveland radio station, a small part of this radio station, that talks about unions and has a pro-union moderator. That is the only show I have heard, and that is 1 hour on one station out of 15 stations or so and maybe 20 stations in greater Cleveland. Half of those stations are owned by the President's friend from San Antonio, which is becoming less and less diverse in its programming, more and more single minded, more and more conservative in its politics; and it is continuing to move in that direction.

But little or no discussion about the struggles people have, about unions, about work, about trade policy, about feeding their kids. Few shows devoted to single parents trying to struggle through life. Lots of shows about glamour, lots of shows about the rich, lots of shows about tax cuts; but nothing about the struggles of every day people.

Mr. SANDERS. I think my friend from Ohio put his finger right on the issue, and that is in our country today, there are tens of millions of families who are struggling hard to keep their heads above water. These are people in my State, and I am sure in Ohio, who are not working one job; they are working two jobs, three jobs. They are working 50, 60 hours a week. They are worried about their pensions, worried about their health care situation. It would seem to me that the media might want to focus on those issues.

I have the feeling in the back of my head that truthfully General Electric is not particularly anxious to educate people on those issues; not to talk about the horrendously unfair distribution of wealth and income that we have in this country; not to talk about the fact that the United States is the only Nation in the industrialized world that does not guarantee health care for all people; not to talk about the fact that our pharmaceutical prices are by far the highest prices in the world because we are the only Nation that does not regulate the pharmaceutical industry.

So the point that I am making here is that I do not want anyone to think this is some kind of abstract, obtuse, inside-the-Beltway issue that does not affect their lives. It does affect their lives. The media, to a significant degree, ignores the struggles and the needs of working families throughout this country, not giving them the information they need.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. My friend from Vermont mentions the drug companies. Now, the drug companies, how often in the newspapers or in TV or radio shows do we hear, unless maybe they quote one of us, and there are not that many of us talking about that, that the drug industry is the most profitable industry in America for 20 years straight; that they pay the lowest tax rate in America for 20 years straight; that taxpayers do almost half of all the research and development on prescription drugs; that Canada's prices are one-half or one-third what they are in the United States; that we are the only country in the world that does not do something to regulate or lower or try to push down drug prices? Not one story ever, almost never a story about that.

Rarely is there a story about why drugs are cheaper in Canada, what the Canadian Government does. Rarely is there a story about what the French or the British or the Germans or the Japanese or the Israelis do to get drug prices down. There are a lot of advertisements on all those stations about prescription drugs, about arthritis drugs, about asthma drugs, about cholesterol-reducing drugs; and all that stuff is good information for the public, but millions, actually billions, of dollars going into the pockets of these corporations that own the media and few if any stories about how the drug companies really rip off the American public.

When you think about that, all this money coming in to these corporations to advertise, of course they are not going to bite the hand that feeds them. Of course they are not going to expose the drug companies' kind of practices and decision-making. Of course they are not going to talk about 600 lobbyists in this town alone lobbying the United States Congress. Of course they are not going to talk about the $15 million that the drug companies are going to spend in my own State, in one State, to try to kill a ballot issue and to keep it off the ballot. Of course they are not going to do any of this because they are getting so much money from the drug companies.

I do not accuse the media of being sleazy for that. That is probably a good business practice. But what I accuse as sleazy is the way they lobby the FCC and get the three Republicans on the FCC to do their bidding, to do whatever corporate America wants. That is what is outrageous.

So point the finger at the drug industry and some of the media; but more importantly, point the finger at the people on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, who stand by these decisions and do whatever corporate America wants them to.

□ 2145

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman organizing this special order on a dark day for American democracy, because today the FCC, in almost a little hidden cabinet without taking adequate input from the American public, struck a low blow for information going to Americans.

I have come to the floor because I am hopeful that the U.S. House will listen to the thousands of Democrats and Republicans who have barraged the FCC with e-mails and letters that were ignored, and will come to the rescue and change this rule in a way that is good for democracy.

Since the FCC proposed this rule, they wanted to keep this as quiet as possible. They wanted to sweep it under the rug. They wanted as few Americans as possible to know what they were doing to America's broadcast rights. What they did was they decided to have the statutorily minimum number of hearings in a minimally accessible place, so they had one hearing in Virginia.

Now to put this in context, when the Forest Service thought about changing a rule regarding the forest, they had 600 hearings around America so Americans could let Congress know what was going on.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and some people in Seattle initiated a public meeting in Seattle.

Mr. INSLEE. And 350 people turned out, essentially spontaneously, with about 48 hours' notice to tar and feather the FCC commissioners who were going to ram this down their throats, and these folks were very, very angry. And the reason they were angry was, they understood the game being played by the FCC here. People are sophisticated enough to get this.

The argument has been made if the anticonsolidation rules are removed, we would have a plethora of new stations to listen to, and radio is frequently used as an example. They say, There are still a lot of radio stations out there, which is true, but what Americans understand and what people in Seattle were so upset about, they realize there might be a lot of stations, but they are owned by the same people. One company owns 1,200 radio stations. Before these rules were relaxed, the most radio stations owned by one company was 65.

It does not matter if we have 20 hoses all coming from the same spigot, and that is the situation that the FCC is allowing to take place.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, when people go to a newsstand and they see hundreds, if not thousands, of magazines, they say, Wow, look at the diversity of opinion. And we all know there are hundreds and hundreds of television stations out there.

I would remind the gentleman that in the last days of the Soviet Union, which was a totalitarian society, some people had the impression that there was one newspaper and one television station and one radio station. Wrong. There were hundreds, if not thousands. The only problem was that all of them were either controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union or the government of the Soviet Union.

The gentleman's point exactly. All kinds of outlets; the problem is, controlled by, in that case, two institutions.

Well, we do not have two institutions, we have more, six, eight, nine institutions. But every day, and as a result of this deregulation effort, that number is going to be smaller and smaller. So do not kid yourself when you say hundreds of television stations and radio stations; ask who owns them.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in response to this, and we have heard the response of the FCC who pushed through this rule, their response is we do not know that is going to happen. We do not know that consolidation is going to take place.

I do not think that it is rocket science to realize, if we remove rules against consolidation, there is going to be consolidation. This is not rocket science, either, because we have had an experiment with this in radio. The largest number of stations owned was 65 before the anticonsolidation, and now it is 1,200; and that is why this is a bipartisan concern.

It is interesting, groups as disparate as the National Rifle Association and William Safire have come out against this. I love to quote William Safire, at least when I agree with him. He said, ''The concentration of power, political, corporate, media, cultural, should be anathema to conservatives. Why do we have more channels but fewer real choices today? Because the ownership of our means of communication is shrinking. Moguls glory in amalgamation, but more individuals than they realize resent the loss of local control and community identity.''

I think that is what happened to the FCC. They may have been stunned by this outpouring of concern, but it is there. Ninety-nine percent of all of the input they have received in the last several months on this issue is against the very rules they just shoved down America's throat.

Mr. SANDERS. I think the gentleman is absolutely right in two regards. Number one, there is enormous concern over this issue from one end of this country to the other. Just a few days ago I was in San Diego, California, with the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who held a public meeting on this issue, and the problem was, he had rented a hall that could only seat 200 people and 400 people showed up, so half of the people had to be outside listening to the meeting via speakerphone.

We held a meeting outside of Burlington, Vermont, we are a small city in a small State, and we had 600 people come out to hear Michael Copps, who has been one of the courageous commissioners on this issue, traveling all over the country.

There is massive public concern, and your point earlier about the outrage that, on an issue of this significance, Mr. Powell did not have public meetings all over the United States; and if he had, no question, based on your experience and my experience, hundreds of thousands of Americans would likely have come out to say, No, we believe in a democratic society, and a handful of people controlling the media is not what a democratic society is all about. I suspect he knew that, which is why he held one public hearing in the daytime in Richmond, Virginia.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman coming forward this evening to spend a few minutes via one of the avenues of public expression that is still available to us to be able to talk to people about this. The gentleman's comments a moment ago with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) touched a nerve with me.

We have been watching this issue slowly bubble in the background, move into the public consciousness. We have all expressed and we have all experienced an outpouring in our own districts, our own correspondence, phone calls, e-mails. It is fascinating to me that over the last 6 months I have not had one Oregonian express to me support for the direction the FCC has taken, not one.

One would think that for something that is this momentous, there would be at some point, on some level, some indication that ordinary men and women, that business people, government leaders, that somebody would be there expressing the case for this relatively radical approach.

To the contrary, we have seen in our community the same deep bipartisan apprehension and opposition that has been expressed here this evening. People know on several levels that competition matters, that we benefit from a diversity of voices. Certainly, in this Chamber there are a variety of different points of view. I think on those occasions when we are actually able to express it, I think we do our jobs better and the American public is better served.

But the people that I work with are aware that today almost every television station, whether we go to Nashville, Redmond, Washington, or Burlington, Vermont, the news sounds the same. They have the same air-brushed approach. They have basically the same television accents. They use the same media consultants to craft the sets that they use. They all use the same gyrations, putting forth everything from the weather to on-the-spot news. The same formats ensue because people are being driven by the same media consultants and the pressures from advertisers.

