United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001 No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 14, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, the psalmist cannot find enough words to express trust in You.

Personal experience of Your presence, care, and abiding guidance gives rise to his song: ''O Lord, my rock, my fortress, my deliverer. My God, my rock of refuge, my shield, the fullness of my salvation, my stronghold.''

Stir in our hearts today Your holy spirit. Touch the soul of this Nation that we may see Your saving work in our work, Your strength behind our weakness, Your purpose in our efforts at laws of justice, Your peace drawing all of us and the whole world to lasting freedom.

You are ever faithful, O Lord, worthy of all of our trust, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PASCRELL 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.

FEBRUARY IS AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, February is American Heart Month as designated by Congress in 1963. I want to thank my colleagues for taking time to come to the floor today to draw attention to the impact that heart disease and stroke have on our own society.

Perhaps in no other instance is a quick reaction more important to saving lives than during heart attacks. There is an important chain of survival which, when followed, can make an impact on the devastating effect of America's number one killer, heart disease.

The first step is preparation, understanding; and reacting quickly to cardiac events saves lives. Knowing the warning signs of heart attack and being ready to react can save precious moments. Warning signs include: uncomfortable pressure, fullness or pain in the center of the chest lasting more than a few minutes; pain spreading to the shoulders or neck; nausea, sweating or shortness of breath.

The third step is calling 911. The earlier emergency medical personnel can begin resuscitation, the better chance of survival.

Finally, learn CPR. It is important that we maintain this life-saving skill throughout our lives. One never knows when one will be in the situation to implement the chain of survival. The more of us that know it, the more lives that can be saved.

CHILDPROOF HANDGUN ACT

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, children are killing children by gunfire. These deaths are occurring in homes and streets and in schools. The failure of Congress in recent years to shoulder the ultimate responsibilities of safeguarding our communities from gun violence is inexcusable. It is time to get past the rhetoric by the extremes on both sides of the gun control issue and pass sensible anti-gun violence legislation.

Today I will introduce in the House of Representatives the Childproof Handgun Act. This legislation requires that gun manufacturers develop personalized guns within the next 5 years. This technology would guarantee that only authorized users could operate the weapon. This is not something out of science fiction. A prototype exists that can read and recognize the gun owner's fingerprint allowing only the owner to fire the gun. This will keep weapons out of the hands of children and criminals.

The Federal Government sets standards for child safety cigarette lighters and insists that children riding in cars be buckled in approved car seats, and it demands that manufacturers put childproof caps on aspirin containers. For guns, we have nothing.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, in 1963 Congress designated February as American Heart Month; and today is Valentine's Day, a day not only about flowers and candy, but also about love and family. It is fitting that we recognize and congratulate the efforts of the American Heart Association and other organizations to reduce the enormous burdens, physical, emotional and economic, that heart disease places on American families.

The fact is that an American dies from cardiovascular disease every 33 seconds killing 1 million Americans annually, about 41 percent of all deaths in the United States. Every American, young or old, male or female, is at risk.

Madam Speaker, today I encourage every American to learn the signs of cardiac arrest and the causes of cardiac disease. Together we can reduce the burden of cardiac disease and its imposition on our families so that everyone can celebrate not only this day as Valentine's Day but many more in the future.

CHARACTER EDUCATION

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Speaker, later today I will be introducing with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) the Character Learning and Student Success Act. Society is growing increasingly concerned about the steady decline of our Nation's core ethical values, especially in our children.

There exists in Tennessee and across the country successful character education programs that have improved school climate, reduced disruptive behavior and resulted in higher performing schools. However, no organization exists that can track these success stories, help schools identify their particular needs, and implement effective character education programs. That is why we are introducing the CLASS Act. This bill would establish a national center for character education that would provide the most up-to-date information about effective character education programs and aid schools in developing their own programs.

Character education is becoming a national priority in the education reform debate. We want all of our children to be responsible, upstanding members of society. I believe that this legislation will help schools create environments where such values are fostered.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this bill.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, today is Valentine's Day; and as we take the time to shower our loved ones with chocolates, flowers and poems, I ask that we share the most important gift of all, the gift of life. Heart disease kills nearly 1 million Americans every year and is responsible for over 40 percent of the deaths in our country. Every 33 seconds, an American dies from cardiovascular disease.

This February marks American Heart Month; and unfortunately, too many Americans are not prepared to deal with cardiac emergencies. But by becoming familiar with these serious symptoms, it can mean the difference between life and death. Symptoms such as uncomfortable pressure, fullness, squeezing or pain in the center of the chest lasting for more than a few minutes, pain spreading to the shoulders, arms or neck, and chest discomfort with light-headedness, faintness, sweating nausea, or shortness of breath.

