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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

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

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Once again, today's prayer will be offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Campbell Gillon of Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Lord God, in a world where power usually rules by subjection and oppression, we stand before Thee whose rule, if lovingly accepted, raises us to a new freedom of living and spirit of hope.

We remember the story of Moses giving the Pharaoh Thy word, which was not just a plea for freedom—''Let my people go!'', but ''Let my people go that they may worship Me, serve Me!''—freedom for a purpose.

Teach us, O God, that when freedom is made an end in itself, and not the means to a greater end, it easily degenerates into license and self pleasing. The finale is not freedom, but community destroyed and people self-enslaved.

Lord, we know that those Israelites, when freed, were given by Thee in the wilderness a purpose—to live by those basic commandments, rules for peace and harmony. These we neglect at our peril. For if no divine nature, name, and day is shown reverence and there is not respect for parents, life, relationships, property, and truth, then a society disintegrates from within, since there is no reverence and respect for anything but the solitary self.

Lord God, unless Thou build humanity's house, those who try labor in vain. Unless Thou guard a civilization's city, its protectors are caught napping. So, grant grace to this elected body of Senators, leaders in this superpower, that they may be led to use aright our freedom's dear-bought opportunities, aware of ends beyond the material and the visions that make life noble. This we ask in the name of love revealed. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m. At 1 o'clock, the Senate will then resume consideration of S. 14, the Energy bill. The chairman and the ranking member will be here and will be prepared for Members to come forward with their amendments over the course of today. This is an important piece of legislation that will enhance the energy security of this Nation. I expect that the Senate will make substantial progress on this important bill this week.

As I announced previously, no roll-call votes will occur during today's session. However, Members will be able to offer amendments. I encourage them to do so. Any votes ordered on those amendments will be scheduled to occur during tomorrow's session.

Also this week the Senate will need to address the Defense authorization bill that will be received from the House shortly. Prior to the recess, we finished action on the Senate bill; however, we still need to dispose of a few remaining amendments prior to going to conference with the House. That should take only a couple of hours. We will likely consider that bill one night this week after we spend the day on the consideration of the Energy bill. I will keep my colleagues advised as to what evening that will be.

In addition, we have continued to try to reach agreements on the FAA reauthorization and the State Department reauthorization bills. At some point we will have to proceed to those matters even if we are unable to reach a consent agreement for their consideration.

I should also mention there are a number of Executive Calendar nominations that have been pending for a long period of time. Oftentimes these nominations get caught up in other issues. Again, at some point, I will proceed to the consideration of those nominations that have been pending for a while. If Members want to debate a particular nominee, they will need to come to the Senate floor to do so.

In addition to the items I just mentioned, we have a number of other important issues to address, one of which is prescription drug benefits and strengthening and improving our Medicare Program for 35 million seniors and a million individuals with disabilities. I have stated for a number of weeks—in fact, for the last couple of months—that we will be addressing this particular issue, an issue that is important to the American people, both those who are seniors now, those soon to be seniors, and future generations, and we will be addressing that this month. Much of that activity begins in the Finance Committee this week—in fact, today there are discussions going on—and each and every day from now until we bring it to the floor. We plan on bringing that to the floor in 2 weeks.

Having said that, I look forward to a busy and productive legislative period prior to the next scheduled adjournment. A number of people are coming back into town today after a period of a week being primarily at their homes with their constituencies across the United States of America. We are hopping right into the Energy bill today

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

and through this week, followed by a number of issues this week. We will begin the appropriations process very quickly and spend a focused period of time on prescription drugs and strengthening and improving Medicare.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 1 p.m. with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, although it is morning business, I will talk about the energy policy we will be considering later today and for the rest of the week. I am delighted we are going to work on that. We have been working on an energy policy for some time. We worked on it last year and passed it in the Senate and the House. Unfortunately, the system we used did not produce results and did not go through the committees; therefore, we had problems when we got to the conference committee.

This year, we are back again and more committed to complete our work than we were last year. We should be. When we think about life, work, and the economy, what is more important than energy? Whatever we are doing, wherever we are, whether we are driving, riding, reading, cooking, energy is consumed. It is certainly something we need to think about, how it affects our lives and what impact we can have on energy.

What we are talking about is an energy policy. It is important to remember that. We are not talking about an issue that needs to be resolved, a part of the energy issue that needs to be resolved this week or this month. We are talking about an energy policy. As we talk about it, I am hopeful we can try to see a vision of where we want to be in the future, what is necessary to be successful in the future, and that we can set this policy in terms of what we need to do 10 or 15 years from now. As we move toward that and make immediate decisions we can gauge whether or not these decisions are useful in achieving the goals we have set for ourselves. I think it is very important that we take a look at all the aspects of energy. We have gotten ourselves into a position where we have to rely about 60 percent on imports of oil from an area in the world that is very unsettled. So I think it is important that we take a look at conservation, that we look at alternatives, that we look at research, that we look at domestic production, so we can find a policy for the future.

As you will recall, one of the first things President Bush and Vice President CHENEY moved toward when they came into office was to set an energy policy, to begin to look ahead at what we need to be doing. They still, of course, are very involved in that.

To achieve the kind of lifestyle we want in the 21st century, we have to have reliable energy and a clean environment. These two needs are not necessarily conflicting. We have to deal with them so they do fit together. They can.

We need to modernize conservation. We obviously use more energy than is necessary. Sometimes we could make those changes just by our use. We can make changes by using different kinds of equipment.

We need to modernize our infrastructure. Energy production has changed over the years, whether it is gas that is produced in the West and the markets are in the Midwest or in the East, where you have to have a way to get it there. We see more and more energy produced by merchant generators, ready for markets a good ways away from the generator, where you have to have transmission.

We have to increase our supplies. We are going to be using more and more energy, of course. That includes renewables. Excluding hydro, now renewables only amount to about 3 percent of our total energy use. That is not very much. There are great opportunities to do more.

As we do it, we need to upgrade and increase our improvements for the protection of the environment.

Of course, the thing that has become much more apparent to us lately is the need for security. So as we talk about energy, we have to look at security. We have to achieve energy independence for our economy. Certainly we will feel much more comfortable if we are less reliant on importing what we use. Oil and fossil fuels produce about 85 percent of the energy used in the United States. As I said, if you include hydro, then renewables get up to about 7 percent, but it is still a relatively small amount. There is more we can do about that.

We have needed a policy. I come from a State that is sort of a foundation for much of the energy we use, particularly fossil fuels, gas and coal. Wyoming is a place where there is a great deal of that. We are third in the Nation in coal reserves. We provide 14 percent of U.S. coal. We rank seventh in oil production. We have reserves as well for oil and gas. So we have to do some things a little differently than we have.

For instance, coal is our largest resource of fossil fuel. If we are going to use it increasingly, as I think we should, particularly for the generation of electricity, then we need to continue to work to make it clean. We need to have clean air. We need to have clear skies. We can produce cleaner-burning coal or in some instances we are looking at ways where perhaps you take coal and produce hydrogen. That makes it a little easier to transport. It makes it cleaner. Those are things we have to look forward to, and that we can do.

Regarding the carbon that escapes into the air, we are looking at ways of carbon sequestration, putting it back in the ground. We can do that. But we have to have more experiments; we have to have more research. We have to have goals as to where we are going.

In terms of infrastructure, I mentioned if you are going to move electricity, you have to have transmission. I understand that often transmission is not what people like to have in their backyards. Nevertheless, it has to be there. We had a good example of the problems with that in California a couple of years ago, where you knew the demand was there, the supply was somewhere else, and you had to get it to the market.

As I mentioned, our attempt last year to move into some of these areas did not succeed. We did not go through the process as we have this year. We have had hearings. We have had committees. I thank Senator DOMENICI for keeping us on the right track to do that.

So what kind of policy? We need to have some fuel diversity. We need to have different kinds of fuel. We are looking at hydrogen; I suppose we are looking at solar; we are looking at wind power. Many of those are available but, frankly, they are not economical at this time. We have to do that. We have to strike a balance, as we move forward, with the environment.

So there is much that can in fact be done. In this energy policy we will be considering, we have a title on coal. That is mostly to do some experiments on how that can be used cleaner or how it can be transformed. We are going to do something with Indian energy so the reservations can produce more energy than they have in the past.

Some people kind of freeze up when you talk about nuclear energy. The fact of the matter is, in some States, 30 percent of their electricity currently is generated by nuclear. It is probably the cleanest fuel we have. We have to work on the storage of the waste from nuclear, of course.

We have great opportunities to do some things with renewable energy. I think we need to be a little careful in setting mandates that we are going to be at a certain place at a certain time because that can turn out to be very expensive and difficult.

Regarding fuel efficiency, we can work on that in cars or whatever, and make them much more efficient than we have now.

I mentioned hydrogen. The President indicated he thinks hydrogen is one of our best opportunities for a movement

of alternative fuels. He has put money in his budget for hydrogen work.

I am very hopeful that we do commit ourselves to coming up with some solutions with regard to energy policy. I am a little concerned it is sort of on the base here and we will be moving off to other matters. I hope in this 2-week period this becomes our highest priority, that we continue to stick with it until we have accomplished the goal we set out to accomplish, and that is to have an energy policy for the Senate.

Second, I hope it can be a policy, not a great number of details, but a view in the future as to where we are going to be, and then do the things that are necessary for us to get there.

I am delighted we are going to be moving forward in this area.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDIA OWNERSHIP

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this morning the Federal Communications Commission made some decisions I think were wrong-headed and counterproductive for this country. I would like to describe them just for a moment.

The Federal Communications Commission, by a vote of 3 to 2, decided to change in a dramatic way the ownership rules with respect to broadcast stations and newspapers around this country—radio, television, newspapers. Let me describe where we may end up as a result of the FCC decisions.

As a result of what the FCC has decided today, it is likely that in the largest markets of our country, the same company will own the newspaper, three television stations, the cable company, and eight radio stations.

I can't think of anything more destructive to the interests of localism and to the interests of diversity, both of which are hallmarks of what we aspire to have in American broadcasting, and the free flow of information and diversity of information in this democracy of ours.

I don't understand why the FCC made this decision. The majority of the members of the Senate Commerce Committee signed a letter asking the FCC to delay and provide their recommendations to us first so we could perhaps have a hearing and discuss it with them. But they didn't do that. The first anyone knew of the specific recommendations was this morning at about 10 o'clock. There were somewhere close to 500,000 communications from the American people to the FCC saying don't do this. Instead, the FCC took this action. They say they took this action because there are more voices, there are more outlets and more diversity; therefore, the old rules with respect to ownership are outmoded and old-fashioned.

That is simply not the case. Ninety percent of the top 50 cable stations are owned by the top handful of the broadcasters. Twenty-five of the top Internet sites are owned by the same companies. In terms of diversity of thought in terms of where you get your news, it all comes from the same source—many voices, one ventriloquist.

Is that in the public interest? In my judgment, the answer is no. The FCC held only one hearing in Richmond, VA, and the rest of their work was done largely in secret.

There is a history to some of this. The FCC today said that one ownership group should be able to broadcast to 45 percent of the Nation's audience. It is actually going to be much more than that because they have a rule that counts UHF stations and only 50 percent of the stations.

It is a complex system. But it is 45 percent of the national audience. It used to be 25 percent. In 1996, a piece of legislation—the Telecommunications Act—came to the floor of the Senate taking that 25 percent to 35 percent. I offered an amendment at that point to restore the 25-percent limit; take the 35 percent out of the bill and restore the 25-percent limit. We had a vote. The proponent on the other side in support of the 35 percent was Senator Dole from Kansas, a pretty aggressive competitor, as a matter of fact. We had a vote and I won. I was dumbfounded. I had no idea I would win. But I won by, I think, three or four votes. That was about 4 in the afternoon when we considered the act in 1996.

On that same day, at about 7:30 in the evening, we had a another vote because Senator Dole was cagey enough to have another Senator change his vote, and then we came back after dinner and had a vote on reconsideration. Apparently, three, four, or five Senators had some sort of epiphany over dinner. I lost. I have no idea what they had for dinner, or who talked to them, or how far their arms were bent. But I won that vote for about 4 hours, and then I lost.

The result has been that for 7 years we have had a 35-percent ownership cap with respect to a broadcasting company broadcasting television signals across the country, providing that there is a limit on broadcast stations—that you can't go over 35 percent of the national audience.

Now the FCC this morning said they are taking that to 45 percent. They are eliminating the ban on cross-ownership between newspapers and television stations. This weekend one of the large newspaper chains was reported in a story that I saw to have said, Look, we intend to buy a television station in every city in which we have a newspaper. We intend to do that.

I don't doubt it.

Another story which I read this weekend talked about the plan of one of the large broadcasting enterprises and all the deals they had lined up anticipating the FCC was going to do what they wanted them to do. They have deal after deal. They are going to start. There will an orgy of concentration and mergers that start almost immediately.

What I would like to say to all of those who are now celebrating the FCC's decision today is that Congress will have another bite at this. There are many ways to do it.

No. 1, we have a Congressional Review Act which is a form of legislative veto dealing with rules that we don't like. It has been used rarely. But I think it should be used in this circumstance; it would provide a vote here in the Congress, up or down, on this rule.

There are other approaches. Several of my colleagues—the Presiding Officer is one—have introduced legislation restoring the 35-percent cap. That is a bipartisan piece of legislation cosponsored by Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. Of course, there is always the timeline tradition of, if everything else fails, attempting to legislate on an appropriations bill.

But my point is this: I don't think the FCC decision this morning should be considered the last and definitive word. My own personal view is that I hope we will attempt a form of ''legislative veto'' which is provided for in law. But there will be attempts to overturn much of this decision.

It makes no sense to me that we will have decided through a regulatory agency not to do effective regulation on behalf of the American public, and to say, oh, by the way, concentration is not a bad thing. Let us just allow in one big American city the same company to buy the cable company, buy three TV stations, eight radio stations, buy up the cable system, and buy the newspaper. It makes no sense to me that a Federal regulatory body ought to do that.

I very much regret what the FCC did this morning. In the review mirror, this will be seen as a terrible decision that marches this country backward and not forward, and one that will well satisfy those who have billions at stake because they have lobbied very hard to have this kind of decision come from the FCC but one, in my judgment, which will detract from the interest of localism. Those big enterprises win and American communities lose. Who is going to broadcast basketball games? Who is going to broadcast the local baseball games?

The fact is, we have had some experience with concentration in the media in recent years—since 1996—and it isn't working. We are destroying localism and destroying diversity. I think this Congress needs to weigh in now and deal with the FCC.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to make a comment finally on the Energy bill which my colleague from Wyoming discussed moments ago.

If we have learned anything—and I expect we have learned a lot with respect to the war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the trouble in the Middle East—it is that this country is foolish to continue its excessive reliance on oil from troubled parts of the world. When 55 percent of our oil comes from overseas and outside of our borders, and when the largest growth in energy usage is for transportation and putting gasoline through our carburetors so we can drive back and forth to work and take trips and so on, this country ought to understand the great peril it is in—the peril to which the economy would be flat on its back tomorrow morning if, God forbid, the supply of oil from outside our borders was discontinued or interrupted. We need to understand that. We need to pass an Energy bill that recognizes and addresses it.

The Energy bill, in my judgment, should be legislation that does four things: incentivizes increased production of fossile fuels—yes, oil—using clean fuel technology, coal and natural gas; incentivizes conservation and provides for substantial conservation initiatives; provides for efficiency with all of these things that we use in our daily lives, especially using electricity; and then, finally, addresses the issue of limitless renewable sources of energy—ethanol, biodiesel, and especially, in my judgment, hydrogen.

If we fail to do all of that in an aggressive way, we will not have much of an Energy bill. We will, as we do every 25 years, come back and debate where we should drill now. Digging and drilling is a policy that I call ''yesterday forever.'' It doesn't advance this country's interests. Yes. We should produce more fossil fuels, and we will. But we need to decide that putting gasoline through our carburetors is not what we want our grandchildren to do.

The President talked about moving to a hydrogen economy with fuel cells. I agree with that. Good for him. Putting his administration on line in support of that initiative makes great sense. Frankly, his specific proposal was timid. It was not very bold. But he deserves great credit for moving in the right direction.

I and some of my colleagues will introduce legislation dealing with hydrogen and fuel cells. That will be a $6.5 billion program over the next 10 years—a type of Apollo program. At the start of a decade we said, Let us have a man working on the Moon at the end of the decade. We did it with timelines and with targets.

If we decide we ought to use hydrogen and fuel cells to power America's vehicle fleet, and also some stationary engines, then we ought to move in that direction boldly, not timidly. This is the time to do that with an energy bill. This is the time we decide the direction in which we want America to move and then establish public policy that makes that happen. I don't know whether we will have a bill through the Senate that does all that. I hope so. We will have many amendments. I have some amendments I will offer to get us in that position.

Let me make one additional point. Anyone who watched what happened in the California and the west coast energy markets in the last couple of years has to understand that if we pass an energy bill that does not provide safeguards for the consumers, then we will have failed miserably. We saw companies—and I will name Enron, for one, but there are others the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has already identified—that were playing a monopoly game in west coast markets manipulating loads—they were buying and selling energy to themselves, jacking up prices, in some case, five, ten, and a hundredfold, and stealing from consumers. And it was not just a few dollars; they were stealing billions and billions of dollars from west coast consumers. They are now going to be held criminally liable.

But while all that was happening, we had a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that was dead from the neck up. It would not do a thing; it sat on its hands, looking like a potted plant. It did not do a thing. So this massive stealing went on in west coast markets because big companies that could control supply did control supply, manipulated load, and attempted to extract from the consumers in western America billions of dollars in an unfair way. We must put safeguards in this legislation that prevent that.

If anybody wonders about it, there is plenty written about it. Go trace the trail that describes the Enron Corporation strategies called ''Get Shorty,'' ''Fat Boy,'' and ''Death Star.'' Do you know what those are? Those are strategies to steal from consumers. The FERC is now deciding there was plenty of activity, and there are criminal investigations going on that warrant perhaps prosecution of both companies and individuals.

But all that happened because we had regulators who did not want to regulate. Regulators were afraid to step in and take effective action. Once again, it demonstrates that when you have the market power, the muscle, and the clout, and you do not have regulators who effectively regulate it, people are victims. And in this case on the west coast, the victims lost billions of dollars. The question is, How is there going to be recompense for that? How is that going to be resolved? Who is going to be tried? Which FERC investigations are sent to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution?

My point is, safeguards need to be in this energy bill dealing with that. We have been through this once. We have colleagues still calling for deregulation of these markets. Deregulation, when you have companies with market power willing to use it to the detriment of consumers, is a devastating mistake. You need effective regulators, wearing referee shirts, who safeguard the interests of the consumers.

That has to be a part of this bill as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Alaska, asks unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Frist/Daschle amendment No. 539, to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Alaska, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

Am I correct that we are currently on S. 14?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. The National Energy Policy Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair. I hope Senators and their staff are paying attention. We have been given this week, and it would seem like part of next week, to get an energy bill completed in the Senate. We know this is an important bill, and we know these are important issues to Senators.

Nonetheless, it would seem to this Senator that we have had a very lengthy debate, a lot of amendments, and much discussion last year on an energy policy. Admittedly, much of

that debate centered around the Alaskan wilderness provisions, and they are not going to be at issue in this bill unless somebody chooses to make them so. As manager on this side, I am not aware of anyone who intends to do that. Not because people have changed their minds but because the issue seems to have been decided.

It seems to this Senator that much of the debate has been narrowed. Nonetheless, there is a significant number of issues of consequence to many Members. We did produce a bill in the committee in kind of rapid time, but considering that many of the issues had been debated so frequently, it appeared to this Senator, as chairman, that we did a rather good job. That does not mean we do not have some serious issues, but I believe, since the House has once again produced a National Energy Policy Act, we have a responsibility to produce one. In due course, we will be able to discuss with the Senate and with the people of this country what kind of bill we have.

As chairman, it was this Senator's hope we could produce a bill that over time gave to the American people an opportunity to use a variety of types of energy to meet both the residential and business energy needs in America's future. In essence, we tried to produce a bill that was going to enhance and increase production of various types of energy.

We could have a serious discussion of what we see down the line for the next 5, 10, 15, or 20 years that precipitates this bill and will in turn precipitate the debate on various amendments. However, it ought to be clear to everyone that the United States has, all of a sudden, within the past 5 years decided the energy of choice seems to be natural gas, aside from the fact that we still drive automobiles that use petroleum products, and thus we are still very dependent upon crude oil. We produce as much as we can at home and import a huge amount from a large pool of oil which is now being produced by numerous countries around the globe.

At home, 90 percent of the new electricity production comes from natural gas fired generation. There is nothing wrong with that, but that, coupled with the direct use of natural gas in this country, means we are rapidly moving toward a natural gas economy.

For some, there is no risk in that. For others, they ought to at least be concerned. For others, it seems that we may run into a shortage of natural gas sometime in the not-too-distant future. To that end, this bill says we have an abundance of coal in our country; do everything we can to enhance the usability of coal by spending resources on science to develop and modernize and even build a powerplant that would be clean so that we can prove that in the future coal can begin to fill the gap and begin to take the place of natural gas.

We have also gone ahead particularly at the persuasion of this Senator, the chairman, and said that maybe the time has come for a rebirth of nuclear power in America. We will have a good opportunity for a lengthy and wholesome debate on where we are today, what went wrong in the past, and what we ought to be doing in the future, perhaps, as this bill envisions, giving nuclear power a chance to come back to life in America and become a powerful source of energy around the world.

At the same time, renewables are of great concern to many Americans. A thorough reading of this bill plus the amendment which is contemplated, the one produced by the Finance Committee, which has a significant provision in it for tax incentives for renewables—the totality of the bill, plus the proposed amendment that would be attached from the Finance Committee, suggests to the American people there will be a lot of windmills in our future. Literally, there will be millions of them. They will be a significant portion of the grid in the United States.

In addition, all other sources of energy—biomass and all related forms—are given some incentive, or in every way possible we have attempted to put all of them on an equal footing. There will be a variety of energy types available to the American people in the foreseeable future.

Clearly, there will be seven or eight major issues. I am hopeful that ethanol, which has become a huge issue even though it is not part of the jurisdiction of this committee—the major ethanol bill currently pending as an amendment has many considerations that will be brought to the Senate's attention by Senators concerned about it and who want various changes in it. We would like that it be dealt with in due course, that it not take a huge amount of the time allotted for this entire bill. We are working together on both sides of the aisle to see if we can set that amendment aside while we pursue other amendments, to move ahead, taking the ethanol provisions in due course.

This bill was reported on April 30 and laid before the Senate on May 6. The Senate considered the measure for 3 days at the beginning of May during which time the pending amendment relating to ethanol was laid down. Today, we begin consideration of the measure. I believe we can predict the outcome of most of the major issues in this legislation. The pending amendment is a bipartisan agreement on ethanol reached after years of negotiation among the involved parties sponsored by the majority and minority leaders and identical to language reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works. I don't think there is any question but it will be adopted. However, there are some Senators, led by Senators FEINSTEIN and SCHUMER, who oppose the amendment and have the right to offer as many second-degree amendments as they like—as they did last year.

However, as with all major issues, the Senate spoke last year. For the most part, the issues have not changed. I am certain the resolution of those matters will largely reflect the resolution achieved last year. Last year, it took 6 weeks. There is no reason for it to take that long this year. While some issues are clear, the legislation before the Senate also raised new issues which deserve the consideration of the Senate. I expect amendments related to our titles dealing with electricity, Indian energy, nuclear energy—which I alluded to briefly—which are significantly different from those proposed last year, will take a little bit of time. I also think there are a few areas, such as climate change and renewable portfolio standard, where the outcome may or may not be different from last year.

I hope my colleagues will give Members the opportunity to move as expeditiously through some of these issues as possible. I want the will of the Senate worked, and I will do all I can to move the process along. The majority leader has indicated the Senate will be on this bill this week and some portion of next week with only a few interruptions for other matters that may need to be resolved. I understand we need to spend a few hours resolving some matters relating to the Defense authorization bill and may need to vote on a few judges. Those issues should not consume a lot of time.

For my part, I will be here waiting for amendments. I understand from my distinguished colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, that he, too, is available. We will spend as much time as necessary to move this bill along. I hope a vote can occur tomorrow, perhaps as early as noon, and then thereafter on a regular basis. Senators can expect votes at various times unless we reach some agreements, which everyone would know about from time to time, on each of the days we are scheduled to be in session this week and next week. There are amendments out there. I understand a number of Senators will offer amendments on the OCS inventory provisions of the bill. I have been told perhaps Senator MCCAIN plans to offer amendments related to climate change and perhaps CAFÉ. Senator BINGAMAN made it clear he plans to offer a number of amendments. We are prepared and ready to proceed on those.

I encourage Members to be prepared to come to the Senate as soon as possible. We would like very much to be given the opportunity to get this bill discussed and get the issues debated and voted on as soon as practical. This Senator thinks they are important. There are many people in this country who think energy is important. Until there is a crisis, we act as if we need not worry about an Energy bill, but things have not changed that much. Whatever the crisis was or wasn't last year or the year before, it is practically the same for all intents and purposes today. We remain gravely dependent upon foreign oil. Clearly, there are a number of bottlenecks created

both by bureaucracy and statute that we are going to try to alleviate. There are a number of incentives that ought to be built into the energy base of our country.

As we look at the overall picture, the United States has a rare opportunity to see to it that it has plenty of energy of a variety of types and sources, and after the adoption of this policy through conference and through signature of the President so that America will not have to be worried; we will clearly be in a position that the energy we need to grow and prosper will be there.

Throughout consideration of this bill, there will be discussions about conservation—saving of energy, the use of less energy wherever we can, and promoting policy changes which will indeed promote the use of less rather than more energy. That, too, will create some very serious debates and serious discussions.

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN. We are attempting to get a unanimous consent request in short order. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator DOMENICI. I will just very briefly summarize the views I expressed in much greater detail when we began this bill back in May.

My own view is there is much in this legislation that has come before the Senate which I support. Unfortunately, there are also provisions in here I do not support, and there are provisions left out of the bill that I believe are important to include in any kind of comprehensive energy bill we might pass through the Senate.

On that basis, I did not support the form of the legislation that came out of the Energy Committee. I am hoping during the debate here on the Senate floor we can correct the problems that I believe exist, that we can add some provisions that will improve the bill as regards increased efficiency in the use of energy, that will improve the bill as regards increased diversity in the sources of energy, that will improve the bill as regards a consideration of climate change issues, along with our energy policy. There are a variety of issues that need to be addressed, some that need to be corrected.

I look forward to the chance to debate those issues in detail as we get into the amendments. The chairman's intention, perhaps, is to try to begin dealing with the low-income home energy assistance issue today. I hope we can move ahead on that. It is an extremely important provision of the bill. But I look forward to working with the chairman to try to move this legislation forward. In my view, it is important the Congress act in this area. It is important the country modernize the laws that affect our energy supply and energy usage. It has been many years since we have done that in any comprehensive way. So I hope we can make progress. I know that is the chairman's fondest hope. I certainly join in that and intend to do all I can to cooperate.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have received consent from both sides for the following consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending ethanol amendment be set aside temporarily so that the Senator from New Mexico can offer an amendment with reference to LIHEAP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 840

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to explain what we have done and why we have done it. Obviously, there are Senators who want to debate and propose amendments to the ethanol provision. They are not available today.

On the other hand, there is an issue, the LIHEAP issue. Last year the LIHEAP bill was found in the Energy legislation. This year the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources voted for LIHEAP, to reauthorize the LIHEAP Act, and did not include it in the bill but recommended that it would be offered on the floor as an amendment.

In compliance with that, I am going to offer the LIHEAP reauthorization amendment. It will be offered by myself, for myself and for Senator BINGAMAN, in response to the recommendation of the Energy Committee that such be the case.

With that, I send to the desk the low-income home energy assistance program, on behalf of myself, Senator BINGAMAN, and the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 840.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reauthorize LIHEAP, Weatherization assistance, and State Energy Programs)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new title:

TITLE XII—STATE ENERGY PROGRAMS

SEC. 1201. LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) HOME ENERGY GRANTS.—Section 2602(b) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621(b)) is amended by striking ''each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and $3,400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006.''.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 2604(e) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(e)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after (e) ''(1)'';

(2) striking ''or any other program;'' and

(3) adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the Governor of a State may apply to the Secretary for certification of an emergency in that State and an allotment of amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(e).

''(3) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Department of Energy and States, adopt by rule procedures for the equitable consideration of such applications. Such procedures shall require—

''(A) consideration of each of the elements of the definition of ''emergency'' in section 2603;

''(B) consideration of differences between geographic regions including: sources of energy supply for low-income households, relative price trends for sources of home energy supply, and relevant weather-related factors including drought; and

''(C) that the Secretary shall grant such applications within 30 days unless the Secretary certifies in writing that none of the emergency conditions defined in section 2603 have been demonstrated.''.