Now, as the gentleman points out, we are going to have the ultimate homogeneous force, and that is concentration of ownership into a handful of conglomerates that are going to be dictating it. It seems to me that there will be no reason for our news to be indistinguishable, distorted pabulum that is more entertainment than delivering information.

I have one short, final point to make. I think the gentleman's expression here this evening, bringing forward others, indicates why I do not think this is going to be the last word on this subject. The House and the Senate have the opportunity. They were the ones that originally decided that the people's airwaves, the public airwaves, were going to be given to commercial broadcasters in return for some public benefit. Since we passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, we have seen these competitive forces eroded away, people forgetting the public benefit; and I think that the issues that you are focusing on here will produce such a backlash it will be possible for us to be responsive to the public, and hopefully we will see some action that will reverse this egregious act.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this issue, and that is the aspects of localism. Vermont is different from Oregon, and we should pride ourselves on our differences and not see us become homogeneous. From 1981 to 1989, I was the mayor of the city of Burlington, Vermont, and when I

was mayor, there were four or five local radio stations who covered the news. We would hold a press conference, and there would be four or five takes on what we said. Now, if we are lucky, there is one radio station covering the news, and that phenomenon has gone on all over this country.

I remind my friends and colleagues that as a result of the deregulation decision today, there will be hundreds of cities and towns in America where there will be one company owning the local TV station, radio station and newspaper; and if anyone thinks that is not a dangerous situation, I would strongly disagree with that person.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to respond to this bogus argument that the Republican FCC commissioners put up when they decided to repeal this fairly long-standing, common-sense approach that has enjoyed up to now bipartisan support, and I hope will again.

They argued that, essentially, because we have had a technological revolution in the last decade or so, that removes the necessity of having rules against somebody getting too egregious a distribution proportion.

□ 2200

They said basically that the Internet solves all ills that humans will ever know. I am from the most Internet-involved part of the world probably. I represent the First Congressional District of the State of Washington. It is where a little company called Microsoft is located, together with probably thousands of spin-off companies from Microsoft. I represent a community that are evangelists for the Internet, who really are believers that this is a way to change the way we do business in fundamental ways. But the people there have told me, do not let the FCC remove these anticonsolidation rules, the fans of the Internet, the fans of new technology, the believers in new technology.

What they tell me is the reason we still need these rules is that even though we have now Web-based distribution systems, the Web distributors are owned by the TV companies. It is the same message. What they tell me, again coming back to this kind of host analysis, you don't get a new view just because it is a Web-hosted message if it is the same message you are getting on television or if it is the same message you are getting in the newspaper. And so what they have told me, do not let them remove these anticonsolidation rules. The Internet cannot solve the fact that democracy suffers when there are fewer voices to provide Americans the news. This is going to result, as God made little green apples, in fewer voices delivering news to Americans because that is exactly what has happened in the radio industry, and we know that that is going to happen.

Mr. SANDERS. I would point out, my friend mentioned Clear Channel, which was the company that really sprouted after radio deregulation in 1996 and now owns some 1,200 radio stations. It is important to recognize that Clear Channel not only owns radio stations; they own a lot more. Clear Channel is the largest concert promoter in the country, selling 66 million tickets in 26,000 events in 2001. Why is that significant? It is significant because if you are an entertainer promoted by Clear Channel, obviously you are going to get a lot more air time on their radio stations than somebody who is not. You could be the greatest singer in the world; but maybe if you are not promoted by Clear Channel, you might not get the opportunity to appear on those radio stations.

So I think the issue here is like anything else. We are living in a country where fewer and fewer large corporations own more and more of our Nation. That is a bad situation in general; but I think what we recognize when it comes to the media, it is not just bad from an economic sense in terms of stifling competition; it is bad in what it does to the clash of ideas and diversity of opinions.

We have heard from people, for example, who are involved in African American broadcasting, and what they are saying is they are losing their stations being bought out by the large conglomerates. The same is true with Latino stations. Again, fewer and fewer large companies, homogeneous-type broadcasting one end of the country to the other, fewer ideas for the American people.

Mr. INSLEE. I think it is important to note, too, that there is an economic reason why this new rule, which is going to create these large concentrations of media power, is a bad idea. I think it is important to talk about the economic reason as well. The economic reason is that these megacorporation media conglomerates will have the ability to stifle entry of new businesses, particularly small businesses who want to break into the media market. One of the great things about the American economy is we have traditionally recognized having a dynamic economy which allows entry into the market is important so that people can get new ideas, new creative products and the like.

Here is a fellow who is not exactly in William Safire's philosophical base, but he had an interesting comment. Ted Turner said, if these rules had been in place in 1970, it would have been virtually impossible for me to start Turner Broadcasting or, 10 years later, to launch CNN. The reason it would be impossible is that these consolidations basically allow these companies to build these Chinese walls around their little media fortresses which prevents these small businesses from breaking into the market.

So if you are a small business-oriented person who believes in a dynamic entry of markets, this is a mistake to allow these sort of giant conglomerates to take over. Fundamentally, though, the democratic argument and the damage to democracy is the one that is really bothering Americans tonight, because one of the things we have learned through history is that the paper on the parchment of the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution are nice and they are important; but the Soviet Union had the same language in their Constitution, but they did not have a vigorous press or a vigorous independent judicial branch, and democracy never got going. We are very concerned that absent a vigorous, competitive, dynamic, change-oriented media in our democracy that our democracy will suffer. You can have the best Members of the U.S. Congress, the best Members of the U.S. Senate, and an enlightened President; but unless Americans can get the truth by looking at various different colors in the spectrum, this place is not going to work.

And so, yes, there is an economic rationale; but people value democracy above everything, and they understand the threat that has happened in this rule. I believe, and I know that the gentleman and I and others will be working to pass legislation to reverse this rule. As you know, we have cosponsored a bill already to repeal the 45 percent national consolidation. Other bills will be introduced. We hope to attract bipartisan consensus. We hope Americans will let their Members of Congress know what to do here.

Mr. SANDERS. I would just pick up on that point from my friend from Washington. If there is anything good about what has happened in the last few months, what has been good is that more and more people are now aware of what is happening in this issue than was previously the case. As my friend from Washington indicated, we are going to be introducing probably several pieces of legislation not only to undo the damage of today's decision but to create a situation in which we improve upon what existed yesterday.

My friend mentioned earlier that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people, progressives, moderates, conservatives, people in the NRA, people in the conservative President's Parents Television Council, people from all across the political spectrum have communicated with the FCC to the tune of some 750,000 communications. Yet despite the fact that the communications were overwhelmingly in opposition to more media deregulation, the FCC moved in that direction.

My friend might be interested in knowing, why does that happen? How does it happen? I would point out one of many reasons and that is the power which is not limited just to the FCC but the power that the industry has over the regulators. Sometimes people think that the regulators regulate the industry. In truth, given the role that money plays in Washington, more often than not it is the industry that regulates the regulators. The Center for Public Integrity recently reported

that over the last 8 years the FCC took staff and members on some 2,500 junkets that were paid for by the industry. Industry paid for trips for FCC commissioners and top staffers to be flown to hundreds of conferences, conventions, and broadcast industry events in Las Vegas, coincidentally Las Vegas, 330 trips to Las Vegas for FCC members and staff, New Orleans, New York, London, San Francisco, Miami, Anchorage, Palm Springs, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, all over the world. The industry was paying for the visits and the travel done by the members of the commission and the staff.

Mr. INSLEE. And the reason that I think people are so upset about this, and they are upset, I have talked to a lot of people who are really hot about this issue, and I think justifiably because this has been one of the more outrageous instances of a public agency willfully and consciously, number one, shutting to the extent humanly possible the public out of the decision-making process of their government by holding one hearing in one part of the country. There were other members of the commission who begged the chairman, Mr. Powell, to hold multiple hearings, because he knew this was something that really people cared about around the country, not just inside the Beltway, and Mr. Powell refused. Because they are too busy? Excuse me, this is the single most important decision of the FCC probably in the last 10 years, but they only hold one hearing because they do not want to listen to Americans, and it is wrong. Then when the word snuck out through various efforts, including our own, they have been deluged with almost a unanimous position of the Americans who care about this.

And what is their response to Americans who have taken the time to send postcards, to send e-mails, to call in? Their response has been, go fish. That is about what it boils down to. I heard Mr. Powell today briefly, I did not hear his whole comments, but I heard him say, if we don't do something, this rule will get changed anyway by the courts. That is true if you do not prepare a record; if you do not go out and ask people what is going on in America to prepare the record, then this rule might be subject to judicial scrutiny. He is correct. But the reason is that they did not go out and ask anybody around America. They held one lousy hearing. So if they want to preserve the rule which they had the opportunity to do, they needed to build a record. The reason they did not build a record is they knew the message they were going to get. They had a predisposed decision. These commissioners had made a decision before they opened up these hearings at all. It is pretty obvious when you see the railroad job that took place.

Mr. SANDERS. I would say to the 750,000 people who communicated with the FCC, the 750,000 people who said do not deregulate the industry more so that a tiny handful of companies will control what we see, hear and read, I would say to those people and to the Members of Congress not to give up on this issue. We suffered a setback today which was not unexpected. I think we all knew what was going to happen. But the fact that so many people from the State of Washington or the State of Oregon or the State of Vermont and all the States in between, that so many people are now aroused about this issue, are upset at what happened, are going to fight for a more democratic media, is a positive thing.