Madam Speaker, this Valentine's Day I ask my colleagues to raise awareness on these matters of the heart. It is just one way in which we can eliminate our Nation's number one killer.

MONICA, MARC RICH AND A PHONY FINE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. First there was Monica. While Congress investigated cigars and pantyhose, China was spying and buying America. Now it is Marc Rich. True, Rich does not deserve a pardon. But once again two big pardons in the form of plea bargains have been overlooked, namely, John Huang and James Riady, two crooks that illegally funneled cash to the Democrat National Committee and to investigate them now would be double jeopardy. Beam me up.

What are we coming to, Congress? This was not only slick, this is sick; and America may someday die because of it.

I yield back a phony $8 million fine for James Riady that will be paid for by Chinese Communists who are taking $100 billion a year in trade surplus out of America's economy.

COMMENDING FOREIGN SERVICE WORKERS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the numerous foreign service officers working in our embassies around the world and at the State Department. I have had the pleasure of working with many of these people here in Washington and at our embassies abroad. The tremendous dedication these men and women bring to their work representing our Nation abroad and our principles is an inspiration and an encouragement to all of us. Their work with NGOs is especially appreciated.

The Ambassadors in Thailand, Egypt, Pakistan, and Indonesia, Ambassadors Hecklinger, Kurtzer, Milam, and Gelbard, have lent their expertise and assistance on various issues and projects. In addition, the work of Jeffrey Rock, Lowry Taylor, David Donahue, Sheldon Rapoport, Susan Keogh, John Bradshaw, Susan Sutton, Angie Bryant, and others has been invaluable.

Madam Speaker, I commend these individuals for their important and tireless work on behalf of our Nation and the principles on which our Nation stands.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH ACT

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, today the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and I will reintroduce the National Center for Social Work Research Act which would establish a center within the National Institutes of Health. As a former social worker, I believe that this center would be a tremendous resource not only to Congress and policymakers but also to service providers throughout this country. Social workers are in a unique position to offer insight and recommendations on how to address both individual and community societal problems. They are on the front line working with individuals on a day-to-day basis on issues ranging from access to health care, mental health, child abuse, and family reconciliation.

The establishment of the National Center for Social Work Research would provide us with interdisciplinary, family-centered, and community-based social work research that is needed and designed to help us not only in terms of policy but also in terms of service for our service providers. I ask my colleagues to support this effort, the National Center for Social Work Research.

INTRODUCTION OF CHARACTER LEARNING AND STUDENT SUCCESS (CLASS) ACT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, Americans are concerned about the decline in our Nation's values, particularly among our children. Parents should be the primary developers of character, but educators play an increasingly important role. Many school districts have included character education in their curriculum. Others have not but would like to do so. Schools

need an organization that exists to help them identify their particular needs and implement effective character education programs.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) and I are introducing the Character Learning and Student Success Act. This legislation provides a grant to develop initiatives and disseminate up-to-date resource information about character education. It also funds a study that will examine whether or not character education programs are effective and sustainable.

Madam Speaker, character education not only cultivates minds, it nurtures hearts. I ask my colleagues to please join us in cosponsoring this bill.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, on this day devoted to matters of the heart, I remind my colleagues that February is American Heart Month. We recognize the millions of Americans today struggling with heart disease and recommit ourselves to helping them. And we acknowledge the efforts of organizations like the American Heart Association which help all of us prevent and treat heart disease.

The theme for Heart Month is ''be prepared for cardiac emergencies.'' Each year more than 1 million Americans will suffer a heart attack. Too many of us are not even aware of the warning signs. And too many of us do not know what to do to help someone who has suffered a heart attack.

To that end, today I will reintroduce legislation, the Teaching Children to Save Lives Act, to encourage training in the classroom. This legislation will teach our children about the dangers of heart disease, how to prevent it, and how to respond in a cardiac emergency.

□ 1015

So I urge my colleagues to support this and other efforts to address the scourge of heart disease.

FEBRUARY, AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, as has been mentioned, this is Valentine's Day, and it has been designated as American Heart Month.

As a member of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition, I and others of my colleagues will continue to work to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health. I am pleased that for the past 2 years we have seen annual increases of 15 percent for NIH. The previous 2 years' funding increases for the NIH has translated into increases for the Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke of $138 million over fiscal year 1999, for a total of $1.148 billion for the current fiscal year.