(c) REPORT ON METHODOLOGY.—

(1) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that makes recommendations regarding the methodology for allocating funds to States to carry out the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.).

(2) In preparing the report, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) use the latest, best available statistical data and model to develop the recommendations for the methodology; and

(B) recommend a methodology that—

(i) consists of a mechanism that uses estimates of expenditures for energy consumption (measured in British thermal units) for low-income households in each State, for each source of heating or cooling in residential dwellings; and

(ii) employs the latest available annually updated heating and cooling degree day and fuel price information available (for coal, electricity, fuel oil, petroleum gas, and natural gas) at the State level.

(3) In preparing the report, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consult with appropriate officials in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transmit to Congress a report on the programmatic impacts of using the National Academy of Science's poverty measure with difference equivalence scale, known as DES, to determine low-income households.

SEC. 1202. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 412 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6862) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(A), by striking ''125'' and inserting ''150'', and

(2) in paragraph (7)(C), by striking ''125'' and inserting ''150''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and

Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', $325,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $400,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.''.

SEC. 1203. STATE ENERGY PLANS.

(a) STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PLANS.—Section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322) is amended by inserting at the end of the following new subsection:

''(g) The Secretary shall, at least once every 3 years, invite the Governor of each State to review and, if necessary, revise the energy conservation plan of such State submitted under subsection (b) of (e). Such reviews should consider the energy conservation plans of other States within the region, and identify opportunities and actions carried out in pursuit of common energy conservation goals.''.

(b) STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY GOALS.—Section 364 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6324), is amended to read as follows:

''STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY GOALS

''SEC. 364. Each State energy conservation plan with respect to which assistance is made available under this part or after the date of enactment of this title shall contain a goal, consisting of an improvement of 25 percent or more in the efficiency of use of energy in the State concerned in calendar year 2010 as compared to calendar year 1990, and may contain interim goals.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 5325(f)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005 and $125,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.''.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the amendment increases the authorization for the low-income home energy assistance program from the current authorization of $2 billion annually to $3.4 billion for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2006. The amendment also expands eligibility for the Weatherization Assistance Program to include families with household incomes at or below 150 percent of the poverty level established by OMB, which is equivalent to the existing LIHEAP eligibility.

The amendment also increases funding to $325 million for fiscal year 2004 through $400 million for 2005, and $500 million for 2006.

Finally, the amendment establishes procedures for regular review of existing State energy conservation programs. It sets State energy efficiency goals, reducing energy use by 25 percent by 2010 from energy usage in 1990, and it expands and extends authorization for these programs to $100 million in fiscal year 2004 and 2005, and $125 million for 2006.

I urge my colleagues to agree to the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment that Senator DOMENICI sent to the desk. I think it makes some very much needed improvements in the existing Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and also in the Weatherization Assistance Program. It also provides additional funds for development of State energy plans.

I think these are very important provisions. We did not have that severe of a winter in many parts of the country this year. Accordingly, we didn't see as many headlines about the importance of this Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program as we have in some previous years. But the truth is, this is an extremely important program for a great many of our citizens who are low income and who do need the help. It is important for them in heating their homes in the winter, and it is important for them in keeping their homes reasonably cool in the summer. We are starting the summer.

I went through Dallas on the plane Friday on my way back to Washington. It was 96 degrees. I am sure that is a mild foretaste of what we are going to be seeing in the future as far as the temperature in Dallas and in many parts of the country, particularly in the southern sections of the country.

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program assists people in paying their utility bills for air-conditioning just like it assists them in paying their utility bills for heating.

It is very clear when you look at studies that there are a significant number of people in this country, particularly elderly people in the Southern States, who, in fact, die because of excess heat and the inability to cool their apartments or their homes.

This is a very important program. It is one that we need to deal with. It is one we tried to deal with in the Energy bill last year. We passed it through the Senate in very much this same form. We had general support from the House of Representatives to include it in a final bill to go to the President had we been able to get agreement on a final bill. But there was no disagreement about this part of the program or this part of the legislation.

I believe very strongly this should be agreed to and should be included in this Energy bill.

I notice the House has addressed it already in the Energy bill they have passed. It clearly needs to be part of our Energy bill as well so that when we go to conference we can, in a meaningful way, conference with the House of Representatives on this important issue.

I hope this will be agreed to. I look forward to additional debate on it as necessary.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 841 TO AMENDMENT NO. 840

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have already indicated to the Senate that while this amendment was in the Energy bill last year, and while it was considered by the Energy Committee of the Senate and handled in a manner that I have described, it is not included in the bill but recommended for submission as an amendment, which has been done. It is clear the jurisdictional issue which has arisen did not come up last year, as I understand it, from the distinguished Senator from New Mexico who was chairman last year. It was not raised. So we proceeded as if the same were to occur this year. Such is not the case in that the chairman and the ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction desire to challenge the inclusion of that.

They are aware of the fact that the amendment is going to be included today. The chairman of the appropriate committee, Senator GREGG, is not here today. He will be here tomorrow. Thus, we will not complete debate on this until he comes back tomorrow. But I am going to send to the desk, as they understand this is going to be the case, in behalf of Senator GREGG, an amendment to my amendment which strikes the section of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program substitute and extensive Senate language; that when the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions reauthorizes the LIHEAP Act of 1981, the committee should consider increasing the authorization of the program to $3.4 billion to better serve the needs of low-income and other eligible households.

I, therefore, send in amendment to the desk in behalf of the chairman of the committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions a sense-of-the-Senate amendment which does what I have just described.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. GREGG, for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DODD, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 841 to amendment No. 840.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the reauthorization of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981)

Strike section 1201 (relating to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program) and insert the following:

SEC. 1201. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as ''LIHEAP'') is the primary Federal program available to help low-income households, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens meet their home energy bills and maintain their health and well-being;

(2) home energy costs are unaffordable for many low-income households, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens living on fixed incomes;

(3) those households often carry a higher energy burden than most United States households, spending up to 20 percent of their household income on home energy bills;

(4) States provided more than 4,000,000 households with LIHEAP assistance in 2002;

(5) LIHEAP is currently able to serve only 15 percent of the 30,000,000 households who are income-eligible for assistance under LIHEAP; and

(6) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions has jurisdiction over the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, which provides authority for LIHEAP, and is working towards reauthorizing the Act prior to its expiration in 2004.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, when the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions reauthorizes the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the committee should consider increasing the authorization of appropriations under section 2602(b) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 8621(b)) to $3,400,000,000, in order to better serve the needs of low-income and other eligible households.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as I understand it, this is the second-degree amendment. Clearly, it will be debated tomorrow when Senator GREGG and Senator KENNEDY return. We will see what the wish of the Senate is. I join with my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, in stating that I hope we will leave it in this bill. I think the House has done the same. I think it is important that we adopt the LIHEAP bill and that we do it now. Obviously, there is no need for the Senator from New Mexico to debate any further on this issue because the opponents have to be heard from and they won't be here until tomorrow.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for Senators again, let me repeat that we are awaiting the return of Senator GREGG to debate this issue; that is, the second-degree amendment which was just offered a few moments ago. In the meantime, the entire Energy bill is before us. Amendments would not be in order obviously. We will await their return and then begin the debate. After we finish the debate, we will vote on LIHEAP.

We will also debate the ethanol amendment. We are attempting to work with Senators who have serious issues with reference to ethanol to see if we can't line those up so that we will be ready to proceed in due course and with some degree of dispatch.

Having said that, I don't believe there is going to be any further significant business on this bill. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE FOR JUNE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in opening the Senate this morning, I spoke generally of the schedule for the next month. There are a number of items that I outlined which we will be addressing.

The first is energy, and we will continue that debate, possibly later today but through tomorrow, the next day, the next day, the next day—through this week. It is a very important debate as we work toward that objective, increasing domestic production, decreasing our dependence on foreign sources, addressing issues such as renewable energy sources that we all know are so important, and accomplishing all that with a lot of attention and focus and care with regard to the environment as well as the economy of this great country.

I mentioned this morning that we have begun, weeks ago—in fact, months ago—addressing the issues surrounding the strengthening of our Medicare Program—strengthening it, preserving it, improving it—and at the same time addressing an issue that seniors feel strongly about, people in Medicare feel strongly about, but also soon-to-be-seniors and that younger generation, and that is to include a new benefit of prescription drugs as part of our health care for seniors program, our Medicare Program.

As I talked to a number of people over the last week, a lot of people said, Why now? There are a lot of reasons why now. The bigger question I have is why didn't we do it 6 months ago or a year ago or 2 years ago. Prescription drugs have become an integral part of health care delivery, of the tools, of the equipment, of the armamentarium that a physician has, that a nurse has, that health care providers have, to give people security, health security, and especially to give seniors health care security. That is the purpose of our Medicare Program, to give seniors that health care security. Yet we have this very important benefit today—much more important today than 10 years ago or 20 years ago or 30 years ago when Medicare was started—these prescription drugs, which are vital to health care security for seniors.

We will be addressing, 2 weeks from today on the floor of the Senate, for a 2-week period, how to strengthen and improve Medicare. To answer that question, Why address the issue now? I think there are three reasons.

First, I think we have a unique opportunity because the political environment is right. When I say political environment, I mean the responsiveness that we demonstrate to what our constituents want and what they demand and, indeed, what they deserve. Indeed, in terms of the political environment, we have seen the call for prescription drugs, proposals to deliver prescription drugs, enter into a number of campaigns 6 months ago around the United States of America, in the campaign cycles from 2 years ago, and that is simply a reflection of the importance of the issue to the American people.

Second, we have a unique opportunity because, I believe, the legislative stars are aligned at this point in time—unlike last year, unlike 3 years ago, and possibly unlike 2 or 3 years from now. By that I mean that we have a President of the United States who has spoken out boldly and forcefully that this is important to our domestic agenda. In fact, the President put out a framework several months ago demonstrating his commitment and the commitment of this administration to strengthening Medicare, to improving Medicare, and at the same time adding this new and important benefit of prescription drugs.

When I say the legislative stars are aligned, it starts in many ways there because it takes that bold leadership because this will be the single most significant and most expensive change in the history of Medicare, a new benefit at the same time we strengthen and modernize Medicare. But it also takes bold leadership in the House of Representatives and bold leadership on the floor of the Senate. As a physician, as majority leader of the Senate, I have made it very clear that this is a huge priority for the leadership of this body. Indeed, that reflects the leadership in the last Congress where Medicare reform and modernization and prescription drugs were discussed on the floor for 2 or even 3 weeks, but where we were not able to bring to it a conclusion.

Then we have a House of Representatives, as we look at these legislative stars. Indeed, it is lined up. This will be the third Congress, maybe the fourth

but the third Congress that I recall, that will have put forth and passed a bold, comprehensive plan.

So when you have bold leadership in the White House by the President of the United States, you have this body, which is committed—committed to giving our seniors what they deserve, you have a majority leader who happens to be a physician, who has taken care of, personally, tens of thousands of patients who would be beneficiaries of this type of program—and a House that is committed, we can do it.

The third reason we have this unique opportunity, and which is one that we have little control over, is the unprecedented aging of the population which was defined post-World War II and what we know today as the baby boomers. This unprecedented fertility curve that happened after World War II, this move in our population which begins to hit in about 6 or 7 years, resulted in a doubling of the number of seniors. From where we are today over the next 30 years, that doubling of the number of seniors is going to call for health care security. It is going to make it very expensive. Therefore, we need to look in whatever we do today to make sure we meet that fundamental criterion of having it be sustainable over time, and not to make promises that can't be sustained when we are going to have twice as many people demanding and deserving the services for that health care security.

That unprecedented tidal wave of the aging of our population is what we need to face as responsible legislators. What complicates that huge increase in demand for services is that in the pay-as-you-go system, the number of workers out there who are actually paying into the system is going to fall over time. About seven workers in 1970 would support one senior. I just told you that we are going to double the number of seniors. But no longer having seven workers support every senior, it is now down to about four workers for every senior. And it will go down to about 2.9 workers for every senior. For every one senior you have over here, you are going to have fewer people working harder to provide those services, and on top of that you have a doubling of the number of seniors receiving those services.

This underscores the need to approach this modernization, this strengthening, this reform, this improvement of Medicare, especially since we are adding on top of that system I just described the single largest addition of benefits in the history of Medicare.

Even with benefits as designed today which we have already promised, the system itself is difficult to sustain because of this doubling of seniors, and with almost a halving of the number of people paying in. On top of that, we have the challenge of adding a very expensive service.

It is estimated that seniors will spend about $2 trillion in medicines over the next 10 years. I would say that is a low estimate. If we were to promise all seniors all of their prescription drugs for the next 10 years, that would be $2 trillion which we would be putting on the system. Today, for all health care, we spend about $250 million a year. That simply can't be sustained long term. But that is the challenge which we have.

Let me say that as a physician and as someone who has been involved in delivering care to seniors, Medicare has been hugely successful. The Medicare Program, which is now a little over 35 or 38 years old, has been hugely successful. Seniors would have been driven to financial ruin. They would not have received the health care benefits because there would be too many barriers without this great program. The problem and the challenge is that the program itself has not changed very much over the last 30 years. We have changed it a little bit on the floor of the Senate, but at the same time health care delivery has changed dramatically. We know better how to deliver care in a continuous way that looks at quality, constant monitoring, and chronic disease, but none that have ever been incorporated into this great program, but a stagnant program that hasn't kept up with the times, with the great advances, such as difficult heart transplants—I was involved in putting in artificial hearts as a surgeon in that arena—with a little stint; and the angioplasty. None of that was done in 1965 when Medicare started—zero.

The system changes so little. And you can go through every specialty of health care. These rapid changes in health care simply are incorporated only very slowly with years of lag time, if they are incorporated at all. In Medicare, there is very little preventive medicine, for example. It has been a great program, a tremendous program, and a program we need to preserve. But we need to improve it and strengthen it over time.

Our challenge is that a lot of the seniors listening to me are thinking their Medicare is OK. You politicians up there in Washington, DC may have been a doctor in the past and now may be a U.S. Senator, but just do not touch what I have. I may be 80 years old, or 85. I don't want any politician tinkering with my health care that I think is OK.

That is going to be a challenge as well because a lot of people are going to say don't touch it at all.

I would argue that seniors deserve for us to touch it. Don't take anything away from seniors. If they want to keep what they have today, they can keep exactly what they have. But at the same time we have an obligation to let seniors and soon-to-be seniors know the program is not as good as health care which can be delivered today, and which is delivered today in the private sector. They need to know that.

For example, Medicare doesn't cover catastrophes. That simply means if you are very sick, with Medicare there is no limit of $1,000, $10,000, $50,000, or $100,000 that you are going to pay in. You are always going to be paying out-of-pocket a certain percentage. For example, with physicians, you might be paying 15 or 20 percent of whatever that physician charges. But for the rest of your life—no matter if you have a catastrophe, if you had $100,000 in bills, there is no cap in Medicare. That is not true in the private sector. There is a catastrophe cap for most health care plans.

Second, Medicare today does not offer very much in the way of preventive care. We know that if we catch the disease early and we manage it well before you require hospitalization, before you require surgery, and before you require radiation therapy, you are going to have huge cost savings. But, more importantly, you will have a better quality of life for the rest of your life.

That takes prevention—catching those cancers when they are tiny, before they have spread throughout the body, or catching that heart disease before it has manifested itself in shortness of breath, or congestive heart failure and not being able to get out of bed. We do it all the time today. Yet annual physical exams are not covered in Medicare.

I would tell seniors who say they are getting good coverage today to ask whether there should be some prevention involved. Right now Medicare has very little.

Second, wouldn't you like to have a plan that limits your out-of-pocket expenditures?

Third, Medicare today—as great a program as it has been—does not cover prescription drugs. If you talk to seniors today and ask somebody who is 80 or 85 years of age, Are you on prescription drugs, they will say, No, hopefully, but in all likelihood they will say Yes, for my diabetes, or for my congestive heart failure, or for my obstructive pulmonary disease, for my arthritis. Really, you can pick any one as you go through.

Thus, I would argue, if you are saying you deserve health care security, you deserve some health with your prescription drugs, yet you don't get it today at all in Medicare, there are things which we can do to strengthen it. The value of the benefit package is inferior to what is in the private sector today—inferior to what I would argue seniors deserve today.

I list these things because it is important for people to realize that as good as Medicare is, it simply does not provide what is available and what seniors deserve. If you are a senior, look at your total expenditures for health care. Medicare only pays about half of them. That means you have to figure out some way to pay for the other half. You might do it by buying other supplementary insurance policies, or by getting discounts, or whatever you have to do. In some way or another you have to figure out how to pay for it.

That is certainly not true for people in this body, or for the 9 million Federal employees who are not responsible for 50 percent of their health care today under their insurance program.

We need to change Medicare so it gives a better value and so our seniors will be able to get the health care they need without being unfairly punished by having to pay so much out of pocket—so much more than, say, Federal employees. The list goes on.

As we debate, we will talk more at length about these issues.

I want to mention one other problem with Medicare that we need to debate on this floor; that is, the fragmentation of the system.

In 1965, through compromise at the time, there was a Part A for physicians and a Part B for hospitals. It has been fragmented into two separate categories.

Today, health care needs to be continuous. There needs to be a continuum. You want ongoing, continuous quality management, and you don't need different financing systems or different record keeping or different deductibles or different copayments set up. It is just not an efficient and effective way to deliver health care today.

In short, the Medicare system—again, as good as it is—does not live up to the standard we have set in the private sector. It is now time to address that gap, which we will be doing on the floor of the Senate.

Medicare today is still set up the way it was in the 1960s and in the 1970s to respond to acute episodic care. People get sick and go to the hospital. You treat them, and they go home.

That is not the way health care is delivered today in the private sector where you want to keep people out of the hospital, where it is not just acute care, where you are not just responding to a heart attack. The idea today is to prevent the heart attack in the first place. Now we have the expertise to do it, we have the medicines to do it, but seniors are not getting it today.

So what are we going to see play out here in the next month? We will begin to hear—probably starting tomorrow—a lot of discussion of the various plans that have been both proposed in the past and that the Finance Committee is thinking about. The Senate Finance Committee now is developing a balanced plan, a balanced proposal that draws upon a lot of the legislation that has come to this body, legislation that, in the last Congress, was the tripartisan plan, and a plan from several years ago that JOHN BREAUX and I worked on, and a House-passed plan from last Congress and the Congress before, and the framework put forth by the President of the United States.

I hope and pray but I am committed to see that we develop a bipartisan plan, bringing the best out of this body, from Democrats and Republicans, to address some of the needs—hopefully all of the needs—that I outlined a few minutes ago that make Medicare today less than what seniors deserve.

Over the next 2 weeks there will be a lot of discussion on this issue. Two weeks from now, on the floor of the Senate, we will be debating the legislation for 2 weeks. I am hopeful we can pass a plan out of the Senate before July 1 that responds to these needs.

I mention it has to be balanced and it has to be bipartisan. I say that for lots of reasons. In large part, it is because this is a huge challenge. We are going to have to take the very best of the Republican ideas, the very best of the Democrat ideas, the very best of the President's ideas, and the very best of the House's ideas and put them together. This will be the single largest expansion of Medicare in the history of the Medicare Program. As I said, it is going to be about $2 trillion that seniors are going to be spending over the next 10 years. We need to debate, as we go forward, how we can lower that barrier so seniors can get those prescription drugs.

I will close by saying that reform, modernization, strengthening has to be linked to prescription drugs, and prescription drugs have to be linked to strengthening and improving Medicare. It does not make sense in a fragmented system that doesn't have very much in preventive care that was built on a 1960s model. It does not make sense to superimpose a brand new benefit without taking advantage of putting all that in a single system that gives continuity, quality assurance, a systems approach where you can reduce medical errors that we know occur today.

There are five key principles that will guide our legislative efforts.

I think, first and foremost, we need to stress that whatever we do needs to be patient-centered. We need to think of that senior, what we can do to give him or her health care security, building whatever changes are needed around that.

Second, our seniors deserve the opportunity to voluntarily choose the health care plan, the health care coverage that best meets their individual needs. It is revolutionary in many ways but to look at a senior and say: You will have the opportunity, A, to keep exactly what you have now, what you have under current law, or, B, you can choose a type of coverage that better meets your individual needs, which may focus on your chronic disease of heart failure, which may involve disease management of your diabetes, and which will include preventive care, so whatever your status is when that progresses, we will pick it up early. Seniors will be able to voluntarily choose the type of health coverage and drug benefit that best meets their individual needs.

Third, seniors also deserve coverage where they have continuous quality management and safety improvements, and that requires a systems approach. You hear about these medical errors being made in hospitals, confusing prescriptions and medicines that interact with each other. I think that is the sort of thing we can avoid if we incorporate it in the legislation. I know we can do it in the legislation that evolves over the next several weeks.

Fourth, as I look at these principles, seniors deserve to be able to capture innovation. If we figure out a newer, better way to do something that will improve health care, that innovation should be captured. You should not have to wait 4 years to have access to innovation. It was 4, maybe even 5 years after heart transplants were widely available that they were made available in the Medicare Program. Seniors should not have to wait that long, if it is crystal clear, if the data is there, that this type of therapy is effective.

The fifth principle I would add is that seniors deserve coverage that is less bureaucratic, that has less paperwork, that is more flexible, so it can, indeed, adapt to the times.

We have a huge task ahead of us. A lot of people say they don't know if it can be done over the course of the next month. I am confident it can be done, in large part because much of the work was done in the last Congress, and it is being done both on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. We have made tremendous progress. We are building on a lot of the work that has been done in the past.

I am confident it can be done because the American people want it to be done. I am confident it can be done because people in this body—Democrat and Republican—want to do what is best for seniors, what is best for individuals with disabilities. I think we are going to see that responsiveness of this body play out over the next 4 weeks. I am excited about it.

The House of Representatives will likely be considering strengthening Medicare, addressing prescription drugs over the course of this month as well. If we can both accomplish that—which we are going to work very hard to do—within 6 months, 8 months, or less than a year from now, seniors will have a benefit as they reach out to obtain and use those prescription drugs as part of their health care.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I welcome our colleagues back. We are looking forward to a very productive few weeks. We know we have a lot of work to do in a relatively short time. In particular, work on the Energy bill is

going to require a good and vigorous debate. I know there are a number of Senators wishing to offer amendments. I hope we can begin that process in earnest tomorrow. I know there are a number of my Democratic colleagues who have particular issues they wish to address. We will get into many of those issues in earnest as amendments are offered over the next several days.

I didn't have the opportunity to hear the distinguished majority leader, but he has indicated to me—and I understand he has announced—that it is his interest and his plan to bring up the Medicare reform/prescription drug legislation the last couple of weeks of June. We certainly welcome that. We are looking forward to another debate, picking up where we left off last year.

I am concerned, I suppose, that we are moving quickly to this legislation without the benefit of extended discussion or hearings in the committee. I was rather roundly criticized last year after giving the Finance Committee a certain deadline and having failed to meet that, going to the floor so that we could ensure that we would do all that was possible to get a bill through the Senate in order to conference with the House prior to the end of the session. That wasn't possible, but we made every concerted effort and certainly a case that we could not afford to wait beyond the August recess, which is why we took up the bill last July.

We have not had, as I say, an opportunity to see the ideas that our colleagues on the other side are considering as we look at prescription drugs. But I was very appreciative of the report that I got about the majority leader's comments with regard to the value of Medicare. I think it is important to note that some of our colleagues on the other side have argued that we ought to eliminate Medicare, or terminate Medicare, or dramatically change Medicare—but the distinguished majority leader has noted that Medicare is a very valuable program, and indeed that is the case.

Before Medicare was created—about 1965—less than half of all senior citizens had health insurance. Today, almost every senior citizen has health insurance. So I think that alone argues very well for the importance of recognizing the universality of access to health insurance by those at least over the age of 65. We only wish we could replicate that for the rest of the population.

I think it is also important to note two other things. First, Medicare administrative costs are about 2 to 3 percent. That compares very favorably to the administrative costs of private health care—some 15 percent. So you have Medicare administrative costs at such a point that would leave 97 percent of the revenue generated that could go to benefits, where in the case of private health insurance, only about 85 percent of what revenue is generated is left that could go to benefits. That is a dramatic difference.

So those who argue that somehow the private sector is so much better, I argue that at least from a benefits structure, an efficiency point of view, you can certainly argue that the Medicare prototype or paradigm is so much more efficient. I also argue that in South Dakota it is almost impossible to get private health care benefits. You cannot find them in many parts of my State. That is true of a lot of rural areas. Health care benefits, health care insurance in rural areas is almost nonexistent, especially if it is provided through managed care. We have no managed care, virtually, in South Dakota.

So those who argue that somehow there is a panacea in the private sector overlook the fact that oftentimes, when it comes to rural areas in particular, it is almost impossible to use a private health care model. That is why we fought so hard last year. That is why when we offered the so-called Gramm-Miller-Kennedy legislation, we said, No. 1, there has to be a defined benefit; No. 2, a defined premium; No. 3, a way to ensure that rural areas are provided with the benefits; No. 4, we have to ensure as well that there isn't a coverage gap, a so-called sickness gap that was used oftentimes to make up for the fact that we needed to provide benefits right out of the box, but because we had limited dollars, they would go through a coverage gap before the benefits would kick in again.

Now, unfortunately, on all of those particular points, the bill offered by our Republican colleagues last year failed. There was a coverage gap. You paid premiums into this health insurance plan all year long, but I'm concerned that in some cases the benefits could kick out in February and might not kick back in again until roughly October. So you went through all of the spring and summer paying into the system but not getting any benefit back. That coverage gap was a serious omission and, frankly, one of the reasons we didn't believe that plan had much merit. They could not tell us what it was going to cost on a monthly premium, or what the benefits were going to be. They suggested things, but there wasn't any defined benefit. There wasn't any defined premium.

Then, of course, one of the biggest concerns many of us had is we could not count on the plan being offered in rural areas—especially in States like mine.

So I hope as we begin, we can all agree, No. 1, Medicare is a critical program, a success story of tremendous magnitude. Any time you can say you have eliminated the lack of access to health care for a certain group of people almost entirely, that is a success. That is exactly what we have done. Can it be improved? Again, like the majority leader, I think absolutely it can be. We ought to be providing more preventive care. We ought to find ways in which to promote wellness. That ought to be part of any plan. I personally believe there ought to be a lot more screening, a lot more access to all of the available techniques, all of the available methods of ensuring that we catch illness early, so preventive care is one of those things we can do. Adding a prescription drug benefit—absolutely. But if we are going to do this, let's not make this a big roll of the dice with senior citizens and say we cannot tell you what the premium is going to be, or what the benefits are going to be, or we cannot tell you for sure when your coverage kicks out and when it kicks back in with the coverage gap, or we cannot tell you for sure whether it is going to be offered in rural areas, and we will have just a Medicare backup in case all of this fails.

Well, that isn't a plan many of us would feel very good about, if, ultimately, that were the final vote. But I start with the hope and, I must say, the expectation that we can work together to find common ground; that we can address many of these shortcomings that were so evident in last year's legislation among some of our Republican colleagues; and that we can work together constructively.

I don't see any reason we cannot finish this legislation by the end of this month. But if that is going to happen, I hope, indeed, we can send each other a clear message that we are not looking for a 51-vote solution; we are looking for a 70, 80, or 90-vote solution. We are looking for a compromise in this legislation that brings about a broad consensus.

I hope we can use some discipline and avoid bringing up extraneous issues. We don't need to get into the array of controversial things that have nothing to do with prescription drugs or Medicare. If you want to derail prescription drugs, bring up any one of these extraordinarily controversial things, but I think it would be a very unfortunate set of circumstances. I am optimistic, having been given the report of the distinguished majority leader, and I am hopeful that we can work together so that by the end of this work period, not only will we have accomplished a good deal with regard to energy policy, but we will be able to say to seniors and to the country that we have at long last agreed on starting a Medicare benefit for prescription drugs that we can feel good about, that seniors understand, that would be offered in rural areas, and that builds on the model that has been such a success now for the last 40 years.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BLITZKRIEG ON FREEDOM IN BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this weekend's violent repression of democracy activists in Burma underscores the illegitimacy and brutality of the State Peace and Development Council, SPDC, and its political arm, the Union Solidarity Development Association, USDA.

Although reports are still coming in from the field, Burmese democracy activist Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and supporters of the National League for Democracy, NLD, were attacked on Saturday by armed agents of the junta in Yaway Oo, some 400 miles north of Rangoon. Four people were reported killed, and scores injured and arrested—including Suu Kyi and other members of the NLD.