Clearly now the ball falls to the people in this Congress to undo the damage done by the FCC. I know that I will be working with my friend from Washington and my friend from Oregon and people from all political points of view to undo the damage done today so that we create a media that we are proud of, where the American people become not just the best entertained people in the world but the best informed people, where the media gives our democratic society the ideas and the information that people need in order to make informed decisions in a democratic society.

We have got our work cut out for us. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that the vast majority of the American people stand with us and do not want to see a few corporations controlling the media, and our job now is to take that support and to convert it into strong legislation.

Mr. INSLEE. I just have a closing comment, which is that democracy is not self-executing. It does not get done by itself. Now is a moment for all men and women to come to the aid of their country on this issue. We need, those of us who care deeply about this, for everyone to let their Member of the U.S. Congress and Senate know how they feel about this issue, because we need to kindle and blow a little air on this fire to keep it going. We are going to hope that we will have enough support across the aisle of our good friends, the Republicans, that we are going to have enough Republicans who will join us in forcing a vote on this issue on the House floor. That is going to be very important. It will be a great victory on a bipartisan basis for American democracy. I thank the gentleman for raising this important issue.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Oregon for their very thoughtful remarks. This is an issue of huge consequences. We have got to go forward together to undo the damage done today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to today's vote by the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, to relax limitations on media ownership.

Apparently, the FCC has overlooked the fact that the airwaves are owned by the American public, just as the Commission has forgotten that its legislated mission is to protect those same airwaves for the public's use.

Relaxing rules that have worked for decades in order to allow huge conglomerates to gobble up even more media outlets will certainly diminish the quality of our news and stifle minority views and opinions.

I find it particularly interesting that while the FCC regulators and their staff were reviewing the changes, they took some 2,500 junkets—worth almost $3 million—which were paid for by the media industry. During all that time, the Commission managed to hold just one public hearing. Does anyone have any doubt to whom the FCC was listening during its deliberation process—the media moguls or the public?

I understand how the FCC decisions will benefit those media conglomerates. What I do not understand is how they benefit private citizens or our democracy, which can only survive on the free flow of information and diverse opinions.

Now that the decision has been made, it will be up to Congress to review these rules. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that public interest will be heard—and that our airwaves will not fall victim to powerful special interests. I would like to share with my colleagues an op-ed I authored on this issue which appeared today in Rochester, New York's Democrat & Chronicle.

TOO LITTLE DISCUSSION HAS PRECEDED FCC DECISION ON MEDIA OWNERSHIP

(By Representative Louise M. Slaughter)

What if one person controlled all the information in the newspaper you are reading, on your favorite radio station and on the TV channel you watch nightly?

It could begin to happen today, when a five-member panel at the Federal Communications Commission votes on relaxing regulations governing media ownership in this nation.

Sixty years ago, when television was just a fledgling invention, the FCC was created to ensure that our airwaves—which the American public owns—would not be dominated by a few large corporations that could control information and news.

Our government rightly recognized that the free flow of ideas, opinions and information is central to the ongoing national dialogue that drives this great democracy. Protecting local and minority ownership of media outlets is also crucial to guaranteeing coverage of local issues and diverse viewpoints.

As time passed, a few large corporations began to acquire more newspapers, radio and TV stations across our nation. Thirty years ago, there were 1,500 locally or regionally owned newspapers. Now, there are only 281 such independent papers. Six large companies control most of the media in this nation, while three corporations control all the cable news.

After 1996, when the FCC relaxed ownership limits for radio stations, 90 percent of radio stations were bought or sold within five years. Hundreds of stations have been consolidated since then: Clear Channel now owns more than 1,200 radio stations. Before, they could own only 40.

In Rochester alone, six of our radio stations are owned by Clear Channel. Four more are owned by Infinity Broadcasting. Thus the information and music aired on 10 stations in Rochester are controlled by two conglomerates that are based nowhere near here and have little concern for our local issues.

The FCC is now considering relaxing its regulations even further, which will certainly lead to a dangerous concentration of media ownership. The proposed changes would allow networks to own stations reaching as much as 90 percent of the country,

allow companies to own three television stations in some markets and would do away with a 28-year ban on companies owning both a newspaper and a TV station in the same market.

What is perhaps more egregious is the secretive process through which these changes have been considered. The FCC tried to keep the plan's details secret and refused to have more than one, barely publicized hearing on the issue. FCC Chairman Michael Powell has rejected requests from two of his own commission members to delay the vote for more public comment.

Fortunately, even though this issue got relatively little media coverage, the American public has taken action. Progressive and conservative interest groups, artists and 200 communications academics have protested the new rules. Of the 9,000 e-mails the FCC has received on the issue, only 11 supported relaxing the rules. I, along with 100 of my colleagues in Congress, recently wrote to Chairman Powell expressing our opposition to the proposed rules. Unfortunately, the FCC is not listening.

Owners of media outlets are obliged to serve the public interest—not just their own financial interests. Our Founding Fathers created this democracy to give us the right to debate ideas openly and make informed choices. If these changes go into effect, a few huge, powerful corporations could gobble up even more media outlets to control most of the news we get.

Be grateful that today you had the opportunity to read about these proposed changes, supported by the powerful media conglomerates. If they have their way, the next time the FCC decides to change the rules, you may not be informed at all.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Madam Speaker, I want to take a minute to discuss an issue that is very important to many men and women in my district and to the men and women working in the telecommunications industry.

The FCC is preparing for a release of their Triennial Review of the UNE–P and I want to weigh in with my colleagues as to the fundamentals of how the UNE–P pricing model works, or as I see it, doesn't work.

Suppose you, an entrepreneur, go in to manufacture candy bars and you invest significant capital to create this wonderful factory and generate candy bars. You operate for 30 years, during which you must buy new equipment, and maintain that equipment. The bottom line of your costs is say, $.75. You determine to sell them in the retail market for $1. Then you discover that there is a regulatory body empowered by the Congress that regulates candy bars and one of their missions is to promote competition. One day, these regulators come to you and they say, ''You know what? We think since you're the largest candy bar manufacturer, you should have a competitor. And we have someone that we want to be your competitor.'' Then the regulators tell you one way in which they've determined to promote competition is for you to allow this competitor to sell your product from your machinery and buildings at $0.75 or in some cases less than $0.75, so they in turn can resell it in the market for a profit to them, and a loss to your company.

All the money you just spent to build a building which stores the machinery you use to make your product, package your product, distribute you're product, and maintain all of this, is used to provide a product to your competitor for the same price or less of a price that is costs you, only they don't have any risk.

I pose the question to the regulators and my colleagues. What would you do as CEO of this candy bar company, what do you feel is the right thing to do? I see it to be wrong and think the regulators should take steps to mitigate this wrong or change it while they still have a chance.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SANDERS. Madam 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 my Special Order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

□ 2215

PRESERVING AND PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is interesting to review the ebb and flow of the political tides, as we have had here this evening, where we here on Capitol Hill deal with the ebb and flow of various political crises, whether it is the struggle against global terrorism, whether it is the battle of the economy, budgets and tax cuts, where the economy is hopefully a short-term problem, where the perversion of tax and budget priorities hopefully is temporary in nature, and it is, after all, within our power to change priorities to adjust tax rates and make infrastructure investments.

There is, Madam Speaker, however, a greater battle, and one over which, if we are not careful, we may not be able to exercise such control. I am speaking, of course, of the struggle to preserve and protect our environment, because we are watching the slow, relentless poisoning of air and water, the destruction of habitat, which puts millions of people at risk on a daily basis and inflicts permanent damage.

The World Health Organization, for example, suggests that water-borne diseases kill at least 3.5 million people every year. That is more than three times as many people who were lost in the World Trade Center, who die every day, 365 days a year. It is within our power, our capacity, to do something about it.

It was my privilege to be in South Africa last fall as the world came together, the largest United Nations conference in history, making commitments to what we were going to do to try and make changes like that to protect the environment. I watched as the United States joined with over 104 other heads of state, 194 countries in all, to make commitments, for instance, that over 1 million people who do not have access to clean drinking water, we would cut that amount in half in the next 15 years.

I think a number of people felt uncomfortable with that, thinking about how many people would be sentenced to unnecessary death and disease, but it was an important goal. But that goal suggests that we are going to provide, even that modest goal, 211,000 people per day, clean drinking water who do not have it, in order to reach that 15-year goal of just cutting it in half. It is an example of these threats that we face to the environment.

I would like to reflect for a few moments this evening about what we are doing dealing with these two great global threats.

We have focused our attention on the greater environment in terms of the atmosphere and our oceans. Fifty years ago space was our proxy in a struggle against communism. Ten years later, we had the Stratton Commission, ushering in a new era for the space under our oceans' surfaces. We have spent billions of dollars trying to penetrate deep space, a somewhat lesser amount dealing with our oceans, while we as a planet continue to affect weather patterns, affect global climate change, global warming and disease.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important for us to be able to focus on what we can do to make a difference in those areas.