Eighty-one percent of Americans support increased Federal funding for heart research, and 78 percent support increased Federal funding for stroke research. Heart disease, stroke and other cardiovascular diseases remain this country's number one killer, causing nearly 960,000 deaths every year, and are a leading cause of long-term disability.

Cardiovascular disease has claimed more lives than the next seven leading causes of death combined. One in five Americans suffers from cardiovascular diseases. Heart disease is the number one killer in Maryland, stroke is the number three killer in Maryland, and this reflects the Nation.

Let us resolve on this Valentine's Day to remember what American Heart Month is about, to preserve the health of our loved ones.

RECOGNIZING FEBRUARY AS AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, today we recognize February as American Heart Month. I salute the American Heart Association and other noteworthy organizations' ongoing efforts to eliminate heart disease, which affects millions of Americans every year.

Cardiovascular diseases are the number one killer of women and men. These diseases currently claim the lives of more than half a million females every year.

The American Heart Association estimates that one in two women will eventually die of heart disease or stroke. African American women face a four times higher risk of dying before the age of 60.

Although cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of death among American women, studies show that women still do not recognize their risk, are unaware that their symptoms are different from men's, are less likely to seek treatment when faced with these symptoms, and are less likely than men to be referred for diagnostic testing and treatment by their physicians.

What does this say about our Federal health care system? It has not done enough to address women's healthcare needs.

I applaud the work that the Congress has done. It successfully passed legislation dealing with cardiovascular disease and stroke, but I would urge the 107th Congress to do more in the fight for heart disease research and funding and to ensure adequate health care access for all of our citizens.

RAIL PASSENGER DISASTER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 36 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 36

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 36 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 554, a bill to establish a program coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, to offer assistance to the families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule also provides that the bill shall be open for amendment by section at any point and authorizes the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instruction.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill before us, H.R. 554, the

Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act. This bill is substantially identical to legislation with the same name passed by voice vote in the 106th Congress on October 4, 1999. Unfortunately, that legislation was never taken up by the Senate before the adjournment of the 106th Congress.

Congress addressed a similar issue in 1996 by passing the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act of 1996. In response to the Value Jet and TWA 800 tragedies, Congress approved this measure to coordinate and distribute information to family members in an efficient and sensitive manner.

The next logical step for Congress to take is to extend the same service to families of victims of railroad disasters. The nature of tragedies is that they occur suddenly and without warning. The manner in which these situations are handled in the immediate hours and days following the incident are critical. Providing information quickly and accurately not only saves lives, but offers assurances to family members and loved ones.

In fact, just last week, on Monday, February 5, 2001, an Amtrak train caring 98 passengers collided with a lumber freight train in my home State of New York. Fortunately the accident was not fatal, but there were sent to area hospitals several who were affected by the railroad incident due to serious injuries.

This is a poignant example of the need to synchronize search and rescue efforts with the dissemination of information to family members in the face of catastrophe.

This legislation establishes points of contact both within the National Transportation Safety Board and from an independent nonprofit organization in order to coordinate emotional care and support to family members, directly addressing the need to keep families informed.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for their hard work on this measure.

I would also like to recognize the efforts of my colleague and western New York neighbor, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), the newly appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule. The underlying bill is noncontroversial and was passed under suspension of the rules last Congress by a voice vote.

The measure is intended to deal with the tragedy of rail accidents involving substantial on-board casualties. The key features of H.R. 554 include procedures to assure timely and sensitive handling of information needed by accident victims and their families. This information is coordinated among the National Transportation Safety Board, the rail passenger carrier, and a designated nonprofit charitable organization. The designated organization is in charge of providing necessary counseling services, ensuring a private venue for families to grieve, and assisting families in a variety of matters, including a possible memorial service.

The legislation also protects the victims and their families against unsolicited and intrusive contacts by attorneys in the immediate post-accident environment, when the families may be in shock and not emotionally capable of making sound decisions about possible legal redress. Moreover, the bill also ensures orderly preparedness by rail carriers for accidents by requiring comprehensive plans to be in place governing each carrier's procedures for handling post-accident information and family assistance.

Madam Speaker, again, I know of no controversy surrounding this measure.

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

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

Madam Speaker, just in closing, today is a special day for my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), as he now chairs the Subcommittee on Railroads. I know how proud his mother and father are, as his father Jack, Sr., was a career railroader in the Buffalo area. So today I look forward to seeing the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) bring this bill on as his first as a subcommittee chairman.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REYNOLDS). Pursuant to House Resolution 36 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 554.

□ 1027

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 554) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN).