Given the SPDC's total disregard for the human rights and dignity of the people of Burma, I expect the death toll and number of arrests relating to this incident to rise over the next few days and weeks.

Between the attack and the closure of NLD offices and universities, the SPDC has launched a blitzkrieg on freedom in Burma.

My immediate concern is for the welfare of all NLD members and their supporters, and for safety and security of Suu Kyi. The world must know for certain that Suu Kyi is alive and well. It is absolutely essential that U.N. Special Envoy Tan Sri Razali Ismail meet with Suu Kyi and other imprisoned activists should he travel to Burma later this week.

The international community must meet this brutal assault not with diplomatic niceties, but with forceful condemnation and concrete sanctions against the thugs in Rangoon.

In response to Suu Kyi's arrest and the murder of Burmese democracy activists, the administration should immediately—right now—expand the visa ban against the SPDC to include past and present leadership of both the Council and the USDA. SPDC and USDA assets should be identified in the United States and frozen right now.

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, it is time to draw the sword for freedom and cast away the scabbard.

Mr. President, I am going to continue to closely follow developments in Burma. I will have more to say on this matter tomorrow and later in the week.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALUTE TO THE 147TH FIELD ARTILLERY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Thursday, May 22, the 5th U.S. Army demobilized Battery C, 2nd Battalion of the South Dakota National Guard's 147th Field Artillery. This unit, from Redfield and Miller, was among more than 20 Guard and Reserve units from my State called to active duty in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Today, these soldiers and their service become a part of South Dakota's military heritage. Like those who served in the two world wars, in Korea, in Vietnam and numerous other places, this new generation has answered the call. They have offered to make every sacrifice, including life itself, to protect our freedom and security. We must never forget them or the honor with which they served.

This unit participated in a mobilization with few precedents in South Dakota history. Nearly 2,000 Guard and Reserve troops were called to active duty in our State, by far the largest mobilization since World War II. At the time the fighting began, units from more than 20 communities had been called up, from Elk Point in the south to Lemmon in the north, from Watertown in the east to Custer in the west. Indeed, our State's mobilization rate ranked among the highest of all the States on a per-capita basis.

These soldiers were proud to serve, and their communities are proud of them. Across the State, thousands of citizens pitched in to participate in send-off parades, to lend a hand for families who suddenly had to get by without a mom or dad, and even to assist with financial hardships caused by the mobilization. This mobilization was a Statewide effort, in many ways.

South Dakota's Guard and Reserve units provided our active duty forces in Iraq with invaluable support. Many units did not participate directly in combat, which ended more quickly than anyone expected. But we all know that the battle would have been waged much differently if our Guard and Reserve units had not been ready to deploy as needed. Furthermore, we know that some units will play an important role in the work of restoring peace and order to Iraq, as well as rebuilding basic infrastructure. These tasks will be vital to ensuring that Iraq becomes a stable nation, hopefully with a prosperous economy and democratic government. This is how we can win the peace and save future generations from another conflict.

In addition to the service of this particular unit, I want to acknowledge the sacrifices and dedication of the families who stayed home. They are the unsung heroes of any mobilization. They motivate and inspire those who are far from home, and they, too, deserve our gratitude.

Today, I join these families and the State of South Dakota in celebrating the courage, commitment, and success of the members of the 147th Field Artillery, and I honor their participation in this historic event in our Nation's history. Welcome home. Thanks to all of you for your courage, your sacrifice, and your noble commitment to this country and its ideals.

JOBS AND GROWTH TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2, the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

Former President Ronald Reagan often said, ''If you want more of something, subsidize it. If you want less of it, tax it.'' In recent polls, the American people have consistently said they want more job creation and more economic growth. This legislation, which President Bush is expected to sign into law this weekend, is specifically tailored to achieve these very important goals—by reducing taxes in the right way, it will enable businesses to create jobs and it will spur greater economic growth. It will also help American families keep more of their hard-earned money to spend or save, as they see fit.

One of the most important things the legislation does is accelerate the tax rate cuts already scheduled to take effect. In 2001, Congress passed a law that set in motion a series of income tax rate reductions that were scheduled to be phased in over the next several years. Because of the slow phase-in, the 2001 tax cuts had a muted impact on the U.S. economy and taxpayers felt little benefit. The bill we pass today will make all of those rate reductions effective this year. Taxpayers will see their withholding adjusted almost immediately and will begin reaping the benefits right away.

A key component of this provision is that it brings the top tax rate down to 35 percent—the same rate that corporations pay. While opponents claim this will only benefit wealthy taxpayers, I suggest that they look at what kind of taxpayers fall into the top bracket. The overwhelming majority—nearly 80 percent—of taxpayers in the top bracket have small business income. Small businesses, which are pass-through entities that are taxed at individual rates, are responsible for the creation of at least half of all jobs in the economy; reducing their tax burden will help them expand and create more jobs. Fairness and sound economics dictate that we should not tax small businesses at a higher rate than we tax big corporations. This bill fixes this so that the top small business rate will be the same as the top corporate rate.

Our bill also significantly reduces the taxes individuals pay on dividends they receive from corporations. In order to change investment behavior—and we know that the ongoing economic troubles are almost exclusively related to a collapse in business investment, not to a problem of consumer demand—taxpayers must see a meaningful and permanent reduction in rates at the margins. The bill we pass today does that.

Under current law, a corporation pays taxes on its earnings, usually at a rate of 35 percent, and its shareholders

will pay ordinary income rates—currently, the top rate is 38.6 percent, on any dividends distributed by the corporation. President Bush said we should end this double taxation by eliminating entirely the tax on individuals. I fought hard for the original Senate bill that would have done this, and I still believe that is the best tax and economic policy. However, the conferees from the House were unwilling to agree. The compromise we settled on will reduce the individual tax rate for dividends to 15 percent—a significant improvement over current law. I will continue to work to eliminate the double tax on dividends.

The bill we pass today also reduces the capital gains rate from 20 percent to 15 percent, the same rate we will now apply to dividends. I believe this is also good policy and I hope we can work to eliminate the tax on capital gains too. The dividend and capital gains tax relief should boost stock values significantly and should make it much less costly for businesses to expand and create jobs. Nearly 420,000 Arizona taxpayers will benefit from the dividends and capital gains tax relief.

This legislation also includes a number of provisions designed to provide much-needed tax relief to American families. It increases the child tax credit to $1,000 per child, with a good portion of the tax benefits being sent to families as early as this summer. It also provides additional relief from the marriage penalty. In Arizona alone, nearly 450,000 families will benefit from the child credit increase and more than 600,000 will benefit from the marriage penalty relief.

As I have said, I believe this is a very good bill that will do much to encourage job creation and economic growth, but I believe it could have been better. If the House had been willing to accept some offsets, we could have paid for the $20 billion in temporary State aid this bill provides. I also believe we should have held firm to the Senate position and eliminated the double tax on dividends. Regardless, I am very proud of the business, individual and family tax relief we have provided in this bill.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a landmark report by the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee's Research Institute, ADCRI, entitled, ''Report on Hate Crimes and Discrimination Against Arab Americans: The Post-September 11 Backlash.'' This report catalogues the experiences of the Arab-American community for the year following the tragic September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. According to the report, over 700 violent incidents targeting Arab Americans, or those perceived to be Arab Americans, Arabs and Muslims occurred in the 9 weeks following the attacks.

The report demonstrates the profound challenges confronting the Arab-American community, as well as other communities caught up in the post September 11 backlash. However, the report also emphasizes that Americans have consistently demonstrated their commitment to maintaining tolerance and respect for all Americans and that hatred is confined to a distinct minority. It is this minority that breeds hatred and violence against innocent individuals.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend us against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well. This is a challenge that none of my colleagues should shy away from.●

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON WORKMAN

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Brandon Workman for being named the United States Achievement Academy's United States National Award winner in mathematics. Brandon, who is from May's Lick, KY attends Deming High School and is the son of Shelly Mitchell and Robert Workman.

Brandon's enthusiasm towards hard work and the dedication that he has applied to his academic performance has earned him this distinguished honor. He certainly deserves this honor. Brandon's strong commitment to his peers and to being a better citizen have assured me of his future success to our Commonwealth and Nation.

This award is based upon the recommendations of his school faculty and the high standards set forth by the academy. Brandon, like all other recipients of this award, has proven himself in the classroom and has been recognized by those who teach him and know him the best in the classroom.

The efforts of Brandon Workman should be emulated. Brandon has set an example that should be recognized by high school students throughout Kentucky and across America. I am convinced that he will use his strong abilities to make a difference in our country. I thank the Senate for allowing me to recognize Brandon and voice his praises.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of January 7, 2003, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 8, 2003, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

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. A joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

Under the authority of the order of January 7, 2003, enrolled bills were signed by the President pro tempore on May 23, 2003.

At 12:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1588. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 23, 2003, the following reports of committees were submitted on May 29, 2003:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1160. An original bill to authorize Millennium Challenge assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 108–55).

S. 1161. An original bill to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 108–56).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 274. A bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REID):

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1163. A bill to condition receipt of certain State revolving funds on the restriction of development or construction of new colonia and colonia structures along the border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 1164. A bill to provide for the development and coordination of a comprehensive and integrated United States research program that assists the people of the United States and the world to understand, assess, and predict human-induced and natural processes of abrupt climate change; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1165. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to provide from the Highway Trust Fund additional funding for Indian reservation roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. SUNUNU):

S. 1166. A bill to establish a Department of Defense national security personnel system and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 1167. A bill to resolve the boundary conflicts in Barry and Stone Counties in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 171

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 171, a bill to amend the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment to medicare ambulance suppliers of the full costs of providing such services, and for other purposes.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 253, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns.

S. 271

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable, and for other purposes.

S. 363

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 363, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in social security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which two-thirds of the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200, adjusted for inflation.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) were added as cosponsors of S. 392, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 567

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for sewer overflow control grants.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for farmers and fisherman, and for other purposes.

S. 786

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to amend the temporary assistance to needy families program under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants for transitional jobs programs, and for other purposes.

S. 787

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 787, a bill to provide for the fair treatment of the Federal judiciary relating to compensation and benefits, and to instill greater public confidence in the Federal courts.

S. 816

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 816, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of medicare beneficiaries to health care provided by hospitals in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 847

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 847, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States the option to provide medicaid coverage for low income individuals infected with HIV.

S. 856

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 856, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools.

S. 884

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 884, a bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 922, a bill to change the requirements for naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States, to extend naturalization benefits to members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of a reserve component of the Armed Forces, to extend posthumous benefits to surviving spouses, children, and parents, and for other purposes.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education

Act to provide full Federal funding of such part, to provide an exception to the local maintenance of effort requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 959

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 959, a bill to limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes.

S. 977

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 977, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage from treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease.

S. 982

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) were added as cosponsors of S. 982, a bill to halt Syrian support for terrorism, end its occupation of Lebanon, stop its development of weapons of mass destruction, cease its illegal importation of Iraqi oil, and hold Syria accountable for its role in the Middle East, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to authorize grants through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for mosquito control programs to prevent mosquito-borne diseases, and for other purposes.

S. 1019

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1019, a bill to amend titles 10 and 18, United States Code, to protect unborn victims of violence.

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to provide for a multi-agency cooperative effort to encourage further research regarding the causes of chronic wasting disease and methods to control the further spread of the disease in deer and elk herds, to monitor the incidence of the disease, to support State efforts to control the disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1046

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1046, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to preserve localism, to foster and promote the diversity of television programming, to foster and promote competition, and to prevent excessive concentration of ownership of the nation's television broadcast stations.

S. 1076

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1076, a bill to authorize construction of an education center at or near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

S. 1110

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1110, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide trade adjustment assistance for communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to establish the Office of Native American Affairs within the Small Business Administration, to create the Native American Small Business Development Program, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 7

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 7, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance and on United States currency.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. REID):

S. 1162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mrs. LINCOLN. M. President, I am proud to introduce today the Working Taxpayer Fairness Restoration Act. I offer this bill on behalf of the nearly 12 million children who were left behind when President Bush signed the 2003 tax bill.

The bill that I am introducing, with many of my good friends, including Senators SNOWE, WARNER and JEFFORDS, will restore a provision left on the cutting-room floor when House and Senate leaders finalized the conference report on the tax cut. Our bill will restore the advanced refundability of the child tax credit.

My friend from Maine and I have worked since 2001 to ensure that all working families benefit from the child tax credit. We worked to ensure in the 2001 tax cut that the child tax credit was refundable. During Finance Committee deliberations on this year's tax bill, I successfully offered an amendment that would have advanced the refundability of the child tax credit. Regrettably, that provision was dropped in conference.

Unless we pass the bill that I am introducing today, families with incomes between $10,500 and $26,625 will not get the $400 checks that will be mailed in July as part of the 2003 tax bill. Since nearly half the taxpayers in Arkansas have adjusted gross incomes less than $20,000, Arkansas families are among the hardest hit by this omission in the new tax law.

Consider this: The base pay for a private in the military is just under $16,000 per year. The average Arkansas firefighter makes between $22,000 and $25,000 a year. Many of those enlisted men, who could be given a few days' notice before being shipped off to war, and those firefighters, who could get no more than a few minutes' notice before rushing into a terrorist attack, have families. They work hard to support their families and to protect us. Yet they got left out when negotiators shook hands over the final tax bill.

I wasn't in the room during those negotiations in the dark of night, and I understand that very few of my colleagues were. But we are here today, united in our effort to fight for these working families.

Advancing the refundable portion of the child credit to cover these families will cost only $3.5 billion—just 1 percent of the entire cost of the tax cut. This measure had strong bipartisan support in the Senate, and I was proud to play a leading role to expand the children tax credit in the Senate bill. I'm glad to have bipartisan support in my effort today to restore this provision.

We will pay for this tax relief for working families by shutting down some Enron-related tax shelters. This pay-for was included in the Senate version of the 2003 tax bill, so it has already received the blessing of a majority of the Senate.

Especially as our nation contends with a sluggish economy, we should ensure that everyone benefits from the tax cut. After all, buying blue jeans for schoolchildren, washing powder for the laundry or tires for the car costs just as much for a family making $20,000 a year as it does for a family making $100,000. If we want to get our economy back on track, we need to make sure that we're putting money into the pockets of consumers who will spend it.

This isn't about partisanship—as is evidenced by the cosponsors of this bill—it is about doing what's right for

families who may need a little extra help. We should fix this problem immediately. Let's make these families a priority now.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 1163. A bill to condition of receipt certain State revolving funds on the restriction of development or construction of new colonia and colonia structures along the border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill to improve the deplorable housing situation on the U.S. border with Mexico. In Texas along the 1,248 mile stretch from Cameron County to El Paso County, there are more than 1,400 colonias, or underdeveloped subdivisions, that suffer from such conditions as open sewage, a lack of indoor plumbing, and poor housing construction. These colonias are the most distressed areas in the country, yet despite terrible living conditions, they have grown in population. The legislation I introduce today, along with the Colonias Gateway Initiative Act which I am sponsoring, will go a long way toward eliminating the substandard living conditions that should not exist here in the United States of America.

This legislation will prohibit Federal funding for counties and municipal governments that refuse to enforce reasonable rules to prevent the development or construction of any new colonias that lack water, wastewater, and other basic infrastructure needs. I have inserted and the Senate has passed this exact language into the VA–HUD Appropriations bill every year since fiscal year 2001.

In 1993, I visited with a woman named Elida Bocanegra, who led me through the streets of the colonia where she lived. Elida showed me her community, which lacked paved roads, wastewater facilities and running water. Quite frankly, I could not believe I was in America. After that experience, the first amendment I offered as a U.S. Senator authorized $50 million for a colonias clean-up project. Since my election to the U.S. Senate, I have worked to improve the quality of life and ensure fundamental services are provided for people like Elida, helping to secure more than $615 million for the colonias of my state.

This act will ensure that colonias lacking water and wastewater facilities will be a thing of the past, and the neediest people along our border with Mexico will have the basic necessities to live. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1163

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

SECTION 1. RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW COLONIAS AREAS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COLONIA.—The term ''colonia'' means any identifiable community that—

(A) is located in the State of Arizona, California, New Mexico, or Texas;

(B) is located in the United States-Mexico border region;

(C) is determined by a State referred to in subparagraph (A) to be a colonia on the basis of objective criteria, including a lack of—

(i) a potable water supply;

(ii) adequate sewage systems; and

(iiI) decent, safe, and sanitary housing; and

(D) before the date of enactment of this Act, was in existence and generally recognized as a colonia by the State.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(3) UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER REGION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''United States-Mexico border region'' means the area of the United States located within 150 miles of the border between the United States and Mexico.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''United States-Mexico border region'' does not include any standard metropolitan statistical area with a population that is greater than 1,000,000, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning for the fiscal year in which this Act is enacted, and for each fiscal year thereafter, no State referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) shall receive a capitalization grant for the fiscal year under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) or section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–12) unless the State, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, requires each county and municipal government in the United States-Mexico border region in the State to establish and enforce an ordinance or rule described in paragraph (2).

(2) ORDINANCE OR RULE.—An ordinance or rule referred to in paragraph (1) is an ordinance or rule that prohibits the development or construction of any new colonia, or the construction of any new structure in a colonia, that lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure required—

(A) to comply with—

(i) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); and

(ii) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(B) to address the water infrastructure needs of the colonia or structure.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 1165. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to provide from the Highway Trust Fund additional funding for Indian reservation roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Indian Reservation Transportation Improvement Program Act. I am pleased to be joined, as I have been each time that I have introduced legislation dealing with the Indian Reservation Roads program, by my good friends, Senators INOUYE and CAMPBELL. I am confident that we will replicate the success we have had in our previous endeavors to improve this important program.

In 1982, when I served on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, several members of the Navajo Nation Tribal Council Committee on Transportation approached me with an interesting proposition. These Navajo Councilmen believed that the time had come for Indian tribes to participate directly in our National Highway Trust Fund programs.

I agreed with these gentlemen, the Senate agreed with me, and the Congress and President Reagan approved Indian tribal participation in the U.S. Department of Transportation highway construction program for the first time in our Nation's history.

By the mid-1980's, Indian Reservation Roads, IRR, funding was at about $100 million per year nationwide. By the late 1980's, however, IRR funding fell to about $80 million per year. In ISTEA, for the early 1990's, we were able to raise this critical highway construction funding to about $190 million per year.

Then, in TEA–21, The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, we succeeded in bringing annual IRR funding up to $275 million for fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

As we seek to promote economic opportunities on our Nation's tribal reservations, I believe it is imperative that we once again increase this vital infrastructure funding. I am aware that the National Congress of American Indians, NCAI, is recommending a large jump to $500 million per year for the construction program; $100 million for an Indian transit program; $50 million for Indian bridges; $70 million, plus $26 million in Interior funding, for road maintenance; and several other additions for a total of $907 million in DOT funds in FY2004. By the year FY2009, the NCAI recommendations would exceed $1.4 billion annually.

While I am sympathetic to the need for such large increases, I am keenly aware of competing needs around the country for medical research, economic stimulus, and for our national defense, to name just a few. Therefore, I am compelled to recommend increases for the IRR program that are more likely to win acceptance among my colleagues.

For highway construction, I am recommending an immediate increase of $55 million in the first year to a new total of $330 million. My bill would then increase the amount for construction by $30 million each year so that the program receives $480 million in the final year of the authorization. For the Indian bridge program, I am recommending $15 million per year, an increase of $6 million annually. And for State roads that serve as key bus routes for Indian children, primarily on our Nation's largest Indian reservation—the Navajo Nation—I am recommending increasing this vital funding from $1.5 million per year to $3 million in fiscal years 2004 and 2005, to $4 million in fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and $5 million for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

My final recommendation is to create a rural transit program for Indian Reservations. Because the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration each have their areas of expertise that can make such a program a success, my legislation will require the two agencies to work together for the benefit of the tribes who participate in this program. My suggestion is to fund this program at $20 million.

In closing, I want to thank the Navajo Nation Transportation Committee and the tribal transportation department for keeping me informed of their progress and continuing needs. I believe my bill will be a positive answer to their requests. In addition, the Pueblo Indians and Apache Indians of New Mexico have continuing development needs, including new and improved roads to reach their many attractions for tourists and other visitors.

I ask my colleagues to join me in increasing the Indian Reservation Roads program funds in our Federal Highways Programs to the degree I have requested in this bill. I thank my colleagues and urge their support for these increases as we reauthorize TEA–21 for six more years.

I ask unanimous consent the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1165

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Indian Reservation Transportation Improvement Program Act''.

SEC. 2. INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(A) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 112) is amended by striking ''of such title'' and all that follows and inserting ''of that title—

''(i) $225,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

''(ii) $275,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003;

''(iii) $330,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

''(iv) $360,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

''(v) $390,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

''(vi) $420,000,000 for fiscal year 2007;

''(vii) $450,000,000 for fiscal year 2008; and

''(viii) $480,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR STATES WITH INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—Section 1214(d)(5)(A) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 202 note; 112 Stat. 206) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005, $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009''.

(c) INDIAN RESERVATION ROAD BRIDGES.—Section 202(d)(4)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(B) RESERVATION.—Of the amounts'' and all that follows through ''to replace,'' and inserting the following:

''(B) FUNDING.—

''(i) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2009 to carry out planning, design, engineering, preconstruction, construction, and inspection of projects to replace,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) AVAILABILITY.—Funds made available to carry out this subparagraph—

''(I) shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1; and

''(II) shall not be used to pay any administrative costs.''.

SEC. 3. INDIAN RESERVATION RURAL TRANSIT PROGRAM.

Section 5311 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k) INDIAN RESERVATION RURAL TRANSIT PROGRAM.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

''(B) RESERVATION.—The term 'reservation' means—

''(i) an Indian reservation in existence as of the date of enactment of this subsection;

''(ii) a public domain Indian allotment; and

''(iii) an Indian reservation in the State of Oklahoma that existed at any time before, but is no longer in existence as of, the date of enactment of this subsection.

''(C) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

''(2) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program to provide competitive grants to Indian tribes to establish rural transit programs on reservations or other land under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribes.

''(3) COOPERATION.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) establish and maintain intra-agency cooperation between the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration in—

''(i) administering tribal transit programs funded by the Federal Highway Administration; and

''(ii) exploring options for the transfer of funds from the Federal Highway Administration to the Federal Transit Administration for the direct funding of tribal transit programs; and

''(B) establish and maintain working relationships with representatives of regional tribal technical assistance programs to ensure proper administration of ongoing and future tribal transit programs carried out using Federal funds.

''(4) FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each fiscal year, of the amount made available to carry out this section under section 5338 for the fiscal year, the Secretary shall use $20,000,000 to carry out this subsection.''.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. SUNUNU):

S. 1166. A bill to establish a Department of Defense national security personnel system and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, the ''National Security Personnel System Act,'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1166

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Security Personnel System Act''.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subpart I of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 99—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM

''Sec.
''9901. Definitions.
''9902. Establishment of human resources management system.
''9903. Contracting for personal services.
''9904. Attracting highly qualified experts.
''9905. Special pay and benefits for certain employees outside the United States.

''§ 9901. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

''(2) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Defense.

''§ 9902. Establishment of human resources management system

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may, in regulations prescribed jointly with the Director, establish a human resources management system for some or all of the organizational or functional units of the Department of Defense. The human resources system established under authority of this section shall be referred to as the 'National Security Personnel System'.

''(b) SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—The National Security Personnel System established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) be flexible;

''(2) be contemporary;

''(3) not waive, modify, or otherwise affect—

''(A) the public employment principles of merit and fitness set forth in section 2301, including the principles of hiring based on merit, fair treatment without regard to political affiliation or other nonmerit considerations, equal pay for equal work, and protection of employees against reprisal for whistleblowing;

''(B) any provision of section 2302, relating to prohibited personnel practices;

''(C)(i) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1), (8), and (9); or

''(ii) any provision of law implementing any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b) (1), (8), and (9) by—

''(I) providing for equal employment opportunity through affirmative action; or

''(II) providing any right or remedy available to any employee or applicant for employment in the public service;

''(D) any other provision of this part (as described in subsection (c)); or

''(E) any rule or regulation prescribed under any provision of law referred to in this paragraph; and

''(4) not be limited by any specific law, authority, rule, or regulation prescribed under this title that is waived in regulations prescribed under this chapter.

''(c) OTHER NONWAIVABLE PROVISIONS.—The other provisions of this part referred to in subsection (b)(3)(D) are (to the extent not otherwise specified in this title)—

''(1) subparts A, B, E, G, and H of this part; and

''(2) chapters 41, 45, 47, 55, 57, 59, 71, 72, 73, and 79, and this chapter.

''(d) LIMITATIONS RELATING TO PAY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall constitute authority to modify the pay of any employee who serves in an Executive Schedule position under subchapter II of chapter 53 of this title.

''(2) Except as provided for in paragraph (1), the total amount in a calendar year of allowances, differentials, bonuses, awards, or other similar cash payments paid under this title to any employee who is paid under section 5376 or 5383 of this title or under title 10 or under other comparable pay authority established for payment of Department of Defense senior executive or equivalent employees may not exceed the total annual compensation payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3.

''(e) PROVISIONS TO ENSURE COLLABORATION WITH EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) In order to ensure that the authority of this section is exercised in collaboration with, and in a manner that ensures the participation of, employee representatives in the planning, development, and implementation of the National Security Personnel System, the Secretary and the Director shall provide for the following:

''(A) The Secretary and the Director shall, with respect to any proposed system or adjustment—

''(i) provide to the employee representatives representing any employees who might be affected a written description of the proposed system or adjustment (including the reasons why it is considered necessary);

''(ii) give such representatives at least 30 calendar days (unless extraordinary circumstances require earlier action) to review and make recommendations with respect to the proposal; and

''(iii) give any recommendations received from such representatives under clause (ii) full and fair consideration in deciding whether or how to proceed with the proposal.

''(B) Following receipt of recommendations, if any, from such employee representatives with respect to a proposal described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary and the Director shall accept such modifications to the proposal in response to the recommendations as they determine advisable and shall, with respect to any parts of the proposal as to which they have not accepted the recommendations—

''(i) notify Congress of those parts of the proposal, together with the recommendations of the employee representatives;

''(ii) meet and confer for not less than 30 calendar days with the employee representatives, in order to attempt to reach agreement on whether or how to proceed with those parts of the proposal; and

''(iii) at the Secretary's option, or if requested by a majority of the employee representatives participating, use the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service during such meet and confer period to facilitate the process of attempting to reach agreement.

''(C)(i) Any part of the proposal as to which the representatives do not make a recommendation, or as to which the recommendations are accepted by the Secretary and the Director, may be implemented immediately.

''(ii) With respect to any parts of the proposal as to which recommendations have been made but not accepted by the Secretary and the Director, at any time after 30 calendar days have elapsed since the initiation of the congressional notification, consultation, and mediation procedures set forth in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary, in his discretion, determines that further consultation and mediation is unlikely to produce agreement, the Secretary may implement any or all of such parts (including any modifications made in response to the recommendations as the Secretary determines advisable), but only after 30 days have elapsed after notifying Congress of the decision to implement the part or parts involved (as so modified, if applicable).

''(iii) The Secretary shall notify Congress promptly of the implementation of any part of the proposal and shall furnish with such notice an explanation of the proposal, any changes made to the proposal as a result of recommendations from the employee representatives, and of the reasons why implementation is appropriate under this subparagraph.

''(D) If a proposal described in subparagraph (A) is implemented, the Secretary and the Director shall—

''(i) develop a method for the employee representatives to participate in any further planning or development which might become necessary; and

''(ii) give the employee representatives adequate access to information to make that participation productive.

''(2) The Secretary may, at the Secretary's discretion, engage in any and all collaboration activities described in this subsection at an organizational level above the level of exclusive recognition.

''(3) In the case of any employees who are not within a unit with respect to which a labor organization is accorded exclusive recognition, the Secretary and the Director may develop procedures for representation by any appropriate organization which represents a substantial percentage of those employees or, if none, in such other manner as may be appropriate, consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

''(f) PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM.—(1) The National Security Personnel System established in accordance with this chapter shall include a pay-for-performance evaluation system to better link individual pay to performance and provide an equitable method for appraising and compensating employees.