I have often on this floor dealt with issues dealing with global warming. The scientific consensus is agreed to, although it is slow in dawning on Members of Congress, and our policies do not yet reflect it. But when you deal with objective members of science, 15 years ago what was a debatable proposition that we were affecting the Earth's climate in cataclysmic ways, now the vast scientific consensus, including the commission that wrote the report from the National Academy of Sciences 2 years ago requested by President Bush, confirms that we now know that global warming and this climate change is a reality; that it is, in all likelihood, a world where our children will inherit a Glacier National Park with no glaciers, indeed, no glaciers at all in the continental United States.

The sudden occurrence of open water at the North Pole for the first time in recorded history is now being followed by evidence of rapid melting of the polar areas, and we face consequences like the extinction of polar bears within our children's lifetime.

But the problems are not just with trophy species and signature landmarks like mountain glaciers. We are changing the envelope, as Professor Holden, Director of the Program on Science and Technology and Public Policy at Harvard University, expresses it, the envelope in which all other environmental conditions and processes operate.

It will be impacting the productivity of our farms, our forests and fisheries,

the livability of our cities in summer, and damages from storms, floods and wildfires. People in States like yours, Madam Speaker, are going to be experiencing dramatic changes as sea levels increase, as issues that relate to the Everglades, something we have all come together to try and do something about, become more acute, because of what we are doing to the global climate, the issue of sudden weather events.

Those who follow the news are intrigued, I think, that on a regular basis now there are recordings not just of hurricanes and tornadoes, storm surges and floods, but the descriptions of these items: in Australia this last year, the worst drought; flooding in Morocco, the worst in a third of a century; the severe storms that we have had across the United States, in the Carolinas and the Northeast this last year; 6 inches of rain that fell on Central Park last December, more than double the amount of rain recorded through all the prior winter.

Time and time again we are watching these occurrences that are of catastrophic proportions. And what we are finding from our friends in the scientific community is that this is a small taste of one of the most serious consequences of global warming: that these sudden, unpredictable, disruptive and terrifying events are going to be predictable in terms of their occurrence, and nobody is going to be safe; the disruption of the food supply chain, habitats that are going to be migrating north, shifting patterns of wealth, sustainability, all subjected to more uncertainty.

We are going to have people living in harm's way in flood plains, whether it is in Florida, in Manhattan, in Bangladesh, that is going to test and best the ability of people to adapt. And tragically, it is going to be those people in the poorest areas of the world that are going to pay the highest price, have the greatest difficulty in adapting.

There are things within our power to start making some modest adjustments. I will be working in this next month, hopefully, we will be able to have brought to the floor of this Chamber some modification of flood insurance, something that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have been working on for years, where we have an un-actuarially sound program that subsidizes people to live in areas where God repeatedly shows they are not wanted, putting them in harm's way, concentrating almost 40 percent of our payments to 2 percent of repetitive flood losses.

A simple adjustment is something that will send the right signals to people to modify their behavior, to move out of harm's way, to save money, to save lives, and to start making adjustments before global warming makes that problem even worse.

There are special responsibilities for the United States as both the wealthiest Nation and the largest polluter in terms of greenhouse gasses to step forward and do something about it.

Well, we have been less than totally successful, one must admit. We have walked away from not only the Kyoto Treaty, but any opportunity for the United States to assume leadership by offering an alternative, to step forward if we do not like the treaty, to be able to indicate what we can do to enter into partnership with countries like China and India.

It is not acceptable to just simply say, Well, these people are going to have to step forward and change their lifestyles before we as the richest, most powerful Nation and the biggest polluter, is willing to do anything. Because they are, although massive in population, they are in fact dealing with significant greenhouse gas emissions now. They are on a trajectory, Madam Speaker; if we do not, as a world, work together to be able to reduce them, if they follow the pattern of development of the United States, China and India have the potential in a short period, a few short years, of having a devastating impact on the world's climate. The world cannot sustain the United States, China and India all following this very destructive pattern.

But it is in the area of protection of our oceans that I find some interesting optimism in the midst of some depressing news. We have all witnessed in recent days studies, for example, the Canadian Study in Nature, that talks about what has happened with our fisheries around the world, where we have destroyed 90 percent of the trophy fish since the 1950s, only 10 percent of the populations of tuna, swordfish, marlin and other prize species remain in the ocean; that we have created a dead zone at the mouth of the Mississippi River now, every year, that has grown. When I first came to Congress, it was only the size of Rhode Island. Now, in less than a decade, it is larger than the State of Massachusetts, with devastating impact for the fisheries in the Gulf area.

Time and time again we look at these dangerous signals that are an important wake-up call to those of us who care about the world's environment.

It has been my privilege since I have been in Congress to understand the scope, direction and nature of these threats to our oceans. I have been privileged to work with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who was the driving force behind the first Oceans Conference, a gentleman who has been active in creating marine sanctuaries, who has been focusing on the fact that we spend eight times more studying space, which is interesting and has positive aspects, but only one-eighth of that expenditure is spent on our oceans, upon which our climate and our very existence depends; and as the gentleman is fond of pointing out, that a lot of this research that is attributed to NOAA and oceans is actually atmospheric study of the weather.

I am privileged to note that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is with us here this evening for a discussion of how we can focus on opportunities dealing with our oceans.

□ 2230

I am particularly honored that he would join with me in the discussion this evening, because, as he is well aware, in fact his predecessor is Chair of a commission, the Pew Oceans Commission, that is the first comprehensive study of oceans policy of the United States and its global implications in over one-third of a century.

I am honored that the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is here. I am privileged to work with the gentleman. I deeply appreciate the gentleman's leadership and insight here in Congress, perhaps one of the strongest, if not the strongest, at least in the House, as it deals with oceans policy and its consequences for our future.

I welcome the opportunity to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his thoughts and observations.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding to me. I am delighted to be here.

I think in light of tonight's discussions, which really have wonderful populist appeal about issues of drug sales in America and about the practices of licensing telecommunications in this country, it is also appropriate that we focus a little bit on the politics, the big politics of the oceans, that is, that the meeting of land and water, of the two massive forces on Earth, takes place in coastal zones. Coastal zones are also where most of the people live, that is, where most of the voters are, most of the taxes are raised. That is where we find the most U.S. population, on the coast, which comprises about 17 percent of our entire land mass.

We also find that people are moving to coastal areas faster than any other place. There is an increase of about 3,600 people a day that move to the coastlines.

I think coastlines are also important from an economic standpoint if we think about that is where fishermen make their living, that is where tourism attracts people to swim in the oceans. The largest recreational areas in the United States are the publicly owned beaches of this country.

It is clear that the public takes special interest in our oceans; and as we have learned from our colleagues, even the inland colleagues in inland States, people in their districts think of oceans because they think of them as they consume seafood, and as places they would like to visit on their vacations, to go to the beach.

What do we do in Congress, because we understand that there are real problems with the oceans, not just ours alone but internationally, as well? In a recent report in the journal Nature, it stated that 90 percent of the large predatory fish are gone from the oceans totally, globally, all over the world.

Overfishing has led to fishery closures for rockfish on the west coast and groundfish on the east coast.

We find that because we have not really effectively monitored or stopped the toxic pollutants that come in from just runoff, where it rains on the land and that rain runs through agricultural land, it runs through parking lots, it runs through streets; and whatever is on those streets, what they call trace metals and pesticides, ends up going into the rivers and then down into the oceans, therefore affecting marine systems.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If the gentleman would let me add for one moment on that precise point, the recent study from the National Academy of Sciences estimates that that runoff the gentleman talks about from our driveways, our parking lots and our roads, these oils, solvents that wash into our rivers, estuaries, and oceans are the equivalent of one *Exxon Valdez* every 8 months, almost 11 million gallons of oil and gasoline in the course of a year, an *Exxon Valdez* and a half every year.

Mr. FARR. It is more difficult to trace than the *Exxon Valdez*, which was essentially one spot, a big contamination. These are subtle contaminations. But these contaminations are not just chemicals.

We have a way of transporting nature. Certainly we have learned about that recently with the way to transport virus, with SARS originating in China ending up affecting us in Toronto and other cities around the world.

The San Francisco Bay now has 175 nonnative marine species living in San Francisco Bay brought in by the ships that travel the oceans far and wide. Despite all these indicators that show that the marine ecosystems are unhealthy today, the question is, well, can we save them? Has it gone beyond repair?

The gentleman and I know that we have certainly laws that govern our coastlines and oceans; but those laws, as the gentleman said, are outdated. It is time to focus anew.

Fortunately, Congress has taken action to do that by creating a commission. With a bill that I authored with Senator HOLLINGS in the Senate that President Clinton signed, and it went into effect when President Bush took office, President Bush appointed the commissioners. They are about to finish their work and give us a report sometime this fall.

As the gentleman mentioned, there is a separate commission appointed by the Pew Charitable Trust, which my friend and predecessor here in Congress, Leon Panetta, has been chairing when Christy Todd Whitman, the former Chair, went to work for the Bush administration as head of EPA. So we have both of these commissions coming to Congress with really strong recommendations on how we need to update our Nation's marine policies.