''(2) The regulations implementing this chapter shall—

''(A) group employees into pay bands in accordance with the type of work that such employees perform and their level of responsibility;

''(B) establish a performance rating process, which shall include, at a minimum—

''(i) rating periods;

''(ii) communication and feedback requirements;

''(iii) performance scoring systems;

''(iv) a system for linking performance scores to salary increases and performance incentives;

''(v) a review process;

''(vi) a process for addressing performance that fails to meet expectations; and

''(vii) a pay-out process;

''(C) establish an upper and lower salary level for each pay band;

''(D) ensure that performance objectives are established for individual position assignments and position responsibilities; and

''(E) establish performance factors to be used to evaluate the accomplishment of performance objectives and ensure that comparable scores are assigned for comparable performance, while accommodating diverse individual objectives.

''(3) For fiscal years 2004 through 2008, the overall amount allocated for compensation of the civilian employees of an organizational or functional unit of the Department of Defense that is included in the National Security Personnel System shall not be less than the amount of civilian pay that would have been allocated to such compensation under the General Schedule system, based on—

''(A) the number and mix of employees in such organizational or functional unit prior to the conversion of such employees to the National Security Personnel System; and

''(B) adjusted for normal step increases and rates of promotion that would have been expected, had such employees remained in the General Schedule system.

''(4) The regulations implementing the National Security Personnel System shall provide a formula for calculating the overall amount to be allocated for fiscal years after fiscal year 2008 for compensation of the civilian employees of an organizational or functional unit of the Department of Defense that is included in the National Security Personnel System. The formula shall ensure that such employees are not disadvantaged in terms of the overall amount of pay available as a result of conversion to the National Security Personnel System, while providing flexibility to accommodate changes in the function of the organization, changes in the mix of employees performing those functions, and other changed circumstances that might impact pay levels.

''(5) Funds allocated for compensation of the civilian employees of an organizational or functional unit of the Department of Defense in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) may not be made available for any other purpose unless the Secretary of Defense determines that such action is necessary in the national interest and submits a reprogramming notification in accordance with established procedures.

''(g) PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement for organizational and functional units included in the National Security Personnel System, a performance management system that includes—

''(1) adherence to merit principles set forth in section 2301;

''(2) a fair, credible, and equitable system that results in meaningful distinctions in individual employee performance;

''(3) a link between the performance management system and the agency's strategic plan;

''(4) a means for ensuring employee involvement in the design and implementation of the system;

''(5) adequate training and retraining for supervisors, managers, and employees in the implementation and operation of the performance management system;

''(6) a process for ensuring ongoing performance feedback and dialogue between supervisors, managers, and employees throughout the appraisal period, and setting timetables for review;

''(7) effective transparency and accountability measures to ensure that the management of the system is fair, credible, and equitable, including appropriate independent reasonableness, reviews, internal grievance procedures, internal assessments, and employee surveys; and

''(8) a means for ensuring that adequate agency resources are allocated for the design, implementation, and administration of the performance management system.

''(h) PROVISIONS REGARDING NATIONAL LEVEL BARGAINING.—(1) The National Security Personnel System implemented or modified under this chapter may include employees of the Department of Defense from any bargaining unit with respect to which a labor organization has been accorded exclusive recognition under chapter 71 of this title.

''(2) For issues impacting more than 1 bargaining unit so included under paragraph (1), the Secretary may bargain at an organizational level above the level of exclusive recognition. Any such bargaining shall—

''(A) be binding on all subordinate bargaining units at the level of recognition and

their exclusive representatives, and the Department of Defense and its subcomponents, without regard to levels of recognition;

''(B) supersede all other collective bargaining agreements, including collective bargaining agreements negotiated with an exclusive representative at the level of recognition, except as otherwise determined by the Secretary; and

''(C) not be subject to further negotiations for any purpose, including bargaining at the level of recognition, except as provided for by the Secretary.

''(3) The National Guard Bureau and the Army and Air Force National Guard are excluded from coverage under this subsection.

''(4) Any bargaining completed pursuant to this subsection with a labor organization not otherwise having national consultation rights with the Department of Defense or its subcomponents shall not create any obligation on the Department of Defense or its subcomponents to confer national consultation rights on such a labor organization.

''(i) PROVISIONS RELATING TO APPELLATE PROCEDURES.—(1) The Secretary—

''(A) may establish an appeals process that provides employees of the Department of Defense organizational and functional units that are included in the National Security Personnel System fair treatment in any appeals that they bring in decisions relating to their employment; and

''(B) shall in prescribing regulations for any such appeals process—

''(i) ensure that employees in the National Security Personnel System are afforded the protections of due process; and

''(ii) toward that end, be required to consult with the Merit Systems Protection Board before issuing any such regulations.

''(2) Regulations implementing the appeals process may establish legal standards for adverse actions to be taken on the basis of employee misconduct or performance that fails to meet expectations. Such standards shall be consistent with the public employment principles of merit and fitness set forth in section 2301. Legal standards and precedents applied before the effective date of this section by the Merit Systems Protection Board and the courts under chapters 75 and 77 of this title shall apply to employees of organizational and functional units included in the National Security Personnel System, unless such standards and precedents are inconsistent with legal standards established under this paragraph.

''(3) An employee who is adversely affected by a final decision under the appeals process established under paragraph (1) shall have the right to petition the Merit Systems Protection Board for review of that decision. The Board may dismiss any petition that, in the view of the Board, does not raise substantial questions of fact or law. No personnel action shall be stayed and no interim relief shall be granted during the pendency of the Board's review unless specifically ordered by the Board.

''(4) The Board shall order such corrective action as the Board considers appropriate if the Board determines that the decision was—

''(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

''(B) obtained without procedures required by law, rule, or regulation having been followed; or

''(C) unsupported by substantial evidence.

''(5) An employee who is adversely affected by a final order or decision of the Board may obtain judicial review of the order or decision as provided in section 7703. The Secretary of Defense may obtain judicial review of any final order or decision of the Board under the same terms and conditions as provided for the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 7703.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the waiver of any provision of law, including an appeals provision providing a right or remedy under section 2302(b) (1), (8), or (9), that is not otherwise waivable under subsection (a).

''(j) PHASE-IN.—(1) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to apply the National Security Personnel System established in accordance with subsection (a) to organizational or functional units including—

''(A) up to 120,000 civilian employees of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2004;

''(B) up to 240,000 civilian employees of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2005; and

''(C) more than 240,000 civilian employees in a fiscal year after fiscal year 2005, if the Secretary of Defense determines in accordance with subsection (a) that the Department has in place—

''(i) a performance management system that meets the criteria specified in subsection (g); and

''(ii) a pay formula that meets the criteria specified in subsection (f).

''(2) Civilian employees in organizational or functional units participating in Department of Defense personnel demonstration projects shall be counted as participants in the National Security Personnel System for the purpose of the limitations established under paragraph (1).

''(k) PROVISIONS RELATED TO SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT INCENTIVES.—(1) The Secretary may establish a program within the Department of Defense under which employees may be eligible for early retirement, offered separation incentive pay to separate from service voluntarily, or both. This authority may be used to reduce the number of personnel employed by the Department of Defense or to restructure the workforce to meet mission objectives without reducing the overall number of personnel. This authority is in addition to, and notwithstanding, any other authorities established by law or regulation for such programs.

''(2)(A) The Secretary may not authorize the payment of voluntary separation incentive pay under paragraph (1) to more than 10,000 employees in any fiscal year, except that employees who receive voluntary separation incentive pay as a result of a closure or realignment of a military installation under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall not be included in that number.

''(B) The Secretary shall prepare a report each fiscal year setting forth the number of employees who received such pay as a result of a closure or realignment of a military base as described under subparagraph (A).

''(C) The Secretary shall submit the report under subparagraph (B) to—

''(i) the Committee on the Armed Services and the Committee on Government Affairs of the Senate; and

''(ii) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

''(3) For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' means an employee of the Department of Defense, serving under an appointment without time limitation, except that such term does not include—

''(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of this title, or another retirement system for employees of the Federal Government;

''(B) an employee having a disability on the basis of which such employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under any of the retirement systems referred to in paragraph (1); or

''(C) for purposes of eligibility for separation incentives under this section, an employee who is in receipt of a decision notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance.

''(4) An employee who is at least 50 years of age and has completed 20 years of service, or has at least 25 years of service, may, pursuant to regulations promulgated under this section, apply and be retired from the Department of Defense and receive benefits in accordance with chapter 83 or 84 if the employee has been employed continuously within the Department of Defense for more than 30 days before the date on which the determination to conduct a reduction or restructuring within 1 or more Department of Defense components is approved pursuant to the system established under subsection (a).

''(5)(A) Separation pay shall be paid in a lump sum or in installments and shall be equal to the lesser of—

''(i) an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of this title, if the employee were entitled to payment under such section; or

''(ii) $25,000.

''(B) Separation pay shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit. Separation pay shall not be taken into account for the purpose of determining the amount of any severance pay to which an individual may be entitled under section 5595 of this title, based on any other separation.

''(C) Separation pay, if paid in installments, shall cease to be paid upon the recipient's acceptance of employment by the Federal Government, or commencement of work under a personal services contract as described in paragraph (5).

''(6) An employee who receives separation pay under this section on the basis of a separation occurring on or after the date of the enactment of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–236; 108 Stat. 111) and accepts employment with the Government of the United States, or who commences work through a personal services contract with the United States within 5 years after the date of the separation on which payment of the separation pay is based, shall be required to repay the entire amount of the separation pay to the Department of Defense. If the employment is with an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of this title) other than the Department of Defense, the Director may, at the request of the head of that agency, waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is within the Department of Defense, the Secretary may waive the repayment if the individual involved is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is with an entity in the legislative branch, the head of the entity or the appointing official may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is with the judicial branch, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position.

''(7) Under this program, early retirement and separation pay may be offered only pursuant to regulations established by the Secretary, subject to such limitations or conditions as the Secretary may require.

''(l) PROVISIONS RELATING TO HIRING.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary may exercise any hiring flexibilities that would otherwise be available to the Secretary under section 4703(a)(1). Veterans shall be offered preference in hiring.

"§ 9903. Contracting for personal services

''(a) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary may contract with individuals for services to be performed outside the United States as determined by the Secretary to be necessary and appropriate for supporting the activities and programs of the Department of Defense outside the United States.

''(b) NO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Individuals employed by contract under subsection (a) shall not, by virtue of such employment, be considered employees of the United States Government for the purposes of—

''(1) any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management; or

''(2) under the National Security Personnel System established under this chapter.

''(c) APPLICABILITY OF LAW.—Any contract entered into under subsection (a) shall not be subject to any statutory provision prohibiting or restricting the use of personal service contracts.

"§ 9904. Attracting highly qualified experts

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a program using the authority provided in subsection (b) in order to attract highly qualified experts in needed occupations, as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) AUTHORITY.—Under the program, the Secretary may—

''(1) appoint personnel from outside the civil service and uniformed services (as such terms are defined in section 2101 of this title) to positions in the Department of Defense without regard to any provision of this title governing the appointment of employees to positions in the Department of Defense;

''(2) prescribe the rates of basic pay for positions to which employees are appointed under paragraph (1) at rates not in excess of the maximum rate of basic pay authorized for senior-level positions under section 5376 of this title, as increased by locality-based comparability payments under section 5304 of this title, notwithstanding any provision of this title governing the rates of pay or classification of employees in the executive branch; and

''(3) pay any employee appointed under paragraph (1) payments in addition to basic pay within the limits applicable to the employee under subsection (d).

''(c) LIMITATION ON TERM OF APPOINTMENT.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the service of an employee under an appointment made pursuant to this section may not exceed 5 years.

''(2) The Secretary may, in the case of a particular employee, extend the period to which service is limited under paragraph (1) by up to 1 additional year if the Secretary determines that such action is necessary to promote the Department of Defense's national security missions.

''(d) LIMITATIONS ON ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.—(1) The total amount of the additional payments paid to an employee under this section for any 12-month period may not exceed the lesser of the following amounts:

''(A) $50,000 in fiscal year 2004, which may be adjusted annually thereafter by the Secretary, with a percentage increase equal to one-half of 1 percentage point less than the percentage by which the Employment Cost Index, published quarterly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the base quarter of the year before the preceding calendar year exceeds the Employment Cost Index for the base quarter of the second year before the preceding calendar year.

''(B) The amount equal to 50 percent of the employee's annual rate of basic pay.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'base quarter' has the meaning given such term by section 5302(3).

''(2) An employee appointed under this section is not eligible for any bonus, monetary award, or other monetary incentive for service except for payments authorized under this section.

''(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection or of section 5307, no additional payments may be paid to an employee under this section in any calendar year if, or to the extent that, the employee's total annual compensation will exceed the maximum amount of total annual compensation payable at the salary set in accordance with section 104 of title 3.

''(e) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED EXPERTS.—The number of highly qualified experts appointed and retained by the Secretary under subsection (b)(1) shall not exceed 300 at any time.

''(f) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—In the event that the Secretary terminates this program, in the case of an employee who, on the day before the termination of the program, is serving in a position pursuant to an appointment under this section—

''(1) the termination of the program does not terminate the employee's employment in that position before the expiration of the lesser of—

''(A) the period for which the employee was appointed; or

''(B) the period to which the employee's service is limited under subsection (c), including any extension made under this section before the termination of the program; and

''(2) the rate of basic pay prescribed for the position under this section may not be reduced as long as the employee continues to serve in the position without a break in service.

"§ 9905. Special pay and benefits for certain employees outside the United States

''The Secretary may provide to certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense assigned to activities outside the United States as determined by the Secretary to be in support of Department of Defense activities abroad hazardous to life or health or so specialized because of security requirements as to be clearly distinguishable from normal Government employment—

''(1) allowances and benefits—

''(A) comparable to those provided by the Secretary of State to members of the Foreign Service under chapter 9 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–465, 22 U.S.C. 4081 et seq.) or any other provision of law; or

''(B) comparable to those provided by the Director of Central Intelligence to personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency; and

''(2) special retirement accrual benefits and disability in the same manner provided for by the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) and in section 18 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403r).''.

(2) The table of chapters for part III of such title is amended by adding at the end of subpart I the following new item:

''99. Department of Defense National Security Personnel System ..... 9901''.

(b) IMPACT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.—(1) Any exercise of authority under chapter 99 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), including under any system established under such chapter, shall be in conformance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) No other provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act may be construed or applied in a manner so as to limit, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of this section, except to the extent that it does so by specific reference to this section.

(c) EXTERNAL THIRD-PARTY REVIEW OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES.—Chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) in section 7105(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) In carrying out subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), (F), and (H) of paragraph (2), in matters that involve agencies and employees of the Department of Defense, the Authority shall take final action within 180 days after the filing of a charge, unless—

''(i) there is express approval of the parties to extend the 180-day period; or

''(ii) the Authority extends the 180-day period under subparagraph (B).

''(B) In cases raising significant issues that involve agencies and employees of the Department of Defense, the Authority may extend the time limit under subparagraph (A), and the time limits under sections 7105(e)(1), 7105(f) and 7118(a)(9) of this title, if the Authority gives notice to the public of the opportunity for interested persons to file amici curiae briefs.'';

(2) in section 7105(e), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) If a representation inquiry or election involves employees of the Department of Defense, the regional director shall, absent express approval from the parties, complete the tasks delegated to the regional authority under paragraph (1) within 180 days after the delegation.'';

(3) in section 7105(f)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(f)'';

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) In any dispute that involves agencies and employees within the Department of Defense, if review is granted, the Authority action to affirm, modify, or reverse any action shall, absent express approval from the parties, be completed within 120 days after the grant of review.'';

(4) in section 7118(a), by adding at the end the following:

''(9)(A) Any individual conducting a hearing described in paragraph (7) or (8), involving an unfair labor practice allegation within the Department of Defense, shall complete the hearing and make any determinations within 180 days after the filing of a charge under paragraph (1). The Authority's review of any such determinations shall, absent express approval from the parties, be completed within 180 days after the filing of any exceptions.

''(B) The 180-day periods under subparagraph (A) shall apply, unless there is express approval of the parties to extend a period.''; and

(5) in section 7119(c)(5)(C), by adding at the end the following: ''The Panel shall, absent express approval from the parties, take final action within 180 days after being presented with an impasse between agencies and employees within the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 3. MILITARY LEAVE FOR MOBILIZED FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and at the end of clause (ii), as so redesignated, by inserting ''or''; and

(B) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(2)''; and

(2) by inserting the following before the text beginning with ''is entitled'':

''(B) performs full-time military service as a result of a call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation as defined in section 101(a)(13) of title 10;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to military service performed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 1167. A bill to resolve the boundary conflicts in Barry and Stone Counties in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to resolve the unfortunate boundary line disputes in Southwest Missouri that have resulted from conflicting Federal Government land surveys performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the United States Forest Service, USFS, respectively. The land involving these disputed property lines is located in the vicinity of the Cassville District of the Mark Twain National Forest in Barry and Stone Counties adjacent to Table Rock Lake.

During the 1970's, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, through various private land surveyors, surveyed this area around Table Rock Lake. In its surveys, the Corps found that most of the original ''corner monuments'' or boundary lines laid out by the U.S. General Land Office, GLO, in its original land surveys performed in the 1840's were either lost, stolen or had eroded over the years. Because of this, Corps surveyors used existing de-facto land markers in the vicinity of the original GLO monuments as the basis for its new survey. Prior to the Corps surveys, these defacto monuments were recognized by local surveyors as legitimate boundary markers and were used in survey after survey over the decades.

For almost 30 years, private landowners in Barry and Stone Counties bought and sold their land based on the surveys performed by the Corps in the 1970's. However, several years ago, the USFS performed new land surveys using surveying technology that had only recently become available. As a result of these new surveys, the USFS now claims that the boundary lines in its surveys conflict with the boundary lines established in the previous corps surveys. In addition to this, the USFS has announced that the Corps surveys are incorrect and that property lines all over this area are in the wrong place.

Because of these new revelations, many private property owners in the vicinity of the Mark Twain National Forest, who bought and paid for their land in good faith based on a previous Federal Government survey, are now being told that they have encroached on USFS land.

USFS has begun telling these private landowners that their land now belongs to the Federal Government, and that they will have to reimburse the USFS for the Federal land that the landowners now occupy. Naturally, these actions have produced chaos, confusion and anger among landowners in these two counties.

Needless to say, it is inherently unfair and absolutely devoid of any common sense to expect private landowners to compensate the Federal Government for land that they have already purchased simply because the government has changed its collective mind about where Federal property begins and ends.

Over the past 18 months, I have repeatedly asked the USFS and the Army Corps of Engineers to work together to find a solution that would resolve this problem. Unfortunately, after 18 month of debate and disagreement, the Corps of Engineers and the USFS have been unable to agree on a resolution of this problem. In the meantime, the lives of many of these Missouri residents continue to be disrupted.

Therefore, I have concluded that Federal legislation represents the only feasible solution to this boundary problem. This legislation authorize the Secretary of the Agriculture to convey, without consideration, title to land in which there is a boundary conflict, with adjoining federal land, to private landowners, who can demonstrate a claim of ownership because they relied on a subsequent land survey approved by the Federal Government.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 840. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 14, to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

SA 841. Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DODD, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 840 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill S. 14, supra.

SA 842. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 136, recognizing the 140th anniversary of the founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and congratulating members and officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers for the union's many achievements.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 840. Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 14, to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new title:

TITLE XII—STATE ENERGY PROGRAMS

SEC. 1201. LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) HOME ENERGY GRANTS.—Section 2602(b) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621(b)) is amended by striking ''each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2004'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and $3,400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006.''.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 2604(e) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8623(e)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after (e) ''(1)'';

(2) striking ''or any other program;'' and

(3) adding at the end the following:

''(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection, the Governor of a State may apply to the Secretary for certification of an emergency in that State and an allotment of amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(e).

''(3) The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Department of Energy and States, adopt by rule procedures for the equitable consideration of such applications. Such procedures shall require—

''(A) consideration of each of the elements of the definition of ''emergency'' in section 2603;

''(B) consideration of differences between geographic regions including: sources of energy supply for low-income households, relative price trends for sources of home energy supply, and relevant weather-related factors including drought; and

''(C) that the Secretary shall grant such applications within 30 days unless the Secretary certifies in writing that none of the emergency conditions defined in section 2603 have been demonstrated.''.

(c) REPORT ON METHODOLOGY.—

(1) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to Congress a report that makes recommendations regarding the methodology for allocating funds to States to carry out the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.).

(2) In preparing the report, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) use the latest, best available statistical data and model to develop the recommendations for the methodology; and

(B) recommend a methodology that—

(i) consists of a mechanism that uses estimates of expenditures for energy consumption (measured in British thermal units) for low-income households in each State, for each source of heating or cooling in residential dwellings; and

(ii) employs the latest available annually updated heating and cooling degree day and fuel price information available (for coal, electricity, fuel oil, petroleum gas, and natural gas) at the State level.

(3) In preparing the report, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consult with appropriate officials in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transmit to Congress a report on the programmatic impacts of using the National Academy of Science's poverty measure with different equivalence scale, known as DES, to determine low-income households.

SEC. 1202. WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) ELIBILIBILITY.—Section 412 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6862) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(A), by striking ''125'' and inserting ''150'', and

(2) in paragraph (7)(C), by striking ''125'' and inserting ''150''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 422 of the Energy Conservation and Production Act (42 U.S.C. 6872) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', $325,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $400,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.''.

SEC. 1203. STATE ENERGY PLANS.

(a) STATE ENERGY CONSERVATION PLANS.—Section 362 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6322) is amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) The Secretary shall, at least once every 3 years, invite the Governor of each State to review, and, if necessary, review the energy conservation plan of such State submitted under subsection (b) or (e). Such reviews should consider the energy conservation plans of other States within the region,

and identify opportunities and actions carried out in pursuit of common energy conservation goals.''.

(b) STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY GOALS.—Section 364 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6324) is amended to read as follows:

''STATE ENERGY EFFICIENCY GOALS

''SEC. 364. Each State energy conservation plan with respect to which assistance is made available under this part on or after the date of enactment of this title shall contain a goal, consisting of an improvement of 25 percent or more in the efficiency of use of energy in the State concerned in calendar year 2010 as compared to calendar year 1990, and may contain interim goals.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 365(f) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6325(f) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting '', $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005 and $125,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.''.

SA 841. Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DODD, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. REED)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 840 proposed by Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill S. 14, to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 1201 (relating to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program) and insert the following:

SEC. 1201. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1981.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (referred to in this section as ''LIHEAP'') is the primary Federal program available to help low-income households, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens meet their home energy bills and maintain their health and well-being;

(2) home energy costs are unaffordable for many low-income households, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens living on fixed incomes;

(3) those households often carry a higher energy burden than most United States households, spending up to 20 percent of their household income on home energy bills;

(4) States provided more than 4,000,000 households with LIHEAP assistance in 2002;

(5) LIHEAP is currently able to serve only 15 percent of the 30,000,000 households who are income-eligible for assistance under LIHEAP; and

(6) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions has jurisdiction over the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, which provides authority for LIHEAP, and is working towards reauthorizing the Act prior to its expiration in 2004.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, when the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions reauthorizes the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.), the committee should consider increasing the authorization of appropriations under section 2602(b) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 8621(b)) to $3,400,000,000, in order to better serve the needs of low-income and other eligible households.

SA 842. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 136, recognizing the 140th anniversary of the founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and congratulating members and officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers for the union's many achievements; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

''(1) recognizes that unions have made tremendous contributions to the structural development and building of the United States, and to the well-being of tens of thousands of workers;

''(2) congratulates unions for their many achievements and the strength of their members; and

''(3) expects that unions will continue their dedicated work and will have an even greater impact in the 21st century and beyond, and will enhance the standard of living and working environment for rail workers and other laborers in generations to come.''.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Tuesday, June 3, 2003 at 10 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on the Status of Tribal Fish and Wildlife Management Programs.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the following hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

June 3, 2003 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 268, authorizes the Pyramid of Remembrance Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have lost their lives during peacekeeping operations, humanitarian efforts, training, terrorist attacks, or covert operations; S. 296, to require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress regarding the requirements applicable to the inscription of veterans' names on the memorial wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; S. 470, to extend the authority for the construction of a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr.; and S. 1076, to authorize construction of an education center at or near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Because of the limited time available for the hearings, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SD–364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact: Tom Lillie at (202) 224–5161 or Pete Lucero at (202) 224–6293.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, June 4, 2003 at 10 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on Proposals to Amend the Indian Reservation Roads Program—S. 281, the Indian Tribal Surface Transportation Improvement Act of 2003, and S. 725, the Tribal Transportation Program Improvement Act of 2003.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, June 4, 2003 at 2 p.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on Impacts on Tribal Fish and Wildlife Management Programs in the Pacific Northwest.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224–2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the following hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

June 10, 2003 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills: S. 499, to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish in the State of Louisiana a memorial to honor the Buffalo Soldiers; S. 546, to provide for the protection of paleontological resources on Federal lands, and for other purposes; S. 643, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the University of New Mexico, to construct and occupy a portion of the Hibben Center for Archaeological Research at the University of New Mexico, and for other purposes; S. 677, to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; S. 1060 and H.R. 1577, to designate the visitors' center at Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, Arizona, as the ''Kris Eggle Visitors' Center''; H.R. 255, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant an easement to facilitate access to the Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska; and H.R. 1012, to establish the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearings, witnesses may testify

by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SD–364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Tom Lillie at (202) 224–5161 or Pete Lucero at (202) 224–6293.

HONORING UNION CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vitiate action on S. Res. 136 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the amendment that is at the desk be agreed to and the resolution, as amended, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 842) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To honor the contributions of all unions to the development and building of the United States, and for other purposes)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

''(1) recognizes that unions have made tremendous contributions to the structural development and building of the United States, and to the well-being of tens of thousands of workers;

''(2) congratulates unions for their many achievements and the strength of their members; and

''(3) expects that unions will continue their dedicated work and will have an even greater impact in the 21st century and beyond, and will enhance the standard of living and working environment for rail workers and other laborers in generations to come.''.

The resolution (S. Res. 136), as amended, was agreed to.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1162

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that S. 1162, introduced earlier today by Senator LINCOLN and others, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1162) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2003

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 3. I further ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of Calendar No. 79, S. 14, the Energy bill. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party lunches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning the Senate will resume consideration of S. 14, the Energy bill. There are currently two LIHEAP amendments pending to the bill, as well as the bipartisan ethanol amendment. At this time, I urge any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to the bill to contact Chairman DOMENICI or the ranking member of the Energy Committee so they may schedule a time for consideration of the amendment. Members should expect rollcall votes tomorrow. It is anticipated that we will be able to dispose of several energy amendments during tomorrow's session. Members will be notified when the first vote is scheduled.

For the remainder of the week, the Senate will continue the consideration of the Energy bill and complete action on the Department of Defense authorization bill. Therefore, Members should expect rollcall votes each day this week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:50 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 3, 2003, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 2003:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KAREN P. TANDY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF DRUG ENFORCEMENT, VICE ASA HUTCHINSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JOSETTE SHEERAN SHINER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on June 02, 2003, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

DEE ANN MCWILLIAMS, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION), WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 24, 2003. ○

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MR. ALBERT KRAUSE, JR. FOR HIS 65 YEARS OF VOLUNTEER FIRE SERVICE

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great New Jerseyan. For 65 years, Mr. Albert Krause, Jr., of River Vale, New Jersey has dedicated his life to serving our local communities. As a 58 year veteran of the River Vale Volunteer Fire Department, where he held the office of Chief twice and Fire Marshall and served for another 7 years as a member of the Oradell Volunteer Fire Department, Mr. Krause committed himself to making northern New Jersey a safer and stronger place to live.

As a life member of the New Jersey and New York Fireman's Association's, Mr. Krause has risen above and beyond the call of duty to protect our communities and neighborhoods. Very few people ever reach this milestone in the fire service. For this distinguished honor of 65 years of service, we recognize him as a true American hero.

Nearly one million state and local first responders, of which approximately 750,000 volunteers like Mr. Krause, regularly put their lives on the line to protect the lives of others and make our country safer. Today, we give thanks for the invaluable service rendered by Mr. Krause and other firefighters, who risk their lives to preserve and protect our communities. Courageous servants, such as Mr. Krause have inspired us with their dedication and professionalism.

As we recognize and remember the sacrifices of Mr. Krause, let us draw great strength from his example of selfless service to others. Mr. Krause's 65 years of fire service to River Vale and Oradell embodies the best of the American spirit.

We thank Mr. Krause for helping to renew our respect for public service and providing lasting lessons in courage for many years to come. On behalf of the people of New Jersey's Fifth Congressional District, it is with great honor, that I recognize Mr. Krause for his 65 years of volunteer fire service.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT STEVEN P. JONES FOR HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Steven P. Jones of the Lake County, California Sheriff's Department, for dedicating his professional life to protecting and serving the people of Lake County.

Steven Jones first joined the Lake County Sheriff's Department on March 15, 1973 as a Deputy Officer. Deputy Jones earned Peace Officer Standards and Training certificates in 1977 and 1982. His achievements and disciplined work ethic helped pave the way for his promotion to the rank of Sergeant in 1977.

Sergeant Jones has served the Sheriff's Department in many different capacities. He has served as SWAT team leader, Search and Rescue team leader, Patrol Supervisor, Investigator, Volunteer Coordinator and Commander at the Lower Lake Substation.

Regardless of his specific title or role within the department, Sergeant Jones has always been a leader and an example to his fellow officers. His dedication to the community has been a tremendous benefit to us all.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Jones epitomizes the standards of a true civil servant. For over 30 years he has conducted himself with honor and dignity. Even when he is not working, Sergeant Jones is never really off duty. On Sunday July 14, 1996 Sergeant Jones and his wife Pattie were walking in Library Park, a popular local recreation area. As they walked about, they looked to the water. There they witnessed an accident involving a 5–year-old boy and his Jet Ski. The child had been knocked off of his Jet Ski and was facing certain peril when without hesitation Sergeant Jones jumped into the water and began swimming toward the boy. Fortunately for that boy and his family, Sergeant Jones' strength and training took over and he not only reached the child, he pulled him to the dock and administered proper medical attention until rescue personnel could arrive.

Such is the character of Sergeant Jones.

Mr. Speaker, three decades have passed since Sergeant Jones first joined the force. In that time, his dedication to our community has remained firm and intact. He has never wavered and he has always maintained our confidence. Sergeant Jones has protected and served Lake County faithfully, he has kept us safe. For his outstanding service and amazing call to duty over the previous 30 years, it is proper for us to honor Sergeant Steven P. Jones at the time of his retirement from the Lake County Sheriff's Department and extend out best wishes to him in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 2003, I missed rollcall vote No. 211. Had I been here I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 211.

HONORING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2003 KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS ANNUAL SHIELD AWARD, RAMSEY, NEW JERSEY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinguished honor to recognize five great New Jerseyans for their service and commitment to public safety. Patrolman Timothy Flanagan of the Ramsey Police Department, Assistant Chief Thomas Lanning of the Ramsey Fire Department, Lieutenant Steve Ahlstedt of the Ramsey Ambulance Squad, Captain Chris Hoffman of the Ramsey Rescue Squad and Michael Greenshields of the Ramsey Office of Emergency Management have risen above and beyond the call of duty to protect our communities and neighborhoods. Their selfless service is a testament and model for those who regularly put their lives on the line to protect others and make northern New Jersey safer. It is my privilege to recognize and give thanks for their invaluable service to the people of Ramsey, New Jersey.

Each and every day across our country, across New Jersey and throughout the great borough of Ramsey, first responders selflessly risk their lives to protect our families and neighborhoods. None of them become a first responder for the money—in many cases they volunteer their services. Nor do any of them put on their uniform expecting a life of ease. Day-in and day-out they put themselves in harm's way and stand in the face of danger. They take the job because they want to serve their community and their country. Fortunately, this great country has such heroic men and women.

On behalf of the people of New Jersey's Fifth Congressional District, it is with great honor, that I recognize and salute Patrolman Flanagan, Assistant Chief Lanning, Lieutenant Ahlstedt, Captain Hoffman and Mr. Greenshields for their bravery, courage and commitment to public safety.

TRIBUTE TO ISAIAH HILL, JR.

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Isaiah Hill, Jr. This noble man has dedicated and committed his life to serving the people of Miami-Dade County for 38 years in our Department of Parks and Recreation, and he has decided to retire at the end of June.

Mr. Hill began his years of distinguished service in 1966 as a Laborer in the county parks system. Few imagined at that time that this first job would lead to a lifelong commitment to becoming a Skilled Laborer, Golf Attendant, and Maintenance Repair Mechanic.

His superiors respect his loyalty, dedication, and commitment to fine workmanship. Anyone who has had the privilege of working with Mr. Hill knows that he will take on any task no matter how hard, and he will always get the job done.

After many years of tireless work and dedication, he has decided to hang up his hat and retire. His many friends and co-workers at Miami Dade Parks and Recreation will dearly miss him, but so will the thousands of Dade County residents who never met Mr. Hill, but who have enjoyed the parks that he helped maintain for so long. The Parks may never look quite the same without his magical touch. He is leaving behind a legacy in the parks system for his co-workers to continue with a high level of commitment to excellence and dedication to service.

Mr. Speaker, Isaiah Hill, Jr. is a good man who does things uncommonly well.

Congratulations, Mr. Hill, and enjoy your retirement.

IN TRIBUTE TO THOMAS SAAM

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Saam will long be remembered by local school children, union workers, Vietnam Veterans, family, friends and hundreds of children in Vietnam. Tom was a patriot who took great pride in America and his service in the U.S. Marine Corps. Always a strong voice for organized labor, Tom was a 26-year employee of General Motors Power Train in Toledo, OH. He was a proud United Auto Worker, UAW, and trustee who believed strongly in the quality of life for workers and their families who remained active as a member of the UAW Local No. 14 Retirees.

Seven years ago, in 1995, Tom Saam underwent a heart transplant. Following successful surgery, Tom became a spokesperson for transplants and a volunteer with the American Heart Association, receiving their prestigious Heart and Soul Award. He served with pride the American Red Cross, Life Connections of Ohio and the Mended Hearts Association. Upon his death on December 7, 2002, Tom Saam became a donor also. During the last 7 years as a proponent for organ and tissue donation, Tom Saam spent a great deal of time speaking to groups as an advocate for donation and educating children about the dangers of smoking. Tom's concern for our children and youth was always present in all that he did.

Tom Saam, a former U.S. Marine, served two tours in Vietnam. Tom Saam never forgot his veteran buddies as an active member of Veteran of Foreign Wars Post No. 3265, Toledo, OH, and VFW Department of Ohio P.O.W./M.I.A. Chairman 1992–1995. Tom served as Post No. 3265 Americanism Chairman from 1990–2002 and served as UAW Region 2B Veterans Representative 1995–2002.

On Veteran's Day in 1999, Tom Saam and several other Vietnam Veterans joined me in our District Congressional Office and placed a conference call to then U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam Pete Peterson. From that conversation and meeting, Tom Saam and his core group of veterans formed the D.O.V.E. Fund, a non-profit humanitarian organization dedicated to helping the children of Vietnam in the areas of health care, improving water quality and building schools. As a charter member and member of the D.O.V.E. Fund Board of Directors, Tom worked diligently to provide the extras such as writing tablets, pencils, toothbrushes, soap and other like items that the children of Vietnam need. Tom never hesitated to approach anyone he felt could provide assistance for a child. His dentist, his insurance agent, his union, his buddies and a variety of local veteran's groups were frequent donors of school supplies, ball caps, candy and anything else that kids needed to improve their quality of life.

In May of 2001 Tom traveled with other veterans on a return trip to Vietnam. Tom had arranged through a Vietnamese-American contact to obtain what was believed to be the remains of 2 American M.I.A.s' and return these remains to our government in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. As a result of his efforts, Tom was named the June 2001, Citizen of the Month by Toledo's Mayor and was awarded the UAW Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award for his courageous efforts. The D.O.V.E. Board of Directors is planning to build a school in Quang Tri Province, Vietnam and dedicate it in Tom Saam's memory.

Tom is the father of Thomas, Jr., Jeremy, Laura and Jamie and the husband of Barbara. He will always be remembered as a loving husband and father, a veteran's advocate, a tough Marine and union member, a gentle spirit and mentor and a proud American. Mr. Oscar Bunch, President of Local No. 14 and long time friend of Tom said, ''Everyone who had anything to do with Tom just loved him.'' Many of us in Northwest Ohio share Oscar's sentiment. Tom Saam will be missed.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ACT OF 2003

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague Congressman MARK UDALL in introducing the Environmental Justice Act and commend my colleague, Congressman MARK UDALL for his work on this issue.

The Environmental Justice Act will make permanent an environmental justice Executive Order 12898 issued by President Bill Clinton in 1994.

It attempts to address environmental injustice within existing federal laws and regulations by prohibiting discrimination in programs that receive federal funds.

This issue has been one of my priorities as a public servant because I have seen the damage—first hand—that environmental injustice can bring to poor and minority communities.

I grew up in the shadow of one of the largest landfills in the country. As the landfill grew, so did other regional pollution. Today, the area, which is 63 percent Latino and where 15 percent of families live in poverty, suffers from water pollution from Superfund sites and the gravel pit industry.

In the Los Angeles area, it is estimated that over 71 percent of African Americans and 50 percent of Latinos reside in areas with the most polluted air, while only 34 percent of whites live in highly polluted areas.

But we are not alone. Environmental injustices are happening nationwide.

Consider the plight of the people of South Omaha, Nebraska where descendants of immigrants who labored in the city's meatpacking plants are fighting to restore city parks and stop the health risks posed by unsanitary conditions at the plants.

Or consider the people who live in Livermore, California near one of the nation's principal nuclear weapons research labs, and who are fighting radioactive contamination that has caused many cancer cases.

In the past we might have accepted our fate but today we chose to fight back.

Hardly a day passes without the media informing us about a neighborhood that is fighting a landfill, incinerator, chemical plant or some other polluting industry.

This was not always the case. Just three decades ago, the concept of environmental justice had not registered on the radar screens of most environmental, civil rights or social justice groups.

In 1996, I had the honor of introducing the first piece of environmental justice legislation in the country. Since that time, 30 other States have adopted similar laws, policies or other statues that protect and recognize the importance of environmental justice communities.

Today, we enjoy a greater ability to connect with the public through grassroots organization and the media but our laws still offer few protections to disadvantaged communities.

I am committed to changing this and look forward to working with Congressman UDALL and others to make sure that environmental protection starts with environmental equality.

This bill is one step in that fight.

HONORING THE AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION TASK FORCE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the African American Education Task Force for its clear record of success in encouraging and acknowledging academic achievement by African American youth in Oakland.

This June, the African American Education Task Force will hold its Second Annual Academic Awards Celebration at the ACTS Full Gospel Church in Oakland. At this celebration, more than 1200 African American students from 8th through 12th grades in the Oakland Unified School District will be honored for attaining grade point averages of 3.00 or above for the 2002–2003 school year.

These outstanding young people's accomplishments are especially remarkable in light of the dismal budgetary climate that now grips the State of California. I want to commend each of them for having an understanding of the importance of staying in school and the responsibility each individual has to take advantage of the educational opportunities available to him or her. By continuing to be the best students you can be and completing your education, you will have more opportunity to achieve your personal goals and our shared goal of world peace.

Your accomplishments represent your dedication and commitment to achieving your goals, and I am proud of you. The skills you have learned and the discipline you have developed will benefit you greatly.

I am honored to represent you in the United States House of Representatives. I hope you will continue your record of service and success. My best wishes for a bright future!

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION TAX ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report. This tax cut is a tragedy. It does not create jobs, it does not grow the economy, and the only thing it grows is the deficit.

What we see here today is the unraveling of fiscal responsibility. It began in the White House with the President's reckless, irresponsible proposal, and it continues with the Republicans in the Congress. By promoting his unnecessary, unfair, and fiscally unsound tax cut, President Bush has created a tax cutting frenzy among Congressional Republicans.

The result is this conference report—and a bill to put our children $1 trillion in debt. That is not leadership. I have asked many times, where have all the Republican deficit hawks gone? They are an endangered species. Democrats still believe in fiscal responsibility, and we believe that raiding Social Security and saddling our children and grandchildren with enormous debt is wrong. If the Republicans had wanted to have a proposal that would grow the economy, focus on the middle class, create jobs and be fiscally sound, they could have done so. They chose not to.

The Democratic plan, which we were not allowed to vote on, creates 1 million new jobs this year without adding one penny to the deficit. It puts money in the hands of people who need it and will spend it, injecting demand into the economy and creating jobs this year. But instead, Republicans have chosen to add $1 trillion in debt—shortchanging education, homeland security, healthcare and other vital needs. The list of missed opportunities goes on and on. That is not leadership.

Investing in education—early childhood education, K through 12, higher education, postgraduate education, lifetime learning—does more to grow the economy than any tax cut you can name. But to accommodate tax breaks for those who need it least, the Republican budget cuts $168 billion from domestic programs, including education, over the next decade. Students are asked to sacrifice, seniors are asked to sacrifice, first responders are asked to sacrifice, middle class families are asked to sacrifice—all so that the average millionaire can get a tax cut of $93,500. That is not leadership.

And, in order to squeeze more tax breaks for the wealthy into this bill, Republicans have included provisions that end the few middle-class tax cuts they once supported. Both the child tax credit and elimination of the marriage penalty end in 2005—leaving middle-class Americans with a tax increase in 2006. A future Congress will be forced to either increase taxes or add billions to our spiraling debt just as the Baby Boomers begin retiring. The middle class is asked to subsidize the wealthy. That is not right. That is not leadership.

These gimmicks hide the true cost of this tax cut, and they are not fair to middle-class Americans. The great irony of all this is that if all the Republicans want to do is to put money in the pockets of wealthy people, then nothing works better than sound, fiscally responsible policies. Wealthy Americans did better in the 1990's than at any other time. But Republicans have failed to build upon the economic successes of the Clinton Administration. Their economic record is a dismal failure.

The first two years of the Bush Administration have seen a loss of 2.8 million jobs—the worst record of job creation of any President since World War II. No job creation whatsoever—job *loss*. No modern President has had a record of that kind. And since President Bush took office, we have seen a surplus of $5.6 trillion turn into a deficit of over $2 trillion—and growing. A swing of $7.6 trillion. So now what do they want to do? Repeat the same economic policies that got us into this hole to begin with, digging the hole even deeper. That is not leadership.

President Bush and Republicans in Congress never miss an opportunity to do what is right for average Americans. Tonight, instead of investing in our children, we are indebting them. We are mortgaging their futures for a tax break that benefits those who need it least, the wealthiest in our country. And we are doing so at the expense of our opportunity to invest further in the education of our children. Vote no on the conference report. Vote no on fiscal irresponsibility. Vote no on a reckless plan that will take our country in the wrong direction.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION TAX ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, we have two million American families struggling with persistent unemployment, we have a Treasury which has asked to increase its debt by an amount bigger than the entire federal debt of 1980, and a central bank desiring yet another interest rate slash to ward off deflation. In the eye of this perfect storm, this fiscal catastrophe, we have the Republican answer to everything: cut more taxes.

This $350 billion bill is rife with uncertainty, as the individual and family tax breaks are afflicted with two-year expirations. While the bill won't inspire much confidence in our economy, it will inspire confidence and certainty that our war on tax code complexity has officially been lost.

Along with fiscal sanity, middle-income families have been tossed overboard in this Republican tax bill as relief from the alternative minimum tax was cut to less than the puny amount either chamber originally provided. Hard as it is to believe—the conference agreement before us today provides even less relief for middle-income taxpayers from the AMT than either the House or Senate bill provided, and for a shorter period of time!

When this bill was originally before the House, the Republican Majority bragged about the 10 million American families saved from higher taxes by their temporary AMT fix. But under the deal we are voting on today, 2005 will bring a tax increase for those 10 million families. Let me repeat that, at the end of next year, 10 million more American families will actually see a tax increase under this bill.

As the former Bush aide now heading the CBO stated, ''At the current pace, the AMT is on track to replace the ordinary income tax for many Americans. The sheer number of taxpayers who are or will be touched by the AMT speaks volumes about the pressure on lawmakers to address the problem.'' Apparently, that pressure was shrugged off by the Republican leaders, and AMT has been pushed off, yet again, to another day.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me object to House Republican leaders insistence in refusing any reasonable revenue offsets. With corporate expatriates dodging $5 billion in US taxes by running offshore, it simply defies logic not to collect this money in order to avoid digging our deficit hole deeper.

By refusing to accept the modest Senate language to close the Bermuda loophole, the House Republicans have sanctioned this corporate misbehavior of choosing profits over patriotism.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

HON. NATHAN DEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded a three-year project funded by HRSA (93–912A). This program was implemented under the umbrella of Project Partnership, the community outreach arm of the Graduate Program in Physical Therapy at North Georgia College and State University. The project was directed by Ms. Charlene L. Hudson and Dr. Lynda D. Woodruff. Our local, state and federal legislators supported this competitive grant.

The purpose of this grant was to bring a variety of services, adaptive equipment and healthcare resources to the population of rural elderly in three contiguous counties: Lumpkin, Hall and Dawson. Healthcare services for the vast majority of these citizens are severely challenged, poorly funded, and extraordinarily inaccessible. The physical therapy faculty, the nurse practitioner faculty, and more than 100 graduate students in these two programs joined forces to provide in excess of 5,000 formal visits/interactions to rural citizens whose quality of health and quality of life have been compromised.

The project was able to supercede its initial goals, standards for operations, and complete programmatic activities fluidly. However, the majority of our requests forwarded to us were far beyond the scope of our project. We somewhat anticipated this phenomenon as a result of our community needs assessment which occurred during the planning phase for the grant application. What we did not anticipate

was a decline in the sparse services available. For example, our three counties have lost home modification resources, rural transportation, and a large number of Medicaid friendly clinical services. This simply means that there is still a severe level of unmet need in our rural region.

We have found a few sources to minimally sustain this project. The network which we initiated in 1995 has matured today to include the State Office of Rural Health, federally funded community health center, State Area Agency on Aging, 9th District Social Services and our University. We are confident that this model is unique and we will strive to share our findings through HRSA publications.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes,

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank Chairman HUNTER, for yielding me this time and thank you for including my language in your en-bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the horrific events of September 11th reminded us all of the importance of protecting our Nation and its people. Unfortunately, these emerging terrorist threats will continue to be an issue for many years to come.

National homeland defense must be our highest priority. We must utilize the unique capabilities and expertise of all agencies in this effort, including the Department of Defense.

The military's mission has been fundamentally changed by the new homeland defense requirements. This mission change has been significant enough to warrant the creation of another major combatant command—Northern Command—to be responsible for national homeland defense.

We must identify exactly what the Department of Defense needs to execute this vital mission. Major steps are already being taken in this area. However, it is essential that we continue to closely examine what is needed to protect America during this dangerous time. Military construction to support the homeland defense mission is an integral part of the picture.

Homeland defense has not been traditionally used as a determining factor in the funding of MILCON projects. I remain concerned that we do not evaluate our military construction needs in light of the new homeland defense mission. This amendment will ensure that all MILCON projects, regardless of when submitted, be evaluated in part for their contribution to the homeland defense mission.

Postponing needed military construction required for homeland defense is something we cannot afford to do.

We need to make homeland defense one of the principle criteria for all future military construction programs. For example, in my district, the 177th Fighter Wing has been worldwide-deployable, but is now focused on homeland defense.

NORAD and NORTHCOM have given this wing responsibility for 24-hour alert and combat air patrol along the mid-Atlantic, including responsibility for cap missions over New York City and Washington, DC.

Because of this new 24-hour alert site status, the wing's needs have changed. Their military construction requirements have changed and this amendment will ensure the MILCON process recognizes this trend nationwide.

I encourage you to vote for this amendment to help preserve our homeland defense. Finally, I join with you to commend the men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces for service and thank them for securing the freedom we all enjoy.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HERALD-CITIZEN

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th year of existence of The Herald-Citizen of Cookeville, Tennessee, an integral part of the community and a reliable source of news for Putnam County and the Upper Cumberland region.

The first edition of this Middle Tennessee newspaper was published on February 11, 1903, by Elmer Wirt and his son, Ralph. During the next century, this newspaper kept Cookeville well-informed and evolved into an award-winning daily publication. From a small town of barely 600 people in 1903 to a thriving Upper Cumberland community of about 25,000 residents today, Cookeville has depended on The Herald-Citizen for unbiased news coverage.

Many changes have occurred at the newspaper during the past century. As the community grew and prospered, so did The Herald Citizen. Elmer Wirt and his son printed the first edition on a small flatbed press that sat on top of a table, with the type set by hand. C. Lee Walls Sr. and his son, C. Lee Walls Jr., now print the newspaper on a modern, computerized press weighing many tons.

Although many changes have occurred at the newspaper and to the community, one thing remains certain: The Herald-Citizen's commitment to fair and honest news coverage. Cookeville and the surrounding communities of Putnam County have benefitted tremendously from the hard work and dedication of the newspaper and its employees over the years. I congratulate the newspaper's success and am sure the next 100 years of publication will be just as exciting and rewarding as the first 100 years.

HONORING GUSTAVUS EVANSEN

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to mention an exemplary Staten Islander, Mr. Gustavus Evansen. He embodies the hard work and determination that characterizes the American Dream.

In 1923, at the age of 17, Gus Evansen emigrated to the United States, along with the rest of his family. They joined his father, Jorgen, who had traveled here to lay the foundations of a stable life for the family in 1917. He automatically began to work alongside his father at the Electric Launch Company, or Elco, in Bayonne, New Jersey, practicing the same shipbuilding trade his father had practiced in their homeland of Denmark. He and his father worked out of their own garage on nights and weekends to make ends meet during the Depression.

Mr. Evansen was promoted to foreman of the hull-building department in 1939, and continued to work for the next 6 years on the 399 PT-boats that Elco made for our government's use in the Second World War. After the war, as the Elco Company scrambled for work while the government contracts waned, Mr. Evansen lost his job when Elco closed down for good in 1949. He wasted no time in beginning a new career with the U.S. Coast Guard. At the age of 70, after 25 years building workboats on Governor's Island, and after rising from the rank of third-class boatbuilder to assistant foreman, Gus Evansen finally retired.

In 1930, he had married his childhood sweetheart, Bergit Knutsen who, with her family, had also emigrated from Denmark. They were together for 71 years until her death. Gus is currently 96 years old, and is enjoying his hard-earned retirement in Staten Island, New York. He has two daughters, five grandchildren, and six great grandchildren. Mr. Evansen has led the life of a model citizen, has worked hard to make a life for his family, and is the true embodiment of the American Dream.

Mr. Evansen, thank you for being a model citizen, and a proud Staten Islander.

HONORING JAKE FANNON

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jake Fannon posthumously for his military accomplishments and years of service to our country. He fought in both World War II and the Korean War, and over came the countless injuries to continue his service.

In 1941, Jake enlisted in the U.S. Army at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, and began his basic infantry training at Camp Roberts in California. He was assigned to the 813th combat engineers in Alaska where he was wounded in duty. He was a part of the 'C' Company 15th Regiment 1st Infantry Division and was injured during the first wave of the Normandy Invasion (D-Day). Later that year he joined the 78th Infantry Division in Germany where he served in combat until the end of the war. One year later, Jake was sent overseas to Australia as part of the 572nd Military Police, afterwards going to Korea. He then served at Fort Benning, Georgia as a paratrooper. After recovering from injuries sustained during one of his jumps, he was sent to the front lines in Korea and was hit on the third day causing

severe facial injuries. Jake continued his service in Germany and several areas in the U.S. before retiring in 1963.

Jake has received countless awards and honors for his steadfast service including: two Bronze Stars, four Purple Hearts, and a Silver Star. Following his service in Korea he was presented with the Congressional Medal of Honor in 1950, and yet refused the award, wishing to return to the lines with his men rather than become an officer. He subsequently received a Bronze Star and his fourth Purple Heart in its place.

He is survived by his wife Lela Fannon; his sons Tommy, Timmy, David, and Steve; and his 13 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jake Fannon for his exceptional service to our country and his efforts around the world. I invite my colleagues to join me in commending Jake for an exceptional career and for his everlasting contributions.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

I cannot believe the Majority will not even let us debate who should be allowed to receive an extension of unemployment insurance.

The extension that we will be allowed to vote on, provided this rule stands, will provide twenty six weeks of assistance to those few states that have exceeded an unemployment threshold of six percent. The unemployed workers in those six states receive the needed benefits, while those in other states receive only half of the extension. This bill ignores that specific areas have suffered high unemployment, but whose overall state unemployment rate has not exceeded the threshold.

In Boulder, which has a number of high-tech companies that have either closed up shop or laid off workers, I have seen a job loss rate exceeding sixteen percent between January of 2001 to January of 2003, this according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This has resulted in a substantial increase in unemployment, and considering the state of our economy, this trend doesn't seem like it will change soon. In fact, the average monthly claims for unemployment averaged a little over sixtyfive hundred claims per month in 2001, by the end of 2002 that number had jumped to over eleven thousand three hundred. But since Colorado's unemployment level has been just below six percent these workers will be in trouble if they can't find a job within the allotted thirteen weeks, if this bill passes.

This isn't just a problem in Colorado. This is a national problem and we need to treat it as such.

But the Majority has created a rule that will not allow us to even consider amendments that would help those Americans who are struggling and cannot find employment.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2185, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this unfair rule and the underlying bill. I stand in solidarity with my colleagues who believe that this body should act in the best interests of all Americans and not only the few. I also stand to speak for those Americans who are not here to speak for themselves. I am here to say that many of them are hurting. They are unemployed and their Federal unemployment benefits are about to run out. Beyond the unemployed individuals themselves, there are countless children and families who depend on them. They are hurting, too.

If this bill is passed without amendment over 69,000 Texans will be left out. That is almost 70,000 people from my State who will not be helped by the Republicans bill. Furthermore, this summer, 39,000 Texans will face the end of their Federal unemployment benefits. That is disgraceful and it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, the unemployment rate is 6.2 percent. In Texas, there are over ¾ of a million people who are unemployed. During the 2 years of this administration, thousands of jobs have been lost in my State. During that same period millions of jobs have been lost across the country. The Democrats have been trying to make that point to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle but they remained deaf to the people's concerns.

Soon across the United States more than 1 million Americans will have exhausted both their state and Federal unemployment benefits yet they will still be unemployed. There are now 3.4 unemployed workers for every one job opening. As a result of the weak economy, this country has lost more than 500,000 jobs Justin the last 3 months. In fact, 70 percent more workers have currently exhausted their Federal benefits than during the recession of the early 1990s.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, the persistence of job losses at the 2-year mark in this recession is unprecedented since the Great Depression. That is a stunning fact. And it is the reason, the legislation put forth by the Democrats calls for $18 billion to extend and strengthen unemployment benefits this year. The Republican bill on the other hand only provides $6 billion.

Our Republican colleagues have failed to do anything to help the millions of Americans who need jobs. Rather than re-igniting the economy so that job creation would occur, the Republicans have passed staggering tax cuts that benefit the wealthy far more than the average working or unemployed person. Now the Republicans put forth this bill in an effort to persuade the American people that they are listening and responding to the needs of the unemployed. However, their bill does not do enough.

When we have the opportunity to help all unemployed workers why don't we take that opportunity? When we know that more people will need assistance 2 months from today, why don't we offer it to them? When we have the chance to provide help for the families of long-term unemployed people while they struggle to make ends meet and to find another job—any job that will allow them to take care of their families—why don't we do so? These are the questions I pose to my Republican colleagues.

When Republicans have the chance to do more to help the families of the unemployed they decide not to do so and instead propose this perfunctory bill that will help some but not enough. That is the most egregious element of this bill. They choose to leave out many Americans when the Democrats would include them. If the Republicans would allow the substitute bill to be heard on the floor they would learn that the Democrats have a better piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if this rule is not defeated I will vote in favor of this amendment but I will continue to push for a stronger bill that helps more Americans. And I will continue to work for legislation that helps put Americans back to work.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JERRY S. CHASTAIN

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Jerry S. Chastain for his brave service in the United States Military during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Upon his graduation from the Citadel, Lieutenant Colonel Chastain was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps. Since then, he has served both at home and abroad in the United States, Europe and Kuwait. Some of his assignments include Supply Platoon Leader and Battalion S–4, Supply and Services Officer, A Company Commander, Future Readiness Officer, Executive Officer for the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, and J4 Logistics Commander. In all of his positions, he has demonstrated integrity and excellent leadership.

Lieutenant Colonel Chastain has been recognized with many honors during his time in the military. His awards and decorations include the Bronze Star, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with Three Oak Clusters, the Army Commendation Medal, the NATO medal, the Army Staff Badge, the Parachutist Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

Lieutenant Colonel Chastain has repeatedly demonstrated his devotion and commitment to this country. He has boldly stood in defense of our Nation and a free world. He serves as an admirable role model for his three sons and for all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend the gratitude of myself and an entire Nation to Lieutenant Colonel Jerry S. Chastain for his service in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his courageous efforts and wishing him well as he returns home.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL ERIC K. SHINSEKI

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to honor General Eric K. Shinseki, the 34th Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I have had the privilege of working with General Shinseki over these past 4 years, as he set forth a vision, and then followed with a plan of execution, that will culminate in a complete Transformation of the premier land force in the world today—The United States Army.