So the body of science, the body of politics, by the fact that the commissioners are from all walks of life that relate to the oceans, from the oil interests to the fishing interests to the museum and science interests, they have all been represented; and they all bring a constituency to the plate that is going to deliver these reports.

June 4, on Wednesday, the privately funded Pew Commission will make its report available to the public. Then sometime later in the year the Commission on Ocean Policy will produce its report.

I anticipate that both commissions will have recommendations that we as Members of Congress, recommendations that, as lawmakers, we can incorporate into legislation and change our ocean policy so that indeed we can have a sustainable ocean policy. I think the gentleman more than most Members, and probably more than anyone, really understands the proportionality of sustainability.

I think that word is used so often as to sort of guarantee success, but it is really one of compromise. Essentially, we do not cut out the economic interests in fishing. We more balance them so they can be sustained over time. It is not just, take it all right now and leave nothing for our children or generations ahead.

The whole idea of how we develop these balancing systems is very controversial, because we do have to regulate people that have never been regulated before, or we have to tell people they cannot fish in certain areas that they have been able to fish in without restrictions.

So this is more what they call an ecosystem-based management. We understand a little bit about ecosystems on land. We do not call them that; we call them zoning. We call them master planning for our communities; essentially, where do we want people to live in houses, where do we want the industrial area to be, where do we want to keep it an open space, where we should not go building because of hazardous conditions such as floodplain zones or earthquake zones and so on.

I think we are getting to a point, and I would love to hear the gentleman's reflection on it, that we really need to master-plan our oceans around these ecosystems and around avoiding conflicts of the sea.

We have seen in California, and Maine as well, where we had, before regulation, people who would make their living setting out crab pots or lobster pots at the same place people were dragging for seismic information for oil companies. They would catch the lines of the lobster pots or crab pots and pull them up, and so destroy the income of one fisherperson for the advantage of someone else who was also interested in a resource from the ocean. That is what I call the conflicts of sea. We just need to make sure we understand what people want to do and how they want to use the ocean, and make the regulations so they can use it wisely.

I would really respect the gentleman's thoughts on those issues, because I think the gentleman has been very involved with the city of Portland. As I remember as a young adult studying in Oregon in undergraduate studies and visiting Portland, it was then, to use a phrase we used at home, a city known by its smell. We used to say that about Monterey because of all the canneries. In Portland, you had all of the wood pulp industries and the Willamette River.

We go to Portland today and it is certainly one of the most beautiful cities in America, and one of the best-managed from a transportation standpoint, from a livability standpoint. As far as aesthetics and trees, it is really an example of what we can do with leadership in providing a turnaround in an area. If we can do that for cities in America, we certainly can do it for oceans and nearby communities, nearshore communities under the sea.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, Madam Speaker, in dealing with the analogy to some of our successes on the land and some of our failures.

Sadly, the Stratton Commission in the late 1960s offered up a vision of how we manage the sea that was more of one of exploitation: how did we extract the bounty of the ocean and not deal with the fragility of resources, the finite nature, the impact of technology and mechanization and of many countries industrializing this extraction, instead of it being a small family enterprise, like happened in the beautiful coastal area that the gentleman represents in California, the fisheries that we have seen in the Southwest, in the Northeast as well; the impact of industrialized fishing, for instance.

We need to look at some of our successes, and understanding that we have to balance interests, that we have to look at competing pressures, that we can work together in a cooperative and thoughtful fashion to be able to make sure that everybody is actually better off.

There are certain areas of our land area, one could think that the way that some people howl about wilderness, we would think that most of the United States is off limits; but as the gentleman and I know, it is only about 5 percent, but it is a critical 5 percent.

Mr. FARR. Even then it is not off limits to people who want to access it on foot rather than by motor vehicle.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Absolutely. But what the gentleman has done in his own career in terms of dealing with issues of marine sanctuaries and marine reserves, we need to be able to make sure that there are some areas where the sea can rest, the fisheries can be restored, much like we do with farmland, where, in some of the areas where I think people are justly proud, we have been conserving some of our farmland. We are being able to zone and protect it. We are looking at ways to revitalize it, working with scientists

and with farmers, with citizens. This is part of what needs to happen.

The gentleman went through some of the list of problems that we are facing, like nonpoint pollution. We have problems with point source pollution, like the massive hog farms that we see in some of our coastal States and along some of our major river systems that dump effluent into our waterways.

He has referenced the issue of invasive species. There are problems of aquaculture. If we are not careful, aquaculture will end up, or if it is not done appropriately, it can produce a great deal of not just pollution, but the potential, for example, where we have had areas where there have been tens of thousands of farm-bred salmon escaping into the ocean.

We have had situations where coastal development, where it is not done in a thoughtful and careful way, severely damages fragile bays and estuaries and river habitat, which are important nesting and breeding grounds. It is where fishing stock is restored. It purifies water. We alter that habitat.

Mr. FARR. We have also shown, though, that where we have degraded that habitat to such a point where all known life forms have failed in those systems, they have gotten so polluted, some of those streams, but with good management techniques we have brought those streams back and made them clean; and they now have vibrant fish life.

The point is, we can turn this around. But when we are dealing with the entire ocean, we just cannot turn that around over time. If we have indeed taken all the large species, commercial species on the planet, it is going to take a long time of not fishing some of those species to allow them, the babies, to grow up to be big adults. Some of these fish live for over 100 years, so it is going to be, some places where we set up these marine reserves, we are going to have to put them off limits for fishing for a long time.

On the other hand, when we do clean up areas and set these reserves, they allow this sort of abundance to return; fish do not know where those boundary lines are. They hang out outside the boundary lines. Then that becomes an opportunity for the commercial activity to be done.

We have in our area a national marine estuary, the largest in California, known as the Elkhorn Slough. Right next to the Elkhorn Slough is one of the largest power plants in California, a Duke Energy gas-fired natural gas plant which used to burn oil and now burns natural gas.

That big industrial complex has worked out a management system with this fragile ecosystem so they can be co-partners in the sustainability of the ecosystem, not one preventing the other from happening.

□ 2245

It is a partnership that has been worked out and is constantly being updated as a sound management practice. Those are the kinds of examples I would like to set because I think so often people hear that if there is a problem, we are just going to shut down somebody or people are going to lose their jobs if we go about this. And I think what the reports are going to say is that this does not have to be a lose-lose or win-lose; it can be a win-win.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is compelling. He has seen examples of cooperative action with fisheries' interests in the State of California. We have seen in the Pacific Northwest, particularly in Alaska, there are some pretty good examples of where these independent fisher-people have been able to work together in a cooperative fashion with the scientists, with government, to be able to make a difference.

The ocean can heal. Fishing stocks can be replenished. We saw what happened to the North Atlantic fishing stocks during World War II. Sadly, it was a war that disrupted the fishing, but the fish nonetheless came back under a combination of thoughtful policies, reducing the catch, managing the resource, having areas that are protected; and the United States controls more surface area of oceans in terms of our zone of influence than any other country in the world. It is a half again larger than the entire surface area of the United States.

It is a tremendous opportunity to strategically allow these species to recover.

Mr. FARR. Let me elaborate a little bit on that. By treaty, we have created the special economic zones, and these economic zones on the oceans go out from the shoreline 200 miles; and why the United States, more than any other country in the world, has larger EEZ is because we have in our territory, in our trust islands in the Pacific, we are all very much aware of Guam and the Hawaiian Islands, but we go through the Marshall Islands and American Samoa, and each one of those islands having a 200-mile radius makes the United States interests in the ocean even greater than any other country in the world.

This is where I think we have to provide leadership in being able to provide these ecosystem-based management plans, and in order to do that, it is going to take an act of Congress. It is going to take new laws in this country.

As we stand here tonight, we are probably at one of the best moments in recent history to be able to have all this scientific knowledge flowing to us. With the release of the Pew report and the commission's report later on this year, Congress will be better informed on what it should do, what it needs to do more than ever before in history.

My hope is that we, in a bipartisan way, because certainly I do not think we need to have partisan fights about it. We had a lot of discussion here sort of on the takings issue on land ownership and whose responsibility it is, whether the government has a right to go onto someone's land to understand what kind of species or wildlife are living on their land. That does not happen in the oceans. The oceans are not owned privately. There are certainly not real estate developments in the ocean, other than oil leases, and those are leases from the Federal Government. So we are the manager.

It seems to me that we, in a collective way, can really provide not only a future for this planet, which breathes from the ocean, and where weather is all initiated in the ocean, but also provide a healthy management system so that our children and grandchildren can enjoy not only the oceans and the bounty of the seas, but also have health and safety, a life of being able to go to beaches that are safe and so on.

This is our responsibility. We are the trustees elected to develop the Federal law, given that trust by our voters and, I think, by the world, by the fact that we have so much of the ocean at stake, to really do sound management; and hopefully, we will take the recommendations of the Pew Foundation and the government commission and put them into law this year. Hopefully, the administration will enthusiastically support those recommendations and help us lobby them through Congress.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's observation, and I think he is correct. We can sit here and talk in ominous tones about some of the very negative things that have occurred, and it truly is disturbing, but there is better information, greater awareness.

We have the United States population concentrated in the coastal areas in a way that we have not seen since the founding of the republic.