General Eric K. Shinseki is a soldier General, a soldier's soldier. He began his Army career after graduating from the United States Military Academy in 1965. He served two combat tours in the Republic of Vietnam. I should note that this officer has been carried off the battlefield on the backs of soldiers. It is because of these soldiers, that he has served so long, and with so much distinction. Despite receiving serious wounds in battle, General Shinseki remained on active duty out of his utmost respect for the young, American soldier he encountered in Vietnam. While he may not have been aware at that time, the experience he garnered under the tutelage of non-commissioned officers as a new officer instilled the discipline and direction that would ultimately place him as The Army's ''point man''. General Shinseki excelled at every level, in command and in staff positions, both in the continental United States and overseas. He commanded the 1st Cavalry Division at Fort Hood, Texas, became Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans at Headquarters Department of the Army, served as the Commanding General, United States Army Europe, Commander Allied Land Forces Central Europe; and Commander, NATO Stabilization Force in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In 1998, he assumed the duties as the 28th Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

On June 22, 1999, General Shinseki became the Chief of Staff of the United States Army. Since assuming that position, General Shinseki's commitment and leadership have contributed immeasurably to ensuring that America's Army is unmatched by any in our history in its skill and professionalism. General Shinseki began a transformation that will fundamentally reform the Army and position it for continuing excellence and achievement in the coming decades. The path of Transformation is one that is filled with challenges, and unexpected events. While he was charting a course for the Army's Transformation, General Shinseki was charged with ensuring The Army was again prepared to go in to battle. At the onset, the Global War on Terrorism began to consume assets. Quickly on the heels of this, was Operation Noble Eagle—the defense of the American Homeland, in Operation Enduring Freedom—the attack on Al Qaeda's lair, and Operation Iraqi Freedom—the liberation of Iraq. These events served as a galvanizing catalyst to General Shinseki's vision for Transformation. The Army was now one Army, at war and transforming. Whether active, National Guard, or Reserve, it is one Army. Throughout all this, General Shinseki has provided a steady hand that as a result leaves the Army, and its men and women, in one of the highest states of readiness ever.

After more than 35 years service to the nation, General Shinseki will retire from the United States Army this month. Throughout that entire period, General Shinseki's actions have epitomized those of a soldier, leader, and consummate professional. Always mission-focused and soldier-centered, he upheld the Army's non-negotiable mission contract with the American people to fight and win the nation's wars, while never forgetting that it is the sacrifice and skill of the American soldier that makes those victories possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of this great country charges this body to raise and support Armies. The Transformation that is underway in our Army is one that is steeped in history, and fraught with vision. While we are charged to raise an Army, it is an officer of such caliber as General Shinseki's, who will ensure its training, its readiness, its ability to answer when the country calls. As we have witnessed since September 11, 2001, the freedoms we enjoy, come at a price. Our nation has been fortunate to have men and women willing to come forward at times of crisis and challenge to pay that price. We now add another name to that distinguished list; General Eric K. Shinseki. It is through dedication, and the selfless devotion to duty of Americans like him, that our nation is able to continue upon the path of democracy. To provide global response and assistance when and where needed. It is with profound admiration and deep appreciation that I pay tribute to General Shinseki for all that he has done for the United States Army and this country. To General Eric K. Shinseki, the 34th Chief of Staff of The United States Army, on behalf of this Congress, and of a grateful nation, Thank you for your service.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DUANE A. GAMBLE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Duane A. Gamble for his brave service in the United States Military during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Lieutenant Colonel Gamble graduated from Western Maryland College in 1985 with the honor of a Distinguished Military Graduate. After graduation, he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant of Ordnance in the Regular Army. Lieutenant Colonel Gamble then attended the Florida Institute of Technology, earning a Masters of Science in Logistics Management in 1994. He has also completed many courses in military education during his time of service.

In the past 18 years, Lieutenant Colonel Gamble has served in a variety of logistics posts including Platoon Leader, Forward Area Support Coordinator and Support Operations Officer, Executive Officer and Logistics Operations Officer, and Deputy Commander. He currently holds the position of Commander of the Taskmaster Battalion and Commander of the Bastogne Brigade Support Area. His fine service has been recognized with awards and decorations that include the Bronze Star Medal, the Master Parachutist Badge, and the Air Assault Badge.

Lieutenant Colonel Gamble has served bravely in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, Hurricane Andrew Disaster Relief, Operation Joint Endeavor, and, most recently Operation Iraqi Freedom. He has repeatedly demonstrated his devotion and commitment to this nation and stood boldly in defense of a free world. He is an admirable role model for his two young daughters and for all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend the gratitude of myself and an entire nation to Lieutenant Colonel Duane A. Gamble for his service in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his courageous efforts and wishing him well in his next assignment as Assistant Chief of Staff for the 101st Airborne Division in Iraq.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the House-Senate agreement on H.R. 2, the so-called Growth and Jobs Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

The only growth this conference report will ensure is the most dramatic growth in our national debt in this nation's history. It is ironic that as soon as the House votes on this legislation, we will adjourn for the Memorial Day District Work Period to allow the Senate to rubber stamp an increase in the debt ceiling of almost $1 trillion dollars, with no discussion by this House.

For me, this is not a partisan issue. I voted for the President's $1.35 trillion tax cut in 2001 because I believed it was the right thing to do. At that time CBO projected our surplus over ten years at $5.6 trillion. I still believe it was the right thing to do then. But that was then. This is now. We are no longer in revenue surplus mode. Now we are in deficit mode. And the $350 billion tax cut passed by Congress will now go straight to our bottom line—the $6.4 trillion national debt. In fact, the Senate will have to increase the debt limit by $984 billion in order to pass this tax cut. This tax cut is being paid for with borrowed money. And, every penny of this tax cut will be paid for by our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose tax cuts. I oppose borrowing money to pay for tax cuts.

We are running the largest deficits in history and compiling a debt whose interest payment consumes almost 18 percent of every tax dollar collected. I call this a ''debt tax'' and this is the only tax that can never be repealed.

The debt tax costs our country $1 billion per day and accounts for one of the largest expenditures by our government, third only to Social Security and national defense. And I submit that by passing this bill, we will be passing the largest tax increase—in the form of the debt tax—in history.

The best way to ensure that we, as well as our children and our grandchildren, are all

overtaxed for the rest of our lives, is to keep borrowing money and running up our debt. Our children will be forced to pay ever higher taxes just to pay the increasing interest on the debt we will incur today. Under the majority's budget, the debt tax will consume more than twenty percent of taxes just to pay interest on our national debt by the end of the decade.

It is irresponsible for us to pass a tax cut for ourselves today that leaves the bill to our children and grandchildren in the form of a crushing national debt.

In his State of the Union Address, President Bush told us, ''This country has many problems. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents and other generations.'' As a proud grandfather who wants to leave a better future for my grandchildren, I enthusiastically applauded that statement. Unfortunately, our current budget policies and this growth plan will only grow our national debt and pass the bill on to future generations.

With respect to this bill being a jobs plan, I submit that in its zeal to pass a tax cut, any tax cut that adheres to an arbitrary number, the majority has crafted a bill guaranteed to cost us jobs in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains so many gimmicks, with phase-ins and phase-outs, that it defies comprehension and makes it impossible for any responsible business or individual to plan for the future. For example, this bill helps married individuals and families by expanding the lower bracket, increasing the child tax credit and eliminating the marriage penalty—but only for 2 years. But all of these good policies (many of which I have supported in the past) will revert back to current law in 2005. It helps businesses expand, grow and create jobs by increasing the code's expensing and depreciation provisions—but these good, pro jobs policies disappear in 2004 and 2005, respectively.

''Why?'' you ask, do these pro-family and pro-jobs provisions disappear after 1 or 2 years? To make room for a proposal that does nothing to create jobs—an ill-conceived dividend reduction proposal that will only concentrate capital in the hands of shareholders without providing any incentives for businesses to create new jobs.

I believe that the President's call to eliminate the so-called double taxation of dividends is a goal toward which we should all work; however, this Congress should consider this proposal in the context of broad individual and corporate tax reform after we've gotten our fiscal house in order. I urge my colleagues to vote against this tax proposal and instead work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve true tax reform, reduction and simplification in the context of a new economic plan to get our country moving again.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOE D. DUNAWAY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel Joe D. Dunaway for his heroic service in the United States Military during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Upon graduating from Northeastern Oklahoma State University in May of 1985, Lieutenant Colonel Dunaway completed several different courses at Fort Rucker, Alabama and Fort Eustis, Virgina. His initial assignment was to the 4th Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment in Fulda, Germany. There, Lieutenant Colonel Dunaway held positions that included Command Aviation Platoon Leader and Air Cavalry Troop Commander. In 1990, he returned to the United States and served at both Fort Eustis and Fort Bragg, North Carolina. At Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, he attended the Command and Central Staff College and was assigned to the 101st Airborne Division as the Division Aviation Maintenance Officer, AVIM Company Command of Company A, and Battalion Executive Officer for the 8–101st Aviation Regiment.

During his time in the military, Lieutenant Colonel Dunaway has been recognized with many honors. His awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Army Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Army Achievement Medal with a silver oak leaf cluster, the National Defense Service Medal, the Master Aviator Badge, an Air Assault Badge, and an Airborne Badge.

Lieutenant Colonel Dunaway's involvement in Operation Iraqi Freedom as the 8–101st Battalion Commander marked his second tour of duty. He served as a role model for all as he bravely stood in defense of our nation and a free world. His devotion and commitment to this country are commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend the gratitude of myself and the entire nation to Lieutenant Colonel Joe D. Dunaway for his participation in this latest conflict in Iraq. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his fine service and wishing him well as he returns to the Aviation Branch to serve as Branch Chief.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF GLADYS HANDROP

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Mrs. Gladys Handrop. Mrs. Handrop has successfully completed over fifty-six years of honorable government service to the citizens of Alabama and Florida.

Mrs. Handrop was first employed in government service in the Escambia County Alabama Tax Assessors office on March 17, 1947. The Escambia County Florida Tax Assessors office later employed her on December 9, 1952.

Mrs. Handrop has been an extremely valuable asset to the agencies and officers by whom she has been employed. She has served under the Honorable Tax Assessors and Property Appraisers Mrs. Frances Botts, Mr. M.B. ''Bill'' Jones, Mr. John R. Jones, Jr. and Mr. Chris Jones.

Mrs. Handrop has displayed never failing loyalty to the citizens, by whom she has been employed and has been a tireless political ally to many honored officers to this county and state.

Mrs. Handrop is known and respected by legal and real estate professionals throughout Escambia County who she has assisted and guided in their practices. She has consistently been a ''family'' member, friend, confidant, role model, source of strength and mentor to all of those with whom she has worked.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to recognize this special person for the example she has set in her community. I offer my sincere thanks for all that she has done for Northwest Florida and this great nation.

CONGRATULATING PEDRO PALOMO ADA

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Pedro Palomo Ada, who we all know affectionately as ''Pete Ada, Jr.'' for being inducted into the Guam Chamber of Commerce's Guam Business Hall of Fame.

Pete Ada, Jr. is an icon of the Guam business community who has done many great things for the island of Guam. He is one of Guam's original entrepreneurs. His success as a businessman is rooted in his hard work, ingenuity, and work ethic, which serves as an inspiration for young businessmen and women on Guam. His induction into the Guam Business Hall of Fame is a testament to his outstanding career and his contributions to our community. I join the Guam Chamber of Commerce, our civic organizations, and our island in commending Pete Ada, Jr. and in congratulating him on this lifetime achievement.

Mr. Ada began his business career while at college at Saint Thomas Military Academy in Saint Paul, Minnesota. Pete would send shoes and other great bargains to Guam for resale in his parents' retail business. After college, he served as one of the first Chamorro commissioned officers in the United States Air Force and later returned to Guam to help with the family business, Ada's Markets. He transformed his family's retail business into a household name, and later, into a real estate holding company. In the process, he transformed how a whole generation viewed business opportunities on Guam. He is a visionary who saw the potential for new residential developments, commercial real estate developments and new markets. He created opportunities for our island and in the process he helped Guam re-define itself from a military service economy to a strong private sector economy with a robust capital investment sector.

Pete Ada, Jr. is presently the Chairman of the investment firm he founded, Ada's Trust and Investment, Inc. and Chairman of Nanbo Guam, Ltd. He is a Director of the Bank of Guam, Pizza Hut of Guam, and Pacific Textiles. He owns 18 commercial properties and is responsible for developing 28 properties throughout his career.

As a model citizen, Pete Ada Jr. championed the ROTC program at the University of Guam. He has supported the Boy Scouts and KGTF Public Television, and he has been active in the Air Force's Civilian Advisory Council. He has served as a board member of several government boards, including the Retirement Fund, the Guam Visitors Bureau, the

Guam Memorial Hospital, the University of Guam and the Guam Blue Ribbon Education Committee. In addition, he served on the board of the former Medical Center of the Marianas. In recognition of his service, he received an Honorary Doctor of Law degree in 1983 from the University of Guam.

Pete Ada, Jr. epitomizes the businessman whose success derives from a motivation to provide products and services that make his community a better place to live, and who has profited as a by-product of that dedication. By his induction into the Guam Business Hall of Fame, he sets a standard for others to emulate. We congratulate him and his proud wife Fe and their family, and we join with all the people of Guam in celebrating his achievement.

RECOGNIZING THE ZACCAGNINO FAMILY, AMERICA'S FUNNIEST FAMILY, FROM ELMWOOD PARK, IL

HON. RAHM EMANUEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Zaccagnino family, from Elmwood Park, in the 5th Congressional District of Illinois. The Zaccagnino family was chosen from hundreds of families who submitted videotapes in hopes of winning the ABC Family cable network ''My Life Is a Sitcom'' contest, replete with a chance of starring in a sitcom based on their life.

According to a recent Chicago Tribune article, the Zaccagnino family is already famous—and their sitcom hasn't even aired yet! Evidently, the family—Diane, Karen, Camille and Danny—have been feted by everyone in Chicago; and now Capitol Hill! Horwath's restaurant threw them a party; their state representative filed a resolution in their honor; teachers are using the family's history as assignments; and the crème de la crème—the family recently taped ''The Oprah Show.''

Finding humor in life is challenging, but the Zaccagnino family sets a great example. Karen is the owner of Karen's Hair'm, a beauty salon located on Belmont Avenue, where societal issues are viewed through changing hairstyles. And as Elmwood Park is known for its outstanding Italian food, it's understandable that a lot of the laughs take place in the kitchen. I am proud of Chicago's own Zaccagnino family, and I look forward to seeing their lives coming soon to a television near you.

Chicagoans can see the funny family for themselves on the ABC Family website where visitors can view video submissions and vote for their choice for ''America's Funniest Family.''

I urge my colleagues, indeed all of America, to keep an eye out for the Zaccagnino family. I have a feeling we'll all be wishing we were part of such a loving, funny and lively family.

HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, conserving our environment is important. Our forests are an important part of both Michigan's and our country's environment. In the west, catastrophic wildfires have decimated our forests over the last several years destroying both government and private property. The Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (H.R. 1904) is a common-sense, cost-effective piece of legislation that helps to control these fires as well as combat destructive insect and disease infestations in our forests.

Removing some of the bureaucratic red tape for performing fire prevention measures is not only environmentally friendly but also fiscally responsible, as fire prevention costs American taxpayers approximately one-fourth of what it costs to fight catastrophic forest fires. The Healthy Forests Restoration Act authorizes the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to reduce the amount of underbrush and deadwood buildup in forests that serve as kindling and fuel for the hottest, most dangerous fires. It would regulate BLM's activities by putting limits on the tree removal and road construction that has provoked controversy at times in the past. This would give BLM the tools it needs to confront the increasing threat of destructive forest fires on federal lands that have had serious impacts both on people and wildlife.

The bill takes additional measures to improve our forests. These include provisions to encourage energy production from renewable energy sources, protection of watersheds in forest areas and the creation of a forest reserve program aimed at preserving and rehabilitating up to one million acres of degraded and rare forest lands.

Disease and insect infestations are not only detrimental to our woodlands, but also to our tree-lined streets and backyards. In southeast Michigan, we are combating an exotic beetle known as the Emerald Ash Borer. The beetles' larvae feed on the sapwood and eventually kill branches and entire trees. This invasive pest has resulted in the quarantine of all ash products in six counties in southeastern Michigan. There are 28 million ash trees in the six quarantined counties and an estimated 700 million ash trees in Michigan. We are now finding that the pest is spreading into Ohio. The magnitude of this problem is serious. Preliminary data from the Forest Service estimates that the potential national impact of the Emerald Ash Borer is a loss of ash trees up to 2 percent of total timber with a value loss of between $20–60 billion.

Following discussions with Secretary Veneman and gaining the support of the Michigan delegation, Michigan Department of Agriculture, and DNR we were able to get the approval of $14.6 million in emergency assistance from USDA to combat the Emerald Ash Borer. This federal funding will supplement resources provided by state and local authorities and will be used for pest surveillance, quarantine of infected areas, and some tree removal. In order to more efficiently combat destructive pests like the Emerald Ash Borer, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act puts in place measures that will allow accelerated information gathering on such insect infestations. By removing bureaucratic red tape and being more proactive in maintaining forest health, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act is a step in the right direction towards efficiently managing our forests, preventing catastrophic fires, controlling damaging insect infestations, and protecting our environment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us is of great importance, perhaps today more than ever. Even as we debate this legislation today, our brave men and women are serving in harm's way. That is why I strongly support many provisions of this legislation; particularly the 4.1 percent across-the-board pay increase for military personnel, as well as the vital readiness, modernization, and infrastructure improvements, which will keep our forces the best-trained and best-equipped in the world.

As we are all painfully aware, there are many security challenges that face our great nation. As such, it is critical that we provide the necessary investments in our national defense. However, because of several highly controversial provisions in what is traditionally a bipartisan bill, I have strong reservations about supporting H.R. 1588 as it is currently written.

One of my primary concerns pertains to the environmental provisions in this legislation that weaken environmental protections. Although I fully support maintaining the highest possible level of military training and readiness, I believe such readiness must also be balanced against our duty to protect at-risk species, especially in light of existing Department of Defense exemptions in current environmental laws. H.R. 1588 does not adequately address this concern.

The Department of Defense contends that military training on the approximately 25 million acres of land at the more than 425 installations nationwide is greatly constrained by environmental laws such as the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. However, a GAO report issued in June 2002 found that training readiness remains high and that the ESA and the MMP are not hampering military readiness. In addition, existing environmental laws already have national security exemptions, yet DoD has never bothered to apply for them. Although I support Chairman HUNTER's attempt to temper this extreme anti-environmental provision, I am dismayed that Democrats were denied the right to offer the Rahall/Dingell amendment,

which would have addressed these environmental exemptions in a much more comprehensive manner.

Another provision that is of great concern to me pertains to the DoD's civilian personnel. H.R. 1588 contains broad, sweeping provisions that grant the Secretary of Defense authority to create an entirely new civilian employee system for DoD's 700,000 civilian workers, which strips these employees of some of their basic rights, such as the right to notice before they are fired and the right to join a union. Representatives COOPER, DAVIS, and VAN HOLLEN offered an important amendment before the Rules Committee to make major modifications to these provisions, in order to protect fundamental employee rights in any new National Security Personnel System designed by the DoD. Disturbingly, the Republicans disallowed this important amendment from being considered on the floor today. I wish I could say I was shocked at this action, but unfortunately it has become standard fare for the Majority to stifle debate and discussion on the important issues of the day.

Last, and certainly not least, is my concern over the nuclear weapons provisions in H.R. 1588. This legislation authorizes previously prohibited research on low-yield nuclear weapons and also authorizes $21 million to study the feasibility of developing a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.

Our military needs improved capabilities to hold at risk hardened, and deeply buried targets in rogue nations that might contain prohibited weapons of mass destruction programs. However, instead of building new nuclear weapons and sending the signal to our allies and enemies alike that it's okay to build nuclear weapons, I believe we should fund weapons that have just as strong a deterrent capability, but do not encourage new uses for nuclear weapons or encourage a new nuclear arms race.

The military has not even asked for nuclear weapons to do the job because there are already several conventional programs underway that would allow us to get at the same targets. A recent article quotes Adm. James Ellis, head of U.S. strategic command, as saying he wants to ''reduce the country's dependence on nuclear weapons by using conventional, precision-guided bombs and missiles.''

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate, I strongly support a strong national defense to address the many national security challenges we face in this uncertain world. Excluding these extraneous, highly controversial provisions, H.R. 1588 contains many important provisions to improve our nation's defenses. I support the important provisions that provide good pay, housing and training for the men and women in uniform and fund important modernization priorities that will ensure that we have the most technologically advanced military in the world. I am very hopeful that the environmental, civil service, and nuclear weapons provisions are addressed in conference in order to make this a more acceptable and bipartisan piece of legislation.

HONORING DON MIDDLETON

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of our great champions of education in Colorado, Mr. Don Middleton. Mr. Middleton is retiring as Superintendent of Clear Creek School District after 37 years of service in public education.

During his tenure at Clear Creek, he has played a valuable role in raising the District's test scores across the board. The effect of his integrity, honesty and passion for education has been far reaching. In fact, he has been credited with restoring the pride of the educational community in his schools through his tireless efforts and compassionate leadership.

Don has been recognized on numerous occasions for his exceptional work in education. He has been given awards such as the Administrator of the Year Award of Excellence; the Award of Distinguished Service; a Certificate of Recognition for Outstanding Service Adams County #1; and the Hall of Fame Award from the Mapleton Education Association. Interestingly enough, if you ask Don to talk about his long and distinguished career of service, you would most likely find that he would rather talk about the kids he has met along the way. His dedication is evident by his enthusiastic presence at so many school functions and classroom visits.

Don Middleton has been a dedicated leader and an unwavering advocate for excellence in education. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Middleton for his hard work on behalf of Colorado's children and families. I wish him success in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING MARY ANN MCROBERT

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mary Ann McRobert, recipient of the Lenawee Chamber's 2003 ATHENA award.

Throughout her life, Mary Ann McRobert has distinguished herself both personally and professionally through her commitment to helping those in need. Earning a Nursing Degree from St. Vincent's Hospital School of Nursing, Mary Ann went on to earn two degrees in Social Work: a bachelor's degree from Siena Heights University and a Masters degree from the University of Michigan. She has shared her experience and knowledge in nursing and social work as an instructor at Siena Heights University and Adrian College.

Mary Ann has made the most of her extensive education and training, serving in a variety of nursing situations, as a social worker, and as an administrator of several social service organizations. In the last 18 years, she has served as: Interim Director of Call Someone Concerned, Executive Director of the Family Awareness Center, Administrative Director of Bixby Medical Center Psychology Unit, Clinical Social Worker in private practice, and Interim Director of Family Counseling and Children's Services. She also served two terms as President of the Board of Directors for the Family Awareness Center, two terms as Vice President of the Board of Directors for Family Counseling and Children's Services, and the Gerontology Network. Mary Ann has also volunteered for Hospice of Lenawee.

Mary Ann McRobert is well respected in her community, and with good reason. She is well known for her ability to initiate a project, enlist the assistance of others, and see the plan through to completion. Her efforts are not for her own benefit, but for the benefit of others. She has been a fierce advocate and courageous leader for social service causes and, by mentoring and her example, has opened many doors for women and men in community leadership.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, people in New Mexico are hurting. Since January 2001, the unemployment rate in my state has risen to 5.9 percent. While every single person on unemployment would rather have a job, until the economy reverses, we in Congress have a moral obligation to help the jobless make ends meet. The extension will help nearly 5,000 New Mexicans who still have not found jobs, and were scheduled to exhaust their Federal benefits at the end of this month.

We have been calling for this type of legislation for weeks, and I applaud the Majority for finally doing what is right. Unfortunately, although they have done what's right, they haven't done enough in this bill to help all Americans who are out of work.

Last year, because of the failed economic policies of this administration, Congress was forced to enact the Temporary Extension of Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) bill. Sadly, though, the need has only increased since then. The economy has actually gotten worse since Congress passed TEUC in March 2002.

The number of unemployed (8.79 million) is at the highest level in nearly a decade. The unemployment rate rose to 6.0 percent in April, compared to 5.7 percent when TEUC was enacted in March 2003 and when the program was extended in January of this year. The number of payroll jobs fell for the third straight month in April; unemployment is now 2.1 million below its level when the recession began. Long-term unemployment also continues to get worse.

Unemployment benefits provide an economic lifeline for families struggling to find work and boost an ailing economy. People are losing their jobs, looking for work, and finding none.

It is unfortunate that the House leadership waited so long to bring up this bill. It is also unfortunate that the House leadership has refused us a vote on the Democratic alternative—yet again.

While I will vote for this bill because it is critical to the millions of Americans who have lost

their jobs in the last two years, we should be doing more. This plan leaves over one million unemployed behind, and fails to provide them the benefits they need to put food on the table, clothes on their backs, and a roof over their heads.

We also should be extending this benefit for 26 weeks, not just 13. Although the bill provides that in high unemployment states jobless workers would be eligible for 13 more weeks—in addition to the 13 extra weeks available to all jobless workers who have exhausted their 26 weeks of regular benefits—the entire country is in need of this assistance. Because of the strict requirements for a state to qualify as a high unemployment state under this program, only six states currently qualify—Alaska, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Washington. We should pass the full Democratic package immediately to help everyone seeking work, not just the few.

Research shows that during previous recessions, the stimulative power of unemployment benefits saved an average of 131,000 jobs and slowed the drop in the Gross Domestic Product by 15 percent. National studies have shown that $1 in unemployment insurance leads to $2.15 worth of economic growth.

Every week without unemployment insurance benefits, states lose $200 million in cash—cash that in all likelihood would be spent at the local grocery store and the local gas station. Indeed, a recent study by Economy.com, an independent financial research group, found that the single most effective stimulus measure would be further extension of emergency Federal unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation unfortunately is long overdue, and very necessary. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2158, and quickly send this legislation to the Senate to ensure these benefits continue uninterrupted.

IN HONOR OF CAROLYN ''CJ'' JONES

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to acknowledge Ms. Carolyn ''CJ'' Jones for her many years of public service and for the depth and diversity of contributions she has made to my staff and to so many people in Colorado.

Upon my election to the 2nd Congressional District in 1998, CJ was the first person I invited to join my staff. She was instrumental in organizing my campaign effort in Adams County, and in the early days after my election, she organized our fledgling congressional office from the basement of her house and took constituent inquiries on her cell phone. CJ Jones assisted in training many of my novice staff members and has subsequently set the standard of excellence for my office in the 2nd Congressional District.

Prior to becoming my staff assistant, CJ served in the offices of Senator Tim Wirth and Congressman David Skaggs. She is also the only member of my staff with her own election certificate—this to the Adams County School District 12 Board. Throughout her distinguished career, she has served successfully in numerous capacities. Her knowledge of Adams County politics is encyclopedic, and her insistence on application of House Ethics Rules has become legendary with members of my staff. We will deeply miss the staff parties at her home, her annual Christmas carols—which started with the earliest snowfall in September—and her tendency to break into song at any moment. Coworkers will also recall those rare moments in CJ's career when her blue eyes turned steely gray, signaling a red alert to everyone in the vicinity.

One of the things I share with CJ is a deep interest in young people. She has been the driving force behind my annual Youth Washington Seminar and she has mentored young people, chaperoning high school students in Washington with care and joy. She has shown young Coloradans that politics is not just about policy debates and electioneering, but also about having fun. High School students visiting Washington with her could always count on a visit to the monuments, but also a visit to the Hard Rock Café. To serve so broadly, so successfully, and with such grace, heart, and spirit is deserving of recognition.

CJ plans to spend some well-deserved time relaxing and traveling with her husband Bill, and spoiling her grandchildren. As a dedicated wife, mother and grandmother, CJ will continue to be the center of her family and the light of their lives. I know that they look forward to having her undivided attention and time. She will no doubt continue to be a force to be reckoned with in the arena of her garden and home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in expressing our gratitude to CJ Jones for her exemplary public service to the people of Colorado and their elected officials. Her many accomplishments go beyond reckoning, and I wish her good health and happiness in the future.

HONORING SHAAN GANDHI, OF BATTLE CREEK, MI, LEGRAND SMITH SCHOLARSHIP WINNER

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect for the outstanding record of excellence he has compiled in academics, leadership and community service, that I am proud to salute Shaan Gandhi, winner of the 2003 LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This award is made to young adults who have demonstrated that they are truly committed to playing important roles in our Nation's future.

As a winner of the LeGrand Smith Scholarship, Shaan is being honored for demonstrating that same generosity of spirit, intelligence, responsible citizenship, and capacity for human service that distinguished the late LeGrand Smith of Somerset, Michigan.

Shaan is an exceptional student at Harper Creek High School, and possesses an outstanding record of achievement in high school. Shaan has received numerous awards for his excellence in science and math, as well as his volunteer activities with the Calhoun County Chapter of the American Red Cross and the Substance Abuse Council of Battle Creek. A Siemens-Westinghouse Scholar, Shaan has also participated in the NASA SHARP PLUS program, is a National Merit Scholarship Finalist, and has been accepted to Harvard University.

Therefore, I am proud to join with his many admirers in extending my highest praise and congratulations to Shaan Gandhi for his selection as winner of a LeGrand Smith Scholarship. This honor is a testament to the parents, teachers, and others whose personal interest, strong support and active participation contributed to his success. To this remarkable young man, I extend my most heartfelt good wishes for all his future endeavors.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2003

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the facts are startling. In just over 2 years, this administration has taken a vibrant economy and turned it into a total mess. Once we saw projected federal surpluses for years, but now we see unprecedented deficits as far as the eye can see. Once we saw Americans working in good paying jobs, but now we see over two million jobs lost and families needing help to make ends meet. Once we saw states thriving and providing much needed benefits to the most needy, but now we see massive state deficits that require federal assistance to close.

Something needs to be done to fix these problems. The question is what's the best way to do it? When we began the debate earlier this year about how to turn around our struggling economy, I was looking for a plan that passed three simple tests. Was the plan fair? Was the plan fast-acting? Was the plan fiscally sound?

Tonight, the House is voting on the President's proposal. The answer to all three of these simple questions is a resounding ''no.''

Is it fair?

The other side likes to point out that the average family will receive about $1,000 in tax breaks. What they don't tell you is that 53 percent of all taxpayers—yes, 53 percent of all taxpayers—will see less than $100 in their pockets. However, if you make over $1 million a year, you get a tax cut of $93,500. This clearly is not fair.

Is it fast acting?

Well, it's going to take effect this year. Yes, that much is true. Unfortunately, the President's plan gives the break this year and next, then it takes it away again in 2005. So, the average middle class taxpayer will actually see their taxes go up 2 years from now. And this trickle-down tax policy will not stimulate the economy now. In fact, it totally depends on those who benefit—the few—to reinvest their windfall down the road. In fact, there is no guarantee that any of this will happen, so there is no guarantee that this tax cut will generate any jobs, let alone the one million promised by the President.

Is it fiscally sound?

The answer is a resounding no. The dividend tax reduction and the cut in the capital

gains rate will give us little bang for our buck. Many leading economists argue that the dividend cut especially is one of the least effective options to grow the economy.

This bill is a cruel hoax on New Mexico families. The overwhelming majority of hard-working New Mexicans will reap minimal benefits from these tax cuts. Although the final agreement hammered out by the House and Senate is much better than President Bush's original proposal, it still will not deliver much of a boost to the economy and instead increase the federal debt to be paid for by future generations.

With passage of this tax cut, Congress and the president are demonstrating their economic arrogance. Over 400 economists, 10 Nobel prize-winning economists, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and a host of other credible experts have told us that this is not the way to go. It is not good economic policy, it is not good tax policy, it is not good fiscal policy, and it is going to put us in a deeper and deeper deficit hole. Eventually interest rates will rise because of the federal debt and that's going to hit middle-income families harder than the wealthy individuals who benefit the most from this misguided bill.

Two years ago, President Bush told us that we could enact his policies and virtually eliminate the debt held by the public by 2008. Now, the Bush Administration is asking Congress to raise the debt limit by almost $1 trillion. It is an unprecedented turn of events. Those in the White House and their allies who want to eventually end the role of the federal government as we know it today—in education, homeland security, health care, Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits and other basic services—are well on their way.

The only beneficial provisions included here are the ones that we included in our alternative plan: raising the refundable child tax credit, speeding up tax relief for married couples, preventing more individuals from being hit by the alternative minimum tax, small business expensing, and the financial aid to the states. Unfortunately, these redeemable items will be strangled by the capital gains and dividends tax breaks for the few.

In 2001, I voted against the Bush tax cut bill because it was too skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and too fiscally irresponsible. Since then, we have gone from record surpluses to record deficits, and the economy is still floundering. Passing another enormous tax cut this year will only continue this trend and increase the economic problems that our children and grandchildren will inherit.

Tonight, I will do so again. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this conference report.

BRUCE WOODBURY POST OFFICE

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to pay tribute to one of Southern Nevada's most distinguished citizens, Commissioner Bruce Woodbury. I have introduced legislation to name the United States Postal Service facility in Boulder City, Nevada in his honor.

I have worked closely with the members of the City Council of Boulder City, and the Mayor of Boulder City, Robert Ferraro, to appropriately thank Commissioner Woodbury for his many contributions to the great State of Nevada.

Commissioner Woodbury is a native of Las Vegas, and he has resided in Boulder City since 1978, He is a graduate of Las Vegas High School, and attended the University of Utah where he graduated Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Beta Kappa, and Magna Cum Laude. Mr. Woodbury then attended Stanford School of Law where he earned a Doctor of Jurisprudence and was a member of the Board of Editors of the Stanford Law Review.

In Southern Nevada, Commissioner Woodbury has served for many years as an outstanding civic leader. He has served as a member of the Clark County Commission for 21 years and on the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada for 17 years, the last 11 as that body's chairman. The magnitude of his contributions are seen by Nevadans every day. Commissioner Woodbury was instrumental in gathering support for the construction of the Las Vegas Beltway, the largest and most visible transportation project ever undertaken in Clark County. Through his leadership, Commissioner Woodbury has worked to minimize traffic delays, reduce inconvenience for drivers, and maintain access to local businesses.

In addition, Mr. Woodbury has been very involved in local, civic, and youth organizations. He is also a proud father and grandfather. I am pleased to introduce this legislation honoring him today. It has been my privilege to work with Commissioner Woodbury on a variety of projects and I can speak to his character as a leader, a citizen, and as a friend.

TRIBUTE TO PONTIAC HIGH SCHOOL'S HUSKIE BRIGADE

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Pontiac Northern High School's ''Huskie Brigade'' for their victory at the U.S. FIRST Robotics National Championship in Houston, Texas last month. The twenty-four students, four teachers, and several engineers should be proud of this accomplishment.

Science and technology are the keystones to our economic prosperity. The quality education of America's youth is more critical now than ever as our society becomes more wired and globalized. Our students must be interested in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology to continue our success.

The For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology (FIRST) competition instills an appreciation of science and technology in students and teaches them how mastering these institutes can enrich our society. Corporations provide economic and professional support to FIRST and teams. General Motors Powertrain sponsored Pontiac Northern High School's team. Many Fortune 500 companies have significantly contributed to FIRST's growth and government organizations such as NASA are key partners. FIRST represents a cooperative team effort by students, teachers, communities, corporations, and our government.

The Huskie Brigade competed in two regional events leading up to the National Competition. At the Great Lakes Regional, they were awarded the prestigious 2003 Regional Chairman's Award. At the Mid-West Regional, the Huskie Brigade finished as a finalist and won the Johnson and Johnson's Sportsmanship Award.

I congratulate the Huskie Brigade on their fine achievements and awards and wish nothing but the best for all the members in their future endeavors.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO SAMANTHA BENTON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I rise today to convey my deepest appreciation to a member of my Washington, D.C. staff for her dedicated service to the people of Oregon's Second Congressional District. Samantha Benton left my staff last week to join the United States Department of the Treasury. I wish her well in this endeavor and am confident that she will excel in her new role.

Samantha was raised in my hometown of Hood River, Oregon, growing up on a family-owned orchard along the Columbia River Gorge. Her parents, John and Julie Benton, are well-respected members of the Hood River community and personal friends of mine. Samantha brought her ''small town values'' from rural Oregon to our nation's capital and to the job she performed assisting Oregonians visiting Washington, D.C. or seeking help from my office. She attended Westside Elementary School and Hood River Middle School before graduating from Hood River Valley High School in 1997. She then went on to attend the University of Puget Sound in Tacoma, Washington, where she studied history and was active as Vice President of Program Development for the University's Zeta chapter of Alpha Phi. Samantha's interest in politics was apparent during her college years, when she worked as an intern in two Congressional offices. Samantha worked as an intern in my Washington, D.C. office during the summer of 1999, then worked in Congresswoman JENNIFER DUNN's Mercer Island District Office in 2000.

After her graduation in 2001, I was pleased to offer Samantha a permanent position on my staff. From the beginning of her tenure, she made Oregonians feel at home when they walked through the door of 1404 Longworth by offering them a warm and sincere reception. She faithfully attended to every detail in helping families navigate the sights and sounds of Washington, D.C. Time and again, she brought history to life by leading tours of the Capitol for Oregonians who had come nearly 3,000 miles so that they and their children could better understand the federal government and our nation's extraordinary history. Samantha arranged their itineraries, answered their questions, and went the extra mile every time to make them feel comfortable an entire continent away from their homes. In short, Mr.

Speaker, Samantha made their day and their trip.

I have a sizable stack of letters from Oregonians who took the time to write after their trip to Washington, D.C., to thank me for Samantha's assistance and her dogged determination to make sure their experience was memorable.

Mr. Speaker, Samantha's energetic and helpful demeanor was equally appreciated by her coworkers. She was attentive in recognizing when something needed to be done, taking the initiative to complete projects and lend others a helping hand. Whether she was drafting letters to address a constituent's concerns or keeping the information on my web site up to date, Samantha's contributions were always appreciated and on target. During her time in my office, she took a staff assistant role and developed it into something much more.

Samantha's attitude and intellect will serve her well as she continues her public service at the Department of the Treasury. Mr. Speaker, she will be a difficult person to replace. Sam, thank you for a job well done and good luck in the future.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. CATHERINE OCHENSKI

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Catherine Ochenski in honor of her becoming the first female District Commander for the Veterans of Foreign Wars 11th district.

Kate proudly served her country in the Women's Army Corps from 1944 to 1946 both in the United States and in Europe. Her role during these 2 years was to assist in the aftermath of World War II. Kate has since gone on to wed a Marine veteran, and raise a family of three children. She has also served in a multitude of capacities at V.F.W. Post 1075 for over 15 years, where she currently has received the honor of being the first female District Commander. Kate's accomplishments are numerous, and her devotion to her country is steadfast.

I am honored today to recognize Catherine Ochenski for her many accomplishments, and to congratulate her on the celebration of her role as first female District Commander for the V.F.W. Post 1075.

RECOGNIZING THE MARRIAGE OF DENA MARIE CARLI AND DENNIS WAYNE POCIASK

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my best wishes for the upcoming marriage of Dena Marie Carli and Dennis Wayne Pociask on June 7, 2003.

Dena and Dennis met while on duty as police officers with the 13th District Chicago Police Department.

Dena, who is currently pursuing a law degree, has been working in law enforcement since 1995. She started as Cook County deputy sheriff and in 1999 became a Chicago police officer. Her parents, Officer Reno and Diane Carli, and her sister, Officer Lisa Carli, are all very proud of her decision to continue in the family business of keeping our city safe.

Dennis has been with the police force since 1998 and remains close with his mother, Tina, his brother, Ray, his sister-in-law, Pamela, and his niece, Holly.

Mr. Speaker, marriage is an occasion worthy of celebration and recognition. Please join me in wishing the very best for Dena and Dennis' new life together. May they share many pleasant memories in a marriage built on trust, friendship and a loving commitment to one another. I wish them many years of happiness and ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CELEBRATES THE NORTH BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the 37 member team from North Brunswick Township High School who built the robot, Evil Machine, and took second place in the national FIRST (For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology) Robotics Competition in Houston Texas. Building a champion robot is more than creating a machine with technical prowess. It represents hours of hard work, dedication, collaboration and communication among students, teachers, mentors and community members. FIRST is an example of technology at its finest. It involves identifying a problem, developing a hypothesis to solve it and implementing the solution.

To win second place in a national competition against 300 other high school robots is a good accomplishment. Each team that participated in FIRST was required to design and build a robot that solved the ''game problem'' using ''kit parts'' and a standard set of rules. Over a six-week period, the North Brunswick Township High School team designed ''Evil Machine''. His task for the competition was to collect and stack plastic storage containers on their side of the playing field, to knock down walls, and during the two-minute competition, to keep the opposing team's robots from doing the same activity.

FIRST is a critical program because it reinforces science education. Science is not just another subject. It is fundamental like reading and math. Science brings order, harmony, and balance to our lives. It teaches us that our world is intelligible and not capricious. A scientific framework provides us the skill for lifelong learning, for creating progress itself. These are very important skills for the very complex times in which we live.

I ask that all the members join me in congratulating these 34 North Brunswick Township High School Students for their excellence and their FIRST Robotics victory.

CONGRATULATING BOYD AND IRENE MADDOX ON 75 YEARS OF MARRIAGE

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we in America have a penchant celebrating milestones in just about every endeavor, be it sports, business or even school attendance. But today I would like to recognize a truly amazing milestone, which is only rarely reached in our modern world: the 75th wedding anniversary of Boyd and Irene Maddox of San Bernardino County.

Boyd Maddox and Irene Crozier are lifelong residents of the Old West, growing up in the rugged early 20st-Century New Mexico Territory, marrying in Tombstone, Arizona and finally settling at the 250,000–acre Las Flores Ranch in the Mojave Desert—a working cattle ranch that still provides good employment to the cowboys of the 21st Century.

Boyd was born in Lordsburg, New Mexico in 1908 and grew up on a cattle ranch where he got to know a young neighbor girl named Sandra Day—later to become Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. After graduating from New Mexico Military Academy, Boyd became a messenger for Continental Bank of Los Angeles, and then worked his way up through a series of banks to become chief bookkeeper of the Douglas State Bank in southern Arizona.

Irene had graduated from Tombstone High School, and married the young bank officer on June 10, 1928 at Old Adobe Episcopal Church in her hometown. The couple homesteaded for 2 years, but the depression forced Boyd to go to work for the Civilian Conservation Corps as a bookkeeper.

A former bank employer had purchased a cattle ranch—the Las Flores Ranch in the Mojave Desert, and urged the Maddox's to come west and help him manage it. They finally visited in September 1938, and never left. Boyd became the working general manager and stayed for the next 50 years until his retirement. Irene raised Boyd, Jr., who is now 67.

Mr. Speaker, Boyd and Irene Maddox are enjoying an active retirement, traveling, visiting friends and reminiscing. I'm sure we would be spellbound by the stories they could tell of their remarkable life together all these years. Please join me in congratulating them on their 75th wedding anniversary, and wishing them many more years to come.

HONORING LEGENDARY PENN HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL COACH CHRIS GEESMAN

HON. CHRIS CHOCOLA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a living legend, Penn High School football coach Chris Geesman from Mishawaka, Indiana.

Coach Geesman recently announced he plans to retire from coaching at the end of this school year.

Since 1972, Coach Geesman has led the Kingsmen to five state championships and has never suffered a losing season.

Mr. Speaker, that's remarkable.

He retires in second place on the All-Time Football Coaching Leaders in Indiana with 339 victories. Only one coach in Indiana high school football history had more wins, but that coach also had more loses.

In 1996, he was inducted into the Indiana Football Hall of Fame.

Coach Geeman's impressive resume includes five state championships (1983, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 2000), three state runner-up finishes (1989, 1991, and 1999), eight semi-state crowns (1983, 1989, 1991, 1995–1997, and 1999–2000), and 13 sectional trophies (1979, 1983, 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1995–2000).

Penn High School football was also a force to be reckoned with under Coach Geesman's guidance in the Northern Indiana Conference by winning 22 NIC titles, including 17 in a row from 1986 through 2002.

Since a loss back in 1985, the Kingsmen have won an astonishing 117 straight NIC games.

The Kingsmen also established a state record with 89 consecutive regular-season victories running from 1985 to 1996 and own a state-record 22 straight playoff victories.

Coach Geesman's Kingsmen were ranked Number 1 in all or parts of a record 13 seasons for a record total of 87 weeks since 1977.

Coach Geesman has also had many players move on to play at the collegiate level and even a couple have advanced to play in the National Football League.

Mr. Speaker, I know the fans of Penn High School football and the Mishawaka community will certainly miss Coach Geesman, but I wish him well in his future endeavors.

A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MR. AND MRS. JOHN PAGE

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page began selling homemade fudge and then founded the Pillars Club to assist those in need; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page's involvement in the annual Pillars Club banquets have benefitted many in the community including students, the unemployed, and disaster victims; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page are examples of love and devotion having been married for over fifty years; and

Whereas, Mr. and Mrs. John Page should be recognized for their extraordinary outreach and selflessness;

Therefore, I join with the residents of the entire 18th Congressional District of Ohio in honoring and congratulating Mr. and Mrs. John Page for their accomplishments and contributions to the community.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MISSOURI HIGHWAY PATROL TROOPER MICHAEL L. NEWTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize the life of Missouri Highway Patrol Trooper Michael L. Newton. His life, though tragically cut short, was enriched by numerous accomplishments in his career, and a loving, caring family.

Mike served the Missouri Highway Patrol with dignity and passion. He set career goals that established himself as a competitive officer. He was ardent about making as many driving-while-intoxicated and traffic arrests as he could and it was this determination that made him a standout among his fellow officers. His eagerness and drive established him as an officer that was well-liked by many of his peers.

Mike is survived by his loving wife Shonnie and two sons, Tyler and Devon. Many of the Missouri Highway Patrol have pledged to help the family through these trying times. It is my hopes that his young boys will always remember how passionate their father was about his job and how diligently he served the people of Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you help me in recognizing and remembering Missouri Highway Patrol Trooper Michael L. Newton, his accomplished career, and the remarkable family he leaves behind. God Bless them.

PRO-LIFE ACTION MUST ORIGINATE FROM PRINCIPLE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as an obstetrician who has delivered over 4000 children, I have long been concerned with the rights of unborn people. I believe this is the greatest moral issue of our time. The very best of the western intellectual tradition has understood the critical link between moral and political action. Each of these disciplines should strongly inform and support the other.

I have become increasingly concerned over the years that the pro-life movement I so strongly support is getting further off track, both politically and morally. I sponsored the original pro-life amendment, which used a constitutional approach to solve the crisis of federalization of abortion law by the courts. The pro-life movement was with me and had my full support and admiration.

Those who cherish unborn life have become frustrated by our inability to overturn or significantly curtail Roe v. Wade. Because of this, attempts were made to fight against abortion using political convenience rather than principle. There is nothing wrong per se with fighting winnable battles, but a danger exists when political pragmatism requires the pro-life movement to surrender important moral and political principles.

When we surrender constitutional principles, we do untold damage to the moral underpinnings on which our Constitution and entire system of government rest. Those underpinnings are the inalienable right to life, liberty, and property. Commenting upon the link between our most important rights, Thomas Jefferson said ''The God which gave us life gave us at the same time liberty. The hands of force may destroy but can never divide these.''

M. Stanton Evans further explained the link between our form of government and the rights it protects when he wrote, ''The genius of the Constitution is its division of powers—summed up in that clause reserving to the several states, or the people, all powers not expressly granted to the federal government.''

Pro-lifers should be fiercely loyal to this system of federalism, because the very same Constitution that created the federal system also asserts the inalienable right to life. In this way, our constitutional system closely links federalism to the fundamental moral rights to life, liberty, and property. For our Founders it was no exaggeration to say federalism is the means by which life, as well as liberty and property, are protected in this nation. This is why the recent direction of the pro-life cause is so disturbing.

Pro-life forces have worked for the passage of bills that disregard the federal system, such as the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, the federal cloning ban, and the Child Custody Protection Act. Each of these bills rested on specious constitutional grounds and undermined the federalism our Founders recognized and intended as the greatest protection of our most precious rights.

Each of these bills transfers to the federal government powers constitutionally retained by the states, thus upsetting the separation and balance of powers that federalism was designed to guarantee. To undermine federalism is to indirectly surrender the very principle upon which the protection of our inalienable right to life depends.

The worst offender of federalism is the so-called Unborn Victims of Violence Act, which not only indirectly surrenders the pro-life principle but actually directly undercuts the right to life by granting a specific exemption to abortionists! This exemption essentially allows some to take life with the sanction of federal law. By supporting this legislation, pro-lifers are expressly condoning a legal exemption for abortionists—showing just how far astray some in the pro-life community have gone.

Even the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act, which is an integral part of the current pro-life agenda, present a dilemma. While I have always supported this Act and plan to do so in the future, I realize that it raises questions of federalism because authority over criminal law is constitutionally retained by the states. The only reason a federal law has any legitimacy in this area is that the Supreme Court took it upon itself to federalize abortion via Roe v. Wade. Accordingly, wrestling the abortion issue from the federal courts and putting it back in the hands of the elected legislature comports with the Founder's view of the separation of powers that protects our rights to life, liberty, and property.

Given these dilemmas, what should those of us in the pro-life community do? First, we must return to constitutional principles and proclaim them proudly. We must take a principled approach that recognizes both moral and political principles, and accepts the close relationship between them. Legislatively, we should focus our efforts on building support to overturn Roe v. Wade. Ideally this would be done in a fashion that allows states to again ban or regulate abortion. State legislatures have always had proper jurisdiction over issues like abortion and cloning; the pro-life movement should recognize that jurisdiction and not encroach upon it. The alternative is an outright federal ban on abortion, done properly via a constitutional amendment that does no violence to our way of government.

If the next version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act reads like past versions in the House, I will likely support it despite the dilemmas outlined here. I cannot support, however, a bill like the proposed Senate version of the Partial Birth Abortion Ban that reaffirms Roe v. Wade.

For the pro-life cause to truly succeed without undermining the very freedoms that protect life, it must return to principle and uphold our Founder's vision of federalism as an essential component of the American system. Undermining federalism ultimately can only undermine the very mechanism that protects the right to life.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2003

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the President has said in numerous speeches that his policies are designed to ''leave no child behind.'' He has said recently that, ''My jobs and growth plan would reduce tax rates for everyone who pays income tax.'' White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer stated on May 29 about the new tax-cut law (which includes all of the provisions of the President's plan in full or in part), ''This certainly does deliver tax relief to people who pay income taxes.'' Now that the bill has been signed, all of these statements have been shown to be false.

Back then, during the debate on this bill, the Republicans assured the press that the final conference bill retained a Senate provision that, while it did not extend any tax relief to millions of low-income working families with children, did at least accelerate the 15 percent partial refundability. The Republicans also claimed that the marriage penalty relief was accelerated for couples. These claims have been proven false as well.

The American people were sold a false bill of goods by the Administration and the Congressional Republicans. In the middle of the night, the Republicans passed a bill that over and over again puts the interests of the wealthiest people in the country ahead of those of the ordinary American family.

You will hear all sorts of excuses from the Republicans as to why this occurred. The spokeswoman for Chairman Bill Thomas of the House Committee on Ways and Means told The New York Times that the blame lay with the members of the other body of Congress''(W)hen we had to squeeze it all to $350 billion, they weren't talking about the child credits.'' She concluded, ''(W)hatever we do is not going to be enough for some segments of the population.''

The ''segments'' of the population we are talking about are those people who the President and Congressional Republicans say that he wants to help. We are talking about 11.9 million children (in 6.5 million families) who would benefit from accelerating the increase in the refundability of the child tax credit. These are parents who work hard at low wages and pay high payroll taxes to the Federal government. Another ''segment'' we are talking about is working couples who qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit. These are working poor families who are often struggling to stay together given the financial pressures on them. A couple with two children where each parent earns about $10,000 has about a $1,000 marriage penalty next year. And yet, the Republicans decided that marriage penalty relief should not include them.

The Republicans also left out 8.1 million taxpayers who receive no benefits from the new tax law and yet pay income taxes. This group consists mainly of low-income single individuals and moderate-income single parents whose children are over 16.

Not only are these ''segments'' made up of men and women who work and pay Federal taxes, many of the people that are left out of tax relief are the same men and women who just fought for this country in Iraq. The society they sacrificed for has decided to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust fund to give billions of dollars in tax relief to wealthy investors, but has not seen fit to give a tax cut to our soldiers.

Make no mistake about it. Nobody forgot to put benefits in because they were sleepy in the middle of the night. This was not necessary because the bill had to cost only $350 billion and it was simply impossible to do anything for these working Americans in the bill. The Republicans in Congress, with the tacit approval of the White House, deliberately skimped and trimmed on the few provisions under consideration to help millions of middle- and low-income working families. Meanwhile, they enhanced provisions for the wealthy and for special interests. They made sure that the average millionaire would receive a $93,500 tax break. They made sure that luxury SUV owners would get a generous tax break if they can figure out a way to make their vehicle a ''business expense.'' They even made sure that the tax cuts for dividends, the so-called elimination of ''double taxation,'' applied to dividends from companies that use sham headquarters in tax havens to get out of paying any tax. These companies that put profits over patriotism get benefits from the tax bill the President signed, but the parents of 12 million children do not.

The bill we introduce tonight is designed to serve those people with children that the Republicans talk about but somehow never do anything for. This includes many of our service men and women who are or have been stationed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Korea. These men and woman have risked their lives and done their duty at such low wages that the President's tax cut which he claims helps ''working families'' has left them out.

The bill would include an expansion of the refundable child credit that was included in the Democratic economic stimulus proposal. It would expand the refundable child credit for the families of military serving in Iraq and other combat zones. It also would include the provision of the Democratic stimulus plan that accelerated the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit that was provided in the 2001 tax bill.

The President's bill gave big tax cuts to the wealthiest citizens and funded these tax cuts though borrowing. While we want every child in America to benefit from tax cuts, we do not want to pass the cost of what we do to our children and grandchildren in the form of more national debt. The cost of the bill would be offset by a combination of the corporate tax shelter and Enron-specific provisions that passed the Senate and Mr. NEAL's bill stopping corporate expatriation.

The legislation we propose has two key sections:

LIBERALIZATION OF REFUNDABLE FAMILY CREDIT

Under current law, the per-child tax credit is partially refundable (i.e., paid even if the family has no income tax liability). The amount of partial refundability is 10 percent of taxable wages above $10,000. Under the 2001 tax act, the amount of refundability is increased to 15 percent of taxable wages over $10,000 effective in 2005 and thereafter.

This legislation accelerates the 15 percent partial refundability and lowers the threshold for partial refundability from $10,000 to $7,500. It would increase the number of families eligible for partial refundability.

The military serving in combat zones receive an exclusion for their pay while serving in the zone. As a result, many in the military will not be eligible for the partial refundable family credit because they do not have taxable wages. The legislation solves this problem by disregarding the combat pay exclusion when computing the size of the partially refundable family credit.

MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF IN EARNED INCOME CREDIT

The 2001 tax act provided three types of marriage penalty relief, an increase in standard deduction, an expanded 15 percent rate bracket, and an increase in the dollar amount at which the earned income credit begins to be phased out. The recently enacted tax cut accelerates the first two types of marriage penalty relief, but does not accelerate the relief in the earned income tax credit.

This legislation will accelerate the marriage penalty relief in the earned income tax credit.

When the Republicans brought their final tax cut bill up in the House in the middle of the night, I argued on the House floor that the bill did almost nothing for working people while rewarding the wealthiest people in our society who have lots of unearned income. The Republicans accuse me of engaging in ''class warfare'' and expect me to back down. But I agree that it is class warfare. The Republicans have declared war against those who earn their living through work, even when those individuals are serving their nation in the armed service. This legislation shows that in this

class warfare, we are on the side of working men and women.

RECOGNIZING THE IMAGEN FOUNDATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the outstanding achievements of the Imagen Foundation. Since its establishment sixteen years ago through the leadership of Helen Hernandez, the Imagen Foundation has led the fight to increase career opportunities for Latinos and Latinas in the entertainment industry and transcend the stereotyped media roles Latinos have been pigeonholed into.

The Imagen Foundation has helped to positively influence the role of Latinos in the media. It is critical for our community to be accurately portrayed because of the influential power the media holds in forming public opinion. Unfortunately, our community is underrepresented and misrepresented throughout all major media networks. Reports show that only 4 percent of people on prime time TV are Latinos, and Latinos who hold more permanent roles only make up 2 percent of actors. It is important to expose the world to the reality that Latinos are also doctors, lawyers, business executives and Members of Congress, and refute the stereotypes perpetuated by the entertainment industry.

Through various tools such as education, mentorship opportunities and workshops, the Imagen Foundation has created openings for Latinos in the entertainment industry. I have had the privilege of attending several workshops and I have seen the incredible talent that exists in the Latino community. The Imagen Foundation has been an amazing force working to develop, showcase and honor the talent in our community. It is my privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Imagen Foundation.