The gentleman mentioned some of the work of the Pew Oceans Commission. It is not just the report that is coming forth in the next 36 hours, but there are some fantastic science reports that the commission has contracted with a distinguished group of scientists and expects to write reports outlining some of the major threats to coastal and ocean resources, offering recommendations for addressing the threats from the perspective of science, the professionals, to assist their own commissioners in forming this report to help the Bush administration and Congress meet its responsibilities.

I had a chance to review, as I know the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has, the materials, Managing Marine Fisheries in the United States; Ecological Effects of Fishing in Marine Ecosystems; Marine Reserves, a powerful tool for ecosystem management and conservation from a professor at Stanford University. They have dealt with, in a realistic way, the best report I have seen, on marine pollution, both accomplishments and future challenges, an area that the gentleman and

I have been working on in our own respective spheres of influence now for over 20 years, dealing with coastal sprawl, the impact that urban design has on aquatic ecosystems in our country.

The gentleman has been a champion, I know, in terms of the California Coastal Conservation Commission, the work that he has done as a local county commissioner, as a legislator and here in Congress; and then there is great research on invasive species and the impact of marine aquaculture, looking at the environmental impacts and policy options.

Having these reports available to us to go along with the two commissions, the work here in Congress and, most important, to be able to raise the awareness of the public, he is 200 percent correct. The ocean belongs to us all. No single person owns those rights. It is truly an international problem, but the United States has the greatest leverage. Not only are we the richest Nation, but we have more control over oceans than any other country. It cries out for that sort of cooperative solution.

Mr. FARR. That interesting, cooperative solution is done by, in congratulations to the gentleman as a representative from Oregon, that the Oregon State University, along with the University of California in Santa Cruz, that is in my District; the Long Marine Lab, that is in my District; the Hopkins Marine Lab which is my district; and the University of California at Santa Barbara; and Stanford University are all participating in this consortium known as the Partnership for Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans, and in fact, they call themselves PISCO, and I understand they have a Web site. It is a pretty easy one. It is just www.piscoweb.org, and those publications are put up on that Web site as they come out.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Truly phenomenal resources for individual citizens or policy-makers that want to be able to understand what these challenges are.

The gentleman referenced the outstanding program at Oregon State University. Dr. Jane Lubchenco is one of the members of the Pew Commission who will be with us here in Washington, D.C., this week, not only with the announcement of the Pew Report and with our friend Leon Panetta, the Chair, but will be meeting with men and women here on Capitol Hill.

The approach is simple: Deal with the information that is available to us; change the philosophy from one of exploitation which, sadly, we have not been able for a variety of forces to do something on public lands in this country. Sadly, the Mining Act of 1872 exists virtually identically to the bill that was signed into law by President Ulysses S. Grant 131 years ago. This is an opportunity for us to move past that, changing the philosophy from one of exploitation to one of conservation and protection.

To be able to reduce the pressures on fisheries and environment, these are things that are within our power. We do not have to wait. What just happened in Canada where the cod fisheries collapsed and they had to stop all fishing because it got to the point where they had verged on destroying the species. It does not have to get to that point.

Being able to focus on protection of coastal areas, and in many cases what we need to do to protect those estuaries, those rivers, those beach fronts are exactly the same thing that our communities are crying out for to protect against sprawl, congestion, bad air and loss of open space. So we will be able to satisfy the needs of the ocean by listening to our constituents right now.

Being able to make the marine sanctuaries, which really are not sanctuaries, transform them into real reserves and connect them in a system so that the fish can migrate from one to another, and as the gentleman mentioned a moment ago, very important, the fish do not recognize the boundaries. So, in effect, we will be reseeding the oceans.

Finally, a commitment of the United States to international leadership. Maybe we can start by ratifying the convention of the oceans.

Mr. FARR. Treaty of the seas, law of the seas, something our Navy is very interested in having ratified. The Senate failed to do that many years ago. I have suggested that the Senate ought to revisit that, particularly with the Navy's interest in it, and hopefully we can get it ratified so that we can be a partner with all the other coastal nations around the world.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Could the gentleman comment on the significance of our failure to have ratified this 210 years ago?

Mr. FARR. I think what happens now, according to a spokesperson for the Navy that I talked to several years ago, was that we have dozens of Navy research vessels which are owned and operated by the Navy, but the operators are mostly contract marine scientists, marine biologists who go out and do the deep ocean exploration and near shore exploration. When we go into these economic zones of other countries we have to go there with their permission. These are military vessels, and without signing a law of the sea, we have no protocols for, if a country decides, well, we think you are spying on us or we think we do not like the work you are doing or you are not sharing it with us enough.

There are always efforts to do that, but nonetheless, if there is a problem, we have no way of getting out of the problem because we are not a signatory to the treaty which lays out a protocol for what we can and cannot do with these research vessels, and that, if indeed there is a question, how we can resolve those disputes.

So we could conceivably get into a military situation because of a seizing of one of our research vessels which has nothing but scientists aboard, and that should be avoided. We need to sign the law treaty as soon as possible.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that explanation and the gentleman's continued leadership. As one of the cochairs of the coastal caucus.

Mr. FARR. The Oceans Caucus.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The Oceans Caucus.

Mr. FARR. Quite all right. Coastal caucus is just as well.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It was some of my colleagues, particularly providing coastal leadership, I get confused, I apologize, but bringing this to the forefront. I appreciate the gentleman's career-long commitment to being able to protect these treasures.

Mr. FARR. Let me say something. I think that before our lifetimes are over we are going to see the ability to rent a vehicle where a person can drive under the sea. They can drive in the sea.

□ 2300

And that will really open up this massive amount of territory on this planet to people who have never been able to see it before.

The technology of getting people down in the water is merging at a very fast rate. Remember, it is much more difficult to go deep than it is to go high. When you go into outerspace, you are just going from zero atmospheric pressure, from 14 pounds atmospheric pressure to zero. When you are going down, it gets harder and harder. And as you have seen, when these researchers have put a little Styrofoam coffee cup with your name on it and put it out in those research vessels, it comes back literally the size of a thimble. That is what the pressure is. So it is much more difficult to get down into the ocean. But they are developing technology where you can go down to 4,000 feet in civilian clothes without a lot of training to essentially allow people who are not scientists to be able to get access to the oceans.

We need underwater artists, we need poets, we need music writers, we need the rest of society to be able to explore the oceans, as well as our marine scientists; and so I thank the gentleman for his leadership in scheduling this Special Order tonight and for inviting me to speak.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I was going to give the gentleman one last word, if I might, because the gentleman wears another hat here in Congress. Well, actually he wears a number of them, but one I know he has spent a lot of time on is the Travel and Tourism Caucus. The gentleman cochairs this with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and the two of you have a commitment, in part I think because your two States have economies that are dramatically impacted by tourism, and I wondered if the gentleman wanted to just make one brief comment about the connection. I know it sounds

a little crass, but we are suffering some difficult economic times now.

Mr. FARR. What is interesting about tourism is, why do people go into the outdoors? It is really to experience the outdoors. And how is that? It is not just the beautiful shapes of mountains and trees and natural forms; it is also the wildlife.

We were able to successfully recover a sea otter herd. The sea otter was thought to be extinct. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a marine scientist discovered them off Big Sur, kept them a secret, because there were no laws in place to protect them; but now that they have been protected by Federal law, the sea otter population has come back. It has, unfortunately, had some setbacks this year with disease, and perhaps with too many boats in the habitat; but that sea otter population on the California coastline is now a multimillion dollar industry, watching sea otters. And who makes money off of that? Certainly they do not. But people who make T-shirts, who make mugs, who make jewelry, who take photographs, who provide boat trips, who do interpretive studies.

The point is that the wildlife can be one of our most viable economic industries if we manage it well. And that is what this is all about; it is trying to have a planet. Here we are discussing so much of how do the people on this globe get along, but the people cannot survive on this globe without nature getting along and at least us understanding how not to just take from nature but also to give back and to manage appropriately so that we can have sustainable oceans, sustainable lands, and hopefully sustainable populations of people that will get along living in peace and being able to enjoy this planet. I think that is what this is all about.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's eloquence. I think that says it all.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to spend a few minutes focusing on what is going to be a big week here on Capitol Hill, focusing on this unique opportunity to deal with the attention that it deserves to protect our oceans, to be able to bring people together across the country, different philosophies, different geographies, different political parties to understand the opportunities to protect our quality of life. By doing the things we need to do on the land and in terms of our habits under the sea, we can restore the vibrance of our fisheries, and we can protect the quality of the tourist experience. We can have the regenerative power of these waterways, and we can make sure that we flex some of our problem-solving muscles that can help us in the international arena and here at home on larger issues of war and peace and climate change.

So I appreciate the opportunity to share this information this evening.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of family illness.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and until 4:00 p.m. June 3 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Washington (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal matters.

Mr. BEREUTER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of the birth of Charles Wilson Ryan on May 30, 2003.