Through groups such as the Imagen Foundation and people like Helen Hernandez, more doors are beginning to open for Latinos in the entertainment industry. While much has been accomplished, we cannot stop here. There is still much to be done and we need to continue to work together. Hispanics are a fundamental part of this nation's history, a significant part of our present, and will play a vital role in the future success of this country's collective prosperity. I know that this is just the beginning, but with institutions such as the Imagen Foundation, who are committed to fighting prejudices and are concerned with bringing truth and a cultural sensitivity to television and society, I look forward to the accomplishments that are yet to come.

HONORING JOHN RHYMES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I am happy to rise before you today to recognize Mr. John Rhymes, who is retiring as Principal of Gundry Elementary School, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan.

Armed with a desire to teach, John Rhymes, a native of Hazlehurst, Mississippi, started his college career at Mississippi Valley State University, where he received his Bachelor's Degree in 1970. He later arrived in Michigan, where he earned a Master's Degree in Guidance and Counseling from Eastern Michigan University, and also studied Educational Leadership at Wayne State University in Detroit.

Moving to Flint 32 years ago with his new wife Lessie Odom Rhymes, John began his tenure with the Flint educational community as a teacher, Social Service field worker, Assistant Principal, and ultimately Principal. In addition to serving as Principal of Gundry Elementary, John is also Executive Director of the Sylvester Broome, Jr. Training Technology Center. At the Broome Center, he oversees the Amistad Academy After-School School, which offers young people classes in computers, public speaking, performing arts, and character development, among other things. To date, there have been 308 graduates of the Academy, with a long waiting list of students eager to be placed into the program.

John's commitment to education is matched only by his tremendous commitment to improving the community. He has been recognized many times for his work by such groups as the Flint Human Rights Commission, Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, and the City of Flint Youth Council, to name a few. As mentor and advisor for the Gamma Delta Kudos of Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., John helps young men enhance leadership skills as well as self-esteem, and for many, serves as a strong, positive role model.

John's professional affiliations include the Congress of Flint Administrators, Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Province Guide Right, and the National Guide Right Board. He is also a member of Metropolitan Baptist Church, where he has served as Youth Fellowship Director, Vacation Bible School Director, Sunday School Superintendent, and the church's Day Care Center's Board of Directors. Presently he is President of the Inspirational Voices Choir, Sunday School teacher and instructor, and Assistant Director of Christian Education.

Mr. Speaker, many of John Rhymes' students, as well as the various faculty members under his leadership, both past and present, have greatly benefited from his insight, as has the entire Flint community. He has always been a staunch fighter for education, for he believes that a strong educational background is the basis toward improving the quality of life. I ask my colleagues to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and wishing him and his family, the best in their future endeavors.

DENTAL OFFICER RETENTION ACT: 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

HON. ROB SIMMONS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 2003

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Dental Office Retention Act, a bill to allow dental officers in military service to receive additional special pay while undergoing an internship or residency.

Aspiring dentists leave medical school owing hundreds of thousands of dollars, often substantially more than $100,000. Shouldering this burden places a large financial strain on these men and women. The loss of additional special pay during their dental training program further aggravates this problem at a time when these dentists can least afford it.

Dental officers with 3–10 years of service lose $6,000 in additional specialty pay. Dental officers with more than 10 years of service lose $15,000. Military dentists face further incentives to leave the service. This is because they receive salaries 30–50 percent lower than their civilian counterparts. We should not be cutting compensation to our military dentists when they need it most.

There are 3,000 dentists in Connecticut and they tell me that the most pressing concern for them in pursuing a career in the military dental corps is how to repay their loans.

Dr. Mark Desrosiers, a dentist from my congressional district in eastern Connecticut, says, ''Having been in the military, and a practicing dentist myself, I think this would be a great way to ensure that residents in military specialty programs not be penalized financially by losing their special pay.''

Another dentist explains during an exit interview why, though he would rather have stayed in the military, his financial burden forced him to leave. ''The main reason for my decision to leave the Air Force is my financial situation. I have enjoyed my time in the Air Force and believe it is one of the best ways for a young dentist to gain experience both as a dentist, leader and follower. It was a difficult decision to make because my wife and I enjoy the military way of life, but we cannot pay our debt with the salary I am paid.''

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep a sufficient number of quality dentists in the dental corps, thereby ensuring the dental readiness of America's forces, it is important to eliminate this disincentive that drives officers from the dental corps. Removing the restriction that the officers not receive additional special pay (ASP) while participating in a dental internship or residency training program would help achieve that end.

I urge all my colleagues to support my legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LARRY COMBEST

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 2003

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight. I am honored to have served in the House of Representatives as a colleague of an outstanding Member of Congress, the gentleman from the 19th District of Texas. I have been especially privileged to serve on the House Agriculture Committee under the chairmanship of LARRY COMBEST. Chairman COMBEST'S example of leadership, commitment and integrity serve as a model for all of us in Congress, especially those of us who care deeply about agriculture.

When I came to Congress, I knew it was important to me to be associated with people who understood and cared about agriculture and the farmers and ranchers of America. It was my honor to become acquainted with Chairman COMBEST. He has been a mentor for me since that time of my arrival seven years ago.

Those of us who represent agriculture in the House of Representatives are a minority. There are not enough of us, so what it takes is people who go beyond their numbers, who more than 1 out of 435 can make a difference. And the gentleman from Texas has done that because he is knowledgeable and understands the issues. Agriculture is in his blood. That is where he comes from. It is who he is. Farming and ranching is LARRY COMBEST. And he is a leader; he cares about using that information and knowledge on behalf of those engaged in everyday activities trying to earn a living on America's farms and ranches.

Mr. COMBEST's leadership in the Committee on Agriculture is extraordinary. It is just something that we have relied upon and at times perhaps taken for granted. As we worked our way through a farm bill in this last Congress, it is clear to me that because of his leadership—and sometimes only because of his leadership—things happened.

LARRY COMBEST has a commitment to what he believes in, and he believes in farmers and ranchers. He wants to see our family farms survive and prosper. He wants that rural way of life to continue. He has a commitment to serving his constituents and to helping American agriculture be here today and tomorrow.

Perhaps most importantly, he has integrity. I have never known anyone I could trust more than LARRY COMBEST. His word can be taken for what it is, his word. What he says is what he means. His advice is honestly given. I have never known him to mislead anyone. And it was that character and that integrity that made it possible for us to do things in agriculture on this House floor. People trusted him, they respected him, and they honored what he was about.

As he returns home to Texas, it is with some sadness that we see our friend LARRY COMBEST leave. We all invest in other people in this place. Often I suppose we spend too much time worrying about things that are not so important. But the thing that is important is the relationships, friendships, and understandings that we have with other Members of Congress. I consider it the highest honor to have been associated with LARRY COMBEST during his term as a Member of Congress.

His relationships with other Members of the House will not end with his departure. His friendship with President Bush has been beneficial to those of us who care about rural America, and we look forward to his continued involvement in issues that matter to us and to farmers and ranchers across the country.

Public service is something that we all talk about and engage in as Members of Congress, but we would do well to learn from the example of LARRY COMBEST. He exemplifies the role of a true public servant, who did what he thought was right, who fought the fight and made a difference on behalf of his constituents, on behalf of all Texans, and on behalf of the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I wish both LARRY and his wife Sharon the absolute best in their future years. I thank them both for their friendship. I honor and respect them, and I hope the fish bite. Thank you, LARRY.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 3, 2003 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 4

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold oversight hearings to examine activities of the Federal Communications Commission.

SR–253

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine Iraq stabilization and reconstruction, focusing on international contributions and resources.

SD–419

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine transforming the Department of Defense Personnel System, focusing on finding the right approach.

SD–342

10 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 281, to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to make certain amendments with respect to Indian tribes, to provide for training and technical assistance to Native Americans who are interested in commercial vehicle driving careers, and S. 725, to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to provide from the Highway Trust Fund additional funding for Indian reservation roads.

SR–485

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine S. 1125, to create a fair and efficient system to resolve claims of victims for bodily injury caused by asbestos exposure.

SH–216

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 714, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, S. 391, to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, S. 1003, to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the continued use of established commercial outfitter hunting camps on the Salmon River, H.R. 417, to revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California, and S. 924, to authorize the exchange of lands between an Alaska Native Village Corporation and the Department of the Interior.

SD–366

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine democracy, human rights, and justice in Serbia today.

334, Cannon Building

2 p.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversighyt hearings to examine the impacts on tribal fish and wildlife management programs in the Pacific Northwest.

SR–485

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2004 and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Small Business Administration.

SR–428A

JUNE 5

2:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine Title XI.

SR–253

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 485, to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce air pollution through expansion of cap and trade programs, to provide an alternative regulatory classification for units subject to the cap and trade program, focusing on emissions-control technologies and utility-sector investment issues.

SD–406

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–226

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine financing AMTRAK.

SR–253

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Defense Production Act.

SD–538

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine arming rogue regimes, focusing the role of OSCE Participating States.

334, Cannon Building

10:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of C. Stewart Verdery, Jr., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning/Border and Transportation Security Directorate, Michael J. Garcia, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Joe D. Whitley, of Georgia, to be General Counsel, all of the Department of Homeland Security.

SD–342

2 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for foreign operations.

SD–192

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Eduardo Aguirre, Jr., of Texas, to be Director of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

SD–226

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine Senate Rule XXII relative to the cloture rule and proposals to amend this rule.

SR–301

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine life inside North Korea.

SD–419

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine castaway children, focusing on whether parents must relinquish custody in order to secure mental health services for their children.

SD–342

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the Head Start program.

SD–430

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine S. 499, to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish in the State of Louisiana a memorial to honor the Buffalo Soldiers, S. 546, to provide for the protection of paleontological resources on Federal lands, S. 643, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the University of New Mexico, to construct and occupy a portion of the Hibben Center for Archaeological Research at the University of New Mexico, S. 677, to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, S. 1060 and H.R. 1577, bills to designate the visitor center in Organ Pipe National Monument in Arizona as the ''Kris Eggle Visitor Center'', H.R. 255, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant an easement to facilitate access to the Lewis and Clark Interpretative Center in Nebraska City, Nebraska, and H.R. 1012, to establish the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site in the District of Columbia.

SD–366

JUNE 11

9 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine patient safety, focusing on instilling hospitals with a culture of continuous improvement.

SD–342

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Charles W. Grim, of Oklahoma, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
SR–485

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine repercussions of Iraq stabilization and reconstruction policies.
SD–419

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine private sector lessons for Medicare.
SD–430

2 p.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine certain issues relative to TWA.
Room to be announced

JUNE 17

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar items.
SD–342

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Fern Flanagan Saddler, Judith Nan Macaluso, Joseph Michael Francis Ryan III, and Jerry Stewart Byrd, all of the District of Columbia, each to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine Native American sacred places.
SR–485

JUNE 19

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to conduct an initial review of the ULLICO matter, focusing on self-dealing and breach of duty.
SD–342

JUNE 24

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine controlling the cost of Federal Health Programs by curing diabetes, focusing on a case study.
SD–342

JUNE 25

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the need for Federal real property reform, focusing on deteriorating buildings and wasted opportunities.
SD–342

10 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, focusing on responding to international parental abduction.
SD–419

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7175–S7197

Measures Introduced: Six bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1162–1167. **Page S7188**

Measures Reported: Reported on Thursday, May 29, during the adjournment:

S. 1160, to authorize Millennium Challenge assistance. (S. Rept. No. 108–55)

S. 1161, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal year 2004. (S. Rept. No. 108–56)

Reported on today:

S. 274, to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, with amendments. **Pages S7187–88**

Measures Passed:

Recognizing 140th Anniversary of Founding of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 136, recognizing the 140th anniversary of the founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and congratulating members and officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers for the union's many achievements, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

McConnell (for Hatch) Amendment No. 842, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7197**

Prior to the above-listed action, Senate vitiated the May 23, 2003 adoption of S. Res. 136. **Page S7197**

ENERGY POLICY ACT: Senate resumed consideration of S. 14, to enhance the energy security of the United States, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7178–82**

Pending:

Frist/Daschle Amendment No. 539, to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence. **Pages S7178–80**

Domenici/Bingaman Amendment No. 840, to reauthorize Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), weatherization assistance, and State energy programs. **Pages S7180–82**

Domenici (for Gregg) Amendment No. 841 (to Amendment No. 840), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the reauthorization of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981. **Pages S7181–82**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 10 a.m., on Tuesday, June 3, 2003. **Page S7197**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Karen P. Tandy, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

Josette Sheeran Shiner, of Virginia, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador. **Page S7197**

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

Dee Ann McWilliams, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Human Resources and Administration), which was sent to the Senate on March 24, 2003. **Page S7197**

Messages From the House: **Page S7187**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S7197**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7188–89**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7189–95**

Additional Statements: **Page S7187**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7195–96**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S7196**

Adjournment: Senate met at 12 noon, and adjourned at 3:50 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, June 3, 2003. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7197.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 2282–2300 were introduced. **Pages H4786–87**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4787–88**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Filed on May 22, H.R. 21, to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, amended (H. Rept. 108–51 Pt. 2);

Filed on May 22, H. Res. 193, 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 (H. Rept. 108–130);

H.R. 361, 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, amended (H. Rept. 108–24 Pt. 2);

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 (H. Rept. 108–131);

H.R. 1474, 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, amended (H. Rept. 108–132);

H.R. 2143, to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, amended (H. Rept. 108–133);

H.R. 1082, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 46 East Ohio Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Birch Bayh Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (H. Rept. 108–134);

S. 703, 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" (H. Rept. 108–135); and

H. Res. 255, (providing for consideration of 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 (H. Rept. 108–136). **Pages H4785–86**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Culberson to act as Speaker Pro Tempore for today. **Page H4741**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by Sister Cecilia Thuy Nguyen, OP, Doctoral Candidate, The Catholic University of America. **Page H4741**

Meeting Hour—Tuesday, June 3: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 3 for morning hour debate. **Page H4742**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Profound Sorrow on the Death of Irma Rangel: H. Res. 159, expressing profound sorrow on the occasion of the death of Irma Rangel (agreed to by yea-and-nay vote of 373 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 227); **Pages H4742–44, H4754–55**

Congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs: H. Res. 195, congratulating Sammy Sosa of the Chicago Cubs for hitting 500 major league home runs (agreed to by 372 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 228); **Pages H4744–49, H4755**

General Charles Gabriel Post Office, Iron Station, North Carolina: 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" (agreed to by 371 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 229); and **Pages H4749–50, H4755–56**

National Tourism Week: H. Con. Res. 172, Supporting the 20th Annual National Tourism Week. **Pages H4751–54**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House completed debate on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 231, supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day. Further proceedings were postponed until Tuesday, June 3. **Pages H4750–51**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:13 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H4754**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H4741.

Referrals: S. 858, was referred to the Committee on Government Reform; S. 878, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; S. Con. Res. 7, was referred to the Committee on International Relations;

and S. Con. Res. 43, was referred to the Committee on Financial Services. **Page H4781**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H4754–55, H4755, and H4755–56. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see) DAILY DIGEST, *p. D 557)*

H.J. Res. 51, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt. Signed on May 27, 2003. (Public Law 108–24)

H.R. 1298, to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Signed on May 27, 2003. (Public Law 108–25)

H.R. 2185, to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002. Signed on May 28, 2003. (Public Law 108–26)

H.R. 2, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004. Signed on May 28, 2003. (Public Law 108–27)

S. 243, concerning participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization. Signed on May 29, 2003. (Public Law 108–28)

S. 330, to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials. Signed on May 29, 2003. (Public Law 108–29)

S. 870, to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to extend the availability of funds to carry out the fruit and vegetable pilot program. Signed on May 29, 2003. (Public Law 108–30)

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of June 3 through June 7, 2003

Senate Chamber

On *Monday,* at 2:30 p.m., Senate will consider S. 1050, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces.

During the balance of the week, Senate will continue consideration of S. 1050, Department of Defense Authorization, and may also consider S. 14, Energy Policy Act, H.J. Res. 51, Increased Public Debt, and any other cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: June 5, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for foreign operations, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: June 5, to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Defense Production Act, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: June 3, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings to examine space propulsion, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

June 4, Full Committee, to hold oversight hearings to examine activities of the Federal Communications Commission, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

June 5, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Title XI, 2:30 a.m., SR–253.

June 5, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine, to hold hearings to examine financing AMTRAK, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: June 3, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold hearings to examine S. 268, to authorize the Pyramid of Remembrance Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have lost their lives during peacekeeping operations, humanitarian efforts, training, terrorist attacks, or covert operations, S. 296, to require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress regarding the requirements applicable to the inscription of veterans' names on the memorial wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, S. 470, to extend the authority for the construction of a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr, and S. 1076, to authorize construction of an education center at or near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

June 4, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 714, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, S. 391, to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, S. 1003, to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the continued use of established commercial outfitter hunting camps on the Salmon River, H.R. 417, to revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California, and S. 924, to authorize the exchange of lands between an Alaska Native Village Corporation and the Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: June 5, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings to examine S. 485, to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce air pollution through expansion

of cap and trade programs, to provide an alternative regulatory classification for units subject to the cap and trade program, focusing on emissions-control technologies and utility-sector investment issues, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: June 3, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Narcotics Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Marsha E. Barnes, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname, John F. Maisto, of Pennsylvania, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, and William B. Wood, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, 10 a.m., SD–419.

June 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Iraq stabilization and reconstruction, focusing on international contributions and resources, 9:30 a.m., SD–419.

June 5, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine life inside North Korea, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: June 4, to hold hearings to examine transforming the Department of Defense Personnel System, focusing on finding the right approach, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

June 5, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of C. Stewart Verdery, Jr., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning/Border and Transportation Security Directorate, Michael J. Garcia, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Joe D. Whitley, of Georgia, to be General Counsel, all of the Department of Homeland Security, 10:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: June 3, to hold oversight hearings to examine the status of tribal fish and wildlife management programs, 10 a.m., SR–485.

June 4, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine S. 281, to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to make certain amendments with respect to Indian tribes, to provide for training and technical assistance to Native Americans who are interested in commercial vehicle driving careers, and S. 725, to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to provide from the Highway Trust Fund additional funding for Indian reservation roads, 10 a.m., SR–485.

June 4, Full Committee, to hold oversight hearings to examine the impacts on tribal fish and wildlife management programs in the Pacific Northwest, 2 p.m., SR–485.

Committee on the Judiciary: June 4, to hold hearings to examine S. 1125, to create a fair and efficient system to resolve claims of victims for bodily injury caused by asbestos exposure, 10 a.m., SH–216.

June 5, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

June 5, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Eduardo Aguirre, Jr., of Texas, to be Director of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: June 5, to hold hearings to examine Senate Rule XXII relative to the cloture rule and proposals to amend this rule, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: June 4, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2004 and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Small Business Administration, 2 p.m., SR–428A.

Select Committee on Intelligence: June 3, to hold closed hearings to examine intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: June 3, to hold hearings to examine the future of human longevity, focusing on the importance of markets and innovation, 10 a.m., SD–628.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: June 3, to hold hearings to examine U.S. policy regarding narcotics in Columbia, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

House Chamber

Tuesday: Consideration of suspensions:

1. H.R. 2143, Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act;
2. S. 222, Zuni Indian Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act;
3. S. 273, Grand Teton National Park Land Exchange Act; and
4. H.R. 1082, Birch Bayh Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Consideration of H.J. Res. 4, Prohibition of Flag Desecration Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (modified closed rule, two hours of general debate);

Wednesday and Thursday: Consideration of suspensions:

1. H. Con. Res. 177, Recognizing and Commending the Participants and Supporters of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq;
2. H. Res. 201, Commending the Business Support for the Armed Forces and their Families;
3. H.R. 361, Sports Agent Responsibility and Trust Act; and
4. H.R. 1954, Armed Forces Naturalization Act.

Consideration of H.R. 760, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act (subject to a rule);

Consideration of H.R. 1119, Family Time Flexibility Act (subject to a rule); and

Consideration of H.R. 1474, Check Clearing for the 21st Century Act (subject to a rule).

Friday: No votes are expected in the House.

Committee Meetings

FOLLOWING TOXIC CLOUDS: SCIENCE AND ASSUMPTIONS IN PLUME MODELING

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations held a hearing on "Following Toxic Clouds: Science and Assumptions in Plume

Modeling.'' Testimony was heard from Keith Rhodes, Chief Technologist, GAO; Anna Johnson-Wineger, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary, Chemical/Biological Defense Programs, Department of Defense; Bruce Hicks, Director, Air Resources Laboratory, NOAA, Department of Commerce; Donald L. Ermak, Program Leader, National Atmospheric Release Advisory Center, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory; and public witnesses.

FLAG PROTECTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 5 to 4, a modified closed rule providing 2 hours of debate in the House on 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. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Conyers or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided between the proponent and an opponent. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Sensenbrenner and Representatives Watt and Cooper.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, June 4, Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, and Research, hearing to review conservation technical assistance and the implementation of the Conservation Title of the 2002 Farm Bill, 10 a.m., 1302 Longworth.

June 5, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, hearing on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, June 3, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Screener Background Investigations, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, on Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Request, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, June 3, Subcommittee on Education Reform, hearing on H.R. 2210, School Readiness Act of 2003, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness, to mark up H.R. 2211, Ready to Teach Act of 2003, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing on ''Strengthening Pension Security: Examining the Health and Future of Defined Benefit Pension Plans,'' 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, June 3, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled ''Can Tobacco Cure Smoking?—A Review of Tobacco Harm Reduction,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 3, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, hearing entitled ''Status of Methyl Bromide under the Clean Air Act and the Montreal Protocol,'' 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

June 3, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Assessing Initiatives to Increase Organ Donations,'' 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing entitled ''Wireless E–911 Implementation: Progress and Remaining Hurdles,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

June 5, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Consumer Directed Services: Improving Medicaid Beneficiaries' Access to Quality Care,'' 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, June 3, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled ''The Accounting Treatment of Employee Stock Options,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Fair Credit Reporting Act: How it Functions for Consumers and the Economy,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

June 5, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing on H.R. 2179, Securities Fraud Deterrence and Investor Restitution Act of 2003, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, June 3, hearing entitled ''Potential Reduced Exposure/Reduced Risk Tobacco Products: An Examination of the Possible Public Health Impact and Regulatory Challenges,'' 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 5, hearing on ''Wasted Space, Wasted Dollars: Reforming Federal Real Property to Meet 21st Century Needs;'' followed by a markup of H.R. 2086, Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2003, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

June 6, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs, hearing on ''Elevation of the Environmental Protection Agency to Department Level Status: H.R. 37, and H.R. 2138 (Department of Environmental Protection Act),'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, June 3, Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia, briefing entitled ''The Forgotten Refugees: the Jewish Exodus from Arab Lands,'' 2:30 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

June 4, full Committee, hearing on U.S. Nonproliferation Policy After Iraq, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Africa, to mark up the following measures: H. Con. Res. 80, expressing the sense of Congress relating to efforts of the Peace Parks Foundation in the Republic of South Africa to facilitate the establishment and development of transfrontier conservation efforts in southern Africa; H. Con. Res. 134, acknowledging the deepening relationship between the United States and the Republic of Djibouti and recognizing Djibouti's role in combating terrorism; H. Con. Res. 154, concerning the transition to democracy in the Republic of Burundi; H. Res. 177, commending the people of the Republic of Kenya for conducting free and fair elections, for the peaceful and orderly transfer of power in their

government, and for the continued success of democracy in their nation since that transition; H. Res. 237, honoring the life and work of Walter Sisulu, a critical leader in the movement to free South Africa of apartheid, on the occasion of his death; and H. Res. 194, regarding the importance of international efforts to abolish slavery and other human rights abuses in the Sudan, 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, June 5, oversight hearing entitled ''The United States Department of Justice,'' 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, June 3, Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, oversight hearing on the Reauthorization of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and Private Property Protection Under the National Historic Preservation Act, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, June 3, to consider the following bills: H.R. 760, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003; and H.R. 1474, Check Clearing for the 21st Century Act, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, June 4, to mark up H.R. 1081, Aquatic Invasive Species Research Act; followed by a hearing on H.R. 1118, Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Firefighters Act of 2003, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

June 5, Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards, to mark up H.R. 1856, Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research Amendments Act of 2003; followed by a hearing on Manufacturing R&D: How Can the Federal Government Help? 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, June 4, hearing on Visa Delays, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, June 3, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on Port Security, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, oversight hearing on The Administration's Proposal to Reauthorize the Economic Development Administration, 2 p.m., 2253 Rayburn.

June 4, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, to continue oversight hearings on Water: Is it the ''Oil'' of the 21st Century? 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

June 5, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on The Aircraft Cabin Environment, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, June 3, hearing to receive the report of the President's Task Force to Improve Health Care Delivery for our Nation's Veterans, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, June 4, executive, hearing on Special Programs, 2:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 4, Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, hearing on CIA Technical Program, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

June 5, Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security, executive, briefing on Global Intelligence Update, 9 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: June 4, to hold hearings to examine democracy, human rights, and justice in Serbia today, 10 a.m., 334, Cannon Building.

June 5, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine arming rogue regimes, focusing the role of OSCE Participating States, 10 a.m., 334, Cannon Building.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 7 through May 31, 2002

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	73	56	..
Time in session	603 hrs., 27′	372 hrs., 42′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	7,174	4,740	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,085	..
Public bills enacted into law	11	26	37
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	5	..	..
Measures passed, total	210	245	455
Senate bills	57	9	..
House bills	18	92	..
Senate joint resolutions	2	..	..
House joint resolutions	6	7	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	19	3	..
House concurrent resolutions	18	32	..
Simple resolutions	90	102	..
Measures reported, total	101	124	225
Senate bills	67	1	..
House bills	4	76	..
Senate joint resolutions	2	1	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	4	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	4	..
Simple resolutions	24	42	..
Special reports	6	1	..
Conference reports	1	5	..
Measures pending on calendar	43	26	..
Measures introduced, total	1,375	2,794	4,169
Bills	1,158	2,281	..
Joint resolutions	13	58	..
Concurrent resolutions	47	201	..
Simple resolutions	157	254	..
Quorum calls	3	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	202	147	..
Recorded votes	..	78	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 56 reports have been filed in the Senate, a total of 130 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 7 through May 31 Day, 2003

Civilian Nominations, totaling 364, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	177
Unconfirmed	184
Withdrawn	3
Other Civilian Nominations totaling 1,268, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,068
Unconfirmed	200
Air Force Nominations, totaling 5,333, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,474
Unconfirmed	859
Army Nominations, totaling 1,498, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,228
Unconfirmed	270
Navy Nominations, totaling 1,208, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	89
Unconfirmed	1,119
Marine Corps Nominations, totaling 2,402, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2,385
Unconfirmed	17

Summary

Total Nominations carried over	0
Total Nominations Received this Session	12,073
Total Confirmed	9,421
Total Unconfirmed	2,649
Total Withdrawn	3
Total Returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, June 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 14, to enhance the energy security of the United States.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 3

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of suspensions:

1. H.R. 2143, Unlawful Internet Gambling Funding Prohibition Act;
2. S. 222, Zuni Indian Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act;
3. S. 273, Grand Teton National Park Land Exchange Act; and
4. H.R. 1082, Birch Bayh Federal Building and United States Courthouse, Indianapolis, Indiana; and

Consideration of H.J. Res. 4, Prohibition of Flag Desecration Amendment to the Constitution of the United States (modified closed rule, two hours of general debate);

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E1093
Camp, Dave, Mich., E1098
Chocola, Chris, Ind., E1098
Deal, Nathan, Ga., E1089
Emanuel, Rahm, Ill., E1094
Fossella, Vito, N.Y., E1090
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1087, E1087
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E1090
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1099
Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E1098
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E1098
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1091
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1088
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E1087
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E1101
Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E1097
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E1088
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E1098
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E1090
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E1087
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1093
Moore, Dennis, Kansas, E1092
Moran, Jerry, Kansas, E1102
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E1089
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E1099
Paul, Ron, Tex., E1099
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E1089
Porter, Jon C., Nev., E1097
Radanovich, George, Calif., E1090
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1100
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1091, E1092, E1093
Simmons, Rob, Conn., E1101
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E1092
Smith, Nick, Mich., E1094, E1095, E1096
Solis, Hilda L., Calif., E1088, E1101
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1087
Udall, Mark, Colo., E1091, E1095, E1096
Udall, Tom, N.M., E1094, E1095, E1096
Walden, Greg, Ore., E1097

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $217.00 for six months, $434.00 per year, or purchased for $6.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (866) 512–1800 (toll free), (202) 512–1800 (D.C. Area), or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.