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. EMANUEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. SIMMONS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 858. An act to extend the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 878. An act to authorize an additional permanent judgeship in the district of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences; to the Committee on International relations.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

H.R. 2185. An act to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on May 23, 2003 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.J. Res. 51. Increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

H.R. 2. To provide the reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

H.R. 1298. To provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2185. To extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2367. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Official Performance and Procedural Requirements for Grain Weighing Equipment and Related Grain Handling Systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2368. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Bioenergy Program (RIN: 0560-AG84) received May 19, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2369. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Capital Adequacy (RIN: 3052-AC05) received April 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2370. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 00-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2371. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, Case Number 01-03, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2372. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert W. Noonan Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2373. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Toney M. Bucchi, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2374. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the retirement of Lieutenant General Peter M. Cuviello, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2375. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the retirement of General Lester L. Lyles, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2376. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Banking and Finance, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Terrorism Risk Insurance Program (RIN: 1505-AA98) received April 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2377. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Delegation of Enforcement Authority Regarding the Foreign Bank Account Report Requirements (RIN: 1506-AA45) received May 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2378. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Filings [Docket No. 03-06] (RIN: 1557-AC13) April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2379. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Requirements for Insurance — received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2380. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2381. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Office of the Chief Accountant, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improper Influence on Conduct of Audits [Release Nos. 34-47890; IC-26050; FR-71; File No. S7-39-02] (RIN: 3235-AI67) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2382. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of alph-methyltryptamine and 5-methoxy-N, N-diisopropyltryptamine into Schedule I [Docket No. DEA-238F] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2383. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Benzylpiperazine and Trifluoromethylphenylpiperazine Into Schedule I [DEA-226F] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2384. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Rescheduling of Buprenorphine From Schedule V to Schedule III [DEA-225F] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2385. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispensing of Controlled Substances to Assist Suicide [AG Order No. 2534-2001] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2386. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Excluded Veterinary Anabolic Steroid Implant Products [DEA-2301] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2387. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Exempt Anabolic Steroid Products [DEA-2361] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2388. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Opioid Drugs in Maintenance and Detoxification Treatment of Opiate Addiction; Addition of Buprenorphine and Buprenorphine Combinition to List of Approved Opioid Treatment Medications (RIN: 0910-AA52) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2389. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program: Revisions and Additions to the Vaccine Injury Table (RIN: 0906-AA55) received May 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2390. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service of Process: Amendment for Materials Related to Petitions Under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program — received May 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2391. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting he Department's final rule — Tobacco Regulation and Maintenance of effort Reporting Requirements for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Bloc k Grant Applications — received May 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2392. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final report entitled, ''The Future Supply of Long-Term Care Workers In Relation To The Aging Baby Boom Generation''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2393. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of 2,5-dimethoxy-4-(n)—propylthiophenethylamine Into Schedule I [DEA-225F] received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2394. A letter from the Senior Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reporting of Information and Documents About Potential Defects; Defect and Noncompliance Reports [Docket No. NHTSA 2001-8677; Notice 4] (RIN: 2127-AI92) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Arab Emirates and Canada [Transmittal No. DDTC 031-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Republic of Korea [Transmittal No. DDTC 033-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2397. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Mexico [Transmittal No. DDTC 025-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2398. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed

Manufacturing License Agreement with Poland [Transmittal No. DDTC 017-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2399. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iraqi Sanctions Regulations; Authorizations of Non-Commercial Funds Transfers and Related Transactions, Activities by the U.S. Government and its Contractors or Grantees, Privately Financed Humanitarian Transactions, and Certain Exports and Reexports to Iraq received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2400. A letter from the President and CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's draft legislation entitled, ''Overseas Private Investment Corporation Amendments Act of 2003''; to the Committee on International Relations.

2401. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for October 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2402. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation — received April 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2403. A letter from the Human Resource Specialist, Department of Labor, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2404. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''$1 Million Lease and Proposed $12.5 Million Purchase of 4800 Addison Road: An Example of Misfeasance and Malfeasance''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2405. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Procurements for Defense Against or Recovery from Terrorism or Nuclear, Biological, Chemical or Radiological Attack [FAC 2001-12; FAR Case 2002-026] (RIN: 9000-AJ54) received February 6, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2406. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Special Counsel for Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1211; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2407. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the updated Annual Report of the Office of Special Counsel for Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1211; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2408. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Revisions to Definition of Length Overall of a Vessel; Correction [Docket No. 030414085-3085-01; I.D. 012601B] (RIN: 0648-AR04) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2409. A letter from the Undersecretary, Emergency Preparedness and Response, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that funding under title V of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded $5 million as a result of the record/near record snowstorms, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2410. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulfport Channel, Gulfport Mississippi [COTP Mobile-02-023] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2411. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Captain of the Port Chicago Zone [CGD09-03-203] (RIN: 1626-AA00) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2412. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulfport, Mississippi, Pascagoula, MS, and Mobile, AL [COTP Mobile-02-020] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2413. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-082] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2414. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-083] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2415. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-084] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2416. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-085] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2417. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-086] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2418. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-088] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2419. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, Virginia [CGD05-02-089] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2420. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, VA [CGD05-02-094] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2421. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, Elizabeth River, VA [CGD05-02-104] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2422. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia [CGD05-02-096] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2423. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Norfolk Harbor Entrance Reach Channel, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton Roads, VA [CGD05-02-105] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2424. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Jacinto River, Houston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-02-020] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2425. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Jacinto River, Houston, Texas [COTP Houston-Galveston -02-021] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2426. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Jacinto River, Houston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-02-022] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2427. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Jacinto River, Houston, TX [COTP Houston-Galveston-02-023] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2428. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 02-149] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2429. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 02-150] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2430. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; St. Johns River, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Jacksonville, FL [COTP Jacksonville 02-129] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2431. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 98.0 to 99.0, Berwick, LA [COTP Morgan City-02-008] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2432. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 173.0 to 175.0, Forked Island LA [COTP Morgan City-02-010] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2433. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 86.0 to 88.0, and the Morgan City Port Allen Landside Route Mile 0.0 to Mile 1.0, Amelia, LA [COTP Morgan City-02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2434. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 51.5 to 52.5, Cape Girardeau, Missouri [COTP Paducah, KY 02-011] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2435. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 51.5 to 52.5, Cape Girardeau, Missouri [COTP Paducah, KY 02-012] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2436. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 51.5 to 52.5, Cape Girardeau, Missouri [COTP Paducah, KY 02-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2437. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulfport, Mississippi [COTP Mobile-02-021] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2438. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pascagoula River, Pascagoula, Mississippi [COTP Mobile-02-018] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2439. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.4 to Mile Marker 0.8, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania [COTP Pittsburgh-02-026] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2440. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami, FL [COTP Miami 02-152] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2441. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Miami River, Miami, FL [COTP Miami 02-114] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2442. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bay Front Park New Years Fireworks, Miami Beach, FL [COTP Miami 02-138] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2443. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Boca Boat Parade, New River, Fort Lauderdale, FL [COTP Miami 02-137] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2444. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Adjacent to National City Marine Terminal, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 02-025] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2445. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Waters Adjacent to National City Marine Terminal, San Diego, CA [COTP San Diego 02-027] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2446. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, M/V WESTWOOD RAINIER Listing, West Waterway Duwamish River, Elliott Bay, WA [CGD13-02-017] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2447. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulations, M/V WESTWOOD RAINIER Listing, West Waterway Duwamish River, Elliott Bay, WA [CGD13-02-012] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2448. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Raccoon Creek, NJ [CGD05-02-065] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2449. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disaster Unemployment Assistance Program (RIN: 1205-AB31) received April 22, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2450. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Waivers of the Coastwise Trade Laws for Eligible Vessels (RIN: 2133-AB49) received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2451. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Limitations on the Issuance of Commercial Driver's Licenses with a Hazardous Materials Endorsement [Docket No. FMCSA-2001-11117] (RIN: 2126-AA70) received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2452. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indian Reservation Roads Bridge Program [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-98-4743] ((RIN: 2125-AE57) received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2453. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad-Highway Projects [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-97-2681] (FHWA RIN: 2125-AD86) received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2454. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Surplus Military Airplanes Manufactured by Consolidated, Consolidated Vultee, and Convair [Docket No. 2003-NM-23-AD; Amendment 39-13126; AD 2003-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2455. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30366; Amdt. No. 3056] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2456. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30365; Amdt. No. 3055] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2457. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003-NM-88-AD; Amendment 39-13121; AD 2003-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2458. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Angel Fire Airport, Angel Fire, NM [Airspace Docket No. 2001-ASW-13] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2459. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E suface area airspace; and modification of Class D airspace; Topeka, Forbes Field, KS [Docket No. FAA-2002-14348; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-5] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2460. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E surface area airspace; and modification of Class D airspace; Topeka, Forbes Field, KS [Docket No. FAA-2002-14348; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-5] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2461. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace, Rome, NY [Docket No. FAA-2003-14735; Airspace Docket No. 03-AEA-02] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2462. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace at Richfield Municipal Airport, Richfield, UT [Airspace Docket No. FAA-01-ANM-16] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2463. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30364; Amdt. No. 3054] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2464. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30363; Amdt. No. 3053] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2465. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.6 to Mile Marker 0.9, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania [COTP Pittsburgh-02-027] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2466. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Ankeny, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14428; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-8] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2467. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Greater Miami New Years Fireworks, Miami Beach, FL [COTP Miami 02-139] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 15, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2468. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Clarinda, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14459; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-12] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2469. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Larned, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-14458; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-11] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2470. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Herington, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-14457; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-10] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2471. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D Airspace; and modification of Class E Airspace; Topeka, Philip Billard Municipal Airport, KS [Docket No. FAA-2003-14347; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-4] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2472. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Ames, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14427; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-7] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2473. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class E Airspace; Lebanon, MO [Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-6] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2474. A letter from the Programn Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airpace; Cherokee, IA [Docket No. FAA-2003-14429; Airspace Docket No. 03-ACE-9] received May 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2475. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Rule; Notice of Information Collection Approval [Docket No. RSPA-02-12064 (HM-232)] (RIN: 2137-AD67) received May 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2476. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities: Evaluation of Tinnitus (RIN: 2900-AK86) received May 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2477. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems and Fiscal Year 2003 Rates; Correction [CMS-1203-CN] (RIN: 0938-AL23) received May 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2478. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Independent Business Purpose (Rev. Rul. 2003-52) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2479. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2002-73) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2480. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Independent Business Purpose (Rev. Rul. 2003-55) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2481. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2003-14] received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2482. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Medical, dental, etc., expenses (Rev. Rul. 2003-57) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2483. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Earned Income Credit and Tribal Child Placements [Notice 2003-28] received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2484. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2485. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2003-38) received May 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2486. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on state payment limitations for medicare cost-sharing, pursuant to Public Law 106—554, section 125 (114 Stat. 2763A—479); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

2487. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Toward a Bundled Outpatient Medicare End Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System,'' pursuant to Public Law 106—554, section 422(c)(2) (114 Stat. 2763A—517); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

2488. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Evaluation of the Community Nursing Organization Demonstration Final Report; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of May 22, 2003]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 21. A bill to prevent the use

of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–51 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 193. Resolution reaffirming support of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and anticipating the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987 (the Proxmire Act) on November 4, 2003 (Rept. 108–130). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted on June 2, 2003]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 361. A bill to designate certain conduct by sports agents relating to the signing of contracts with student athletes as unfair and deceptive acts or practices to be regulated by the Federal Trade Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 108–24, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 4. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 108–131). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1474. A bill to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1474. A bill to facilitate check trucation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2143. A bill to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for lawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Referred to the Committee on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1082. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 46 East Ohio Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Birch Bayl Federal Building and United States Courthouse'' (Rept. 108–134). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 703. An act to designate the regional headquarters building for the National Park Service under construction in Omaha, Nebraska, as the ''Carl T. Curtis National Park Service Midwest Regional Headquarters Building'' (Rept. 108–135). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 255. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 108–136). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 658 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1346 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred May 23, 2003]

H.R. 1562. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than June 13, 2003.

[Submitted June 2, 2003]

H.R. 180. Referral to the Committee on the Budget extended for a period ending not later than July 25, 2003.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2282. A bill to amend the provisions of titles 5 and 28, United States Code, relating to equal access to justice, award of reasonable costs and fees, and administrative settlement offers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 2283. A bill to provide for the creation of an additional category of laborers or mechanics known as helpers under the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H.R. 2284. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to States for assistance in hiring additional school-based mental health and student service providers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BUYER):

H.R. 2285. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Labor to provide staffing at military installations overseas to carry out employment counseling under the Transition Assistance Program for persons separating from active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 2286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase partial refundability of the child tax credit, to provide that pay received by members of the Armed Forces while serving in Iraq or other combat zones will be taken into account in determining eligibility for partial refundability of the child tax credit, to accelerate marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. NEY):

H.R. 2287. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on the ability of qualified dental officers in the uniformed services to receive additional special pay while undergoing dental internship or residency training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2288. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the prorating of Medicaid beneficiary contributions in the case of partial coverage of nursing facility services during a month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2289. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for projects to construct fences or other barriers to prevent public access to tracks and other hazards of fixed guideway systems in residential areas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2290. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly benefits for certain uninsured children living without parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 2291. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend loan forgiveness for certain loans to Head Start teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 2292. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for promoting good health, disease prevention, and wellness and for the prevention of secondary conditions for persons with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2293. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to prevent government

agencies from requiring or prohibiting employers in the construction industry to enter into agreements with labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to delay the termination of the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2295. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to advanced practice nurses under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 2296. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for certain amenities and personal comforts in the Federal prison system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2297. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify and improve certain benefits for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 2298. A bill to amend section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to ensure improved access to employment opportunities for low-income people; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 2299. A bill to authorize assistance through eligible nongovernmental organizations to remove and dispose of unexploded ordnance in agriculturally-valuable lands in developing countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2300. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve the collection of child support arrears in interstate cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

49. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 31 memorializing the United States Congress to maintain Title IX, the Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

50. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 208 memorializing the United States Congress to recognize the meritorious aspects and the successes of the Head Start program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

51. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 28 memorializing the United States Congress to fully fund the Millennium Challenge Account to enable poor and hungry people around the globe to become self-reliant; to the Committee on International Relations.

52. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 33 memorializing the United States Congress to fully fund the Millennium Challenge Account to enable poor and hungry people around the globe become self-reliant; to the Committee on International Relations.

53. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 34 memorializing the United States Congress to support a ban on the global gag rule; to the Committee on International Relations.

54. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 10 memorializing the United States Congress to recognize the political relationship between the United States government and the indigenous Hawaiian people in a similar manner afforded to Native Americans and Alaska natives; to the Committee on Resources.

55. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 21 memorializing the United States Congress that actions recently taken by the federal government pose a threat to the human rights, civil liberties, and constitutional protections of the residents of this State, and run the very serious risk of destroying freedom, security, and prosperity in a misguided attempt to save them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

56. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 121 memorializing the United States Congress to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the federal courts regarding the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 75 memorializing the United States Congress to support the passage of S. 68 to improve benefits for certain Filipino veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

58. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 6 memorializing the United States Congress to repeal the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide the taxation of Social Security income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

59. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 39 memorializing the United States Congress to review and consider eliminating the GPO and WEP social security benefit reductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 59 memorializing the United States Congress to demonstrate our nation's commitment to human rights by ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Energy and Commerce.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 208 memorializing the United States Congress that the Bush Administration and the United States Congress are requested to appropriate financial impact assistance for health, education, and other social services for Hawaii's Freely Associated States Citizens; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

62. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 176 memorializing the United States Congress to take specific actions to help the airlines serving the State in the event of a war; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BEAUPREZ and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 58: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 168: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 193: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 195: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 196: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 199: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 218: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. JANKLOW.

H.R. 303: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 348: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 361: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 369: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 401: Mr. OTTER, Mr. COLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 442: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 463: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 466: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 502: Mr. BURR and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 528: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 533: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 584: Mr. BURGESS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 623: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 685: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. MAJETTE.

H.R. 713: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 737: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 738: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 745: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 759: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 771: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 785: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 786: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 800: Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 813: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 816: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 817: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 819: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 844: Mr. ROSS and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 870: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 879: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 880: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 886: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 898: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 935: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. BELL.

H.R. 965: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 969: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 972: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 983: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 992: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 993: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 994: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 998: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1004: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1031: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1034: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1042: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1043: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1077: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1105: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1115: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1117: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1118: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1120: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1125: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HALL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1155: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1179: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1191: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 1199: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1205: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1209: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABO, Mr. WATT, Mr. FORD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 1212: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1219: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 1225: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1251: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 1259: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1260: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1264: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1267: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1268: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1276: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. VITTER, Mr. OSBORNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1285: Mr. FARR, Mr. FORD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1286: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1315: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1321: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennslvania, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1332: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1340: Ms. LEE, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1351: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1359: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1372: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. MATHESON, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1377: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1385: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1418: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1421: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1426: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1428: Mr. PORTER and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1472: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1479: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1483: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. BROWN, of Ohio.
H.R. 1508: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1532: Mr. WU, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1565: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1580: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1581: Mr. GOODE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1614: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 1628: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1634: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1652: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BALLANCE.
H.R. 1677: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1694: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1695: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1700: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1708: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1709: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1713: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1716: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1723: Mr. HINOJOSA and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1734: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1742: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1767: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1769: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1783: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1784: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1814: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1819: Mrs. NORTHUP.
H.R. 1828: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 1838: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1852: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1858: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1863: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1874: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 1906: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1910: Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. REYES, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 1912: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1926: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1955: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1964: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1981: Mr. ROSS and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1999: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2012: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2020: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HALL, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 2023: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2028: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOSS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2030: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2031: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2032: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2046: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2066: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2075: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 2079: Mr. THOMAS and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2096: Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. OTTER, Mr. Alexander, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 2114: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2123: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2154: Mr. TANCREDO and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2157: Mr. STARK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2193: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2203: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2212: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BACA, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2213: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2235: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2250: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2264: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 2265: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.J. Res. 4: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. CARTER.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. FORD.
H. Con. Res. 86: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 99: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. COSTELLO.
H. Con. Res. 169: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Con. Res. 174: Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 195: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 196: Mr. NADLER.
H. Con. Res. 200: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 38: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H. Res. 60: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 66: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H. Res. 121: Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H. Res. 136: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Res. 159: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Res. 218: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. SERRANO.
H. Res. 237: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.