Mr. QUINN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, before I rise in support of our bill this morning, I would like to welcome the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) as my partner on the new Subcommittee on Railroads. As I think almost everyone in the House realizes this year, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure added a separate Subcommittee on Railroads.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) and I have been friends for quite some time on the full committee; and I am delighted to join with him this next term, the next couple of years, to bring legislation to the floor.

While we are not able to do commercial breaks here, I would like to offer to Mr. CLEMENT a copy of Stephen Ambrose's book entitled ''Nothing Like It in the World,'' which talks about the men and the women who built the Transcontinental Railroad between 1863 and 1869, as a reference tool.

□ 1030

Having been an English teacher, I say to the gentleman, there will not be any quiz, but I have my own copy of this. As we work our way through those difficult, difficult subcommittee hearings of ours, we will find some time to remember why we do the work we do when we see how the people did it for us some century-and-a-half ago.

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUINN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his gift.

Mr. QUINN. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act, a commonsense bipartisan bill to address a gap in our current transportation laws.

The bill is substantially identical to H.R. 2681 approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the full House, I might add, in our last 106th Congress, but never acted upon by the other body in the Senate.

I am pleased that this is the first piece of legislation from our committee under our new chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). As chairman of the newly formed Subcommittee on Railroads, I strongly support the bill, and urge our colleagues to do the same.

Members may recall that several years ago after some terrible, terrible

incidents, most notably the 1996 ValuJet and TWA crashes, the families of crash victims were poorly treated by the carriers, the media, and by some lawyers.

The Congress responded by enacting an aviation law that placed the National Transportation Safety Board and suitable private charitable organizations in charge of coordinating efforts to protect the privacy of crash victims' families, and to assure that they receive the most current information possible from the carrier.

The law has been quite successful in improving the situation for crash victims' families. Since its enactment, it has been updated and expanded in 1997, and again in 1999.

Today, H.R. 554, this bill that the gentleman from Tennessee and I bring to the floor, is virtually a clone of that aviation law, but it is applied to rail passenger service, both intercity and high-speed rail.

Although Amtrak is currently the principal provider of intercity rail passenger service, a number of States are considering forming compacts to support their own bid for rail passenger services.

We understand that, Madam Chairman, necessarily this bill cannot track the aviation statute exactly. We understand that. For example, some passenger trains with unreserved open boarding situations will not have a definite passenger manifest sheet comparable to an airline passenger list. Generally, however, this bill follows the aviation model.

The National Transportation Safety Board is given the authority to invoke the procedures of the bill, including designating the NTSB Director of Family Support Services for the accident as a point of contact for all the families, and to act as liaison between the families and the passenger carrier.

The NTSB has also authorized a designated independent charitable organization, for example, the American Red Cross, for coordinating emotional care and support activities for the families. NTSB is also made primarily responsible at the Federal level for facilitating recovery and identification of victims, and providing relevant information to the same families.

The rail carrier itself in this bill is required to cooperate with the designated charitable organization to provide mental health and counseling services to the families, provide for a private grieving environment, to maintain contact with the families, and also to arrange any appropriate memorial service.

The NTSB is also required to give prior briefings to the families before public disclosure of any information about the accident. Unsolicited attorney contacts with the families or victims themselves, other than the railroad employees, are prohibited for 45 days following the accident.

To ensure that the rail and passenger carriers are prepared to implement the law in the event of an accident, the bill requires each carrier to prepare a response plan and to submit that plan to the Department of Transportation and the NTSB within 6 months of enactment detailing how the carrier will carry out the specific family assistance obligations under the law.

Let me also note for the RECORD, Madam Chairman, that when the substantially identical bill was reviewed by the Congressional Budget Office, CBO stated in its estimate in August of 1999 that this legislation ''would have no significant impact on the Federal budget.''

As to intergovernmental mandates, CBO found that the bill would not require States to change laws or take action. There would be no significant State costs, and these or any costs involved would not meet the threshold minimum of the Unfunded Mandates Act reform.

The details of these evaluations, of course, are printed in the report of the predecessor bill on House Report 106–313. I urge prompt approval and careful consideration of a very bipartisan commonsense approach.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEMENT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate my good friend, my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. QUINN), on becoming chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads.

I want to also thank him for this wonderful book about building the transcontinental railroad. He knows that I am a big railroad buff, and I might say that my father-in-law, Noble Carson, was an old railroad employee from the old L&N Railroad in Nashville, Tennessee, where he retired. He is now deceased.

I am a former college president and I am a real historian anyway of the history of this country, and how we have been able to build that transcontinental railroad in just a few years. In this book, it describes how one can build a railroad in just a few years, so we ought to be able to do great things working together on a bipartisan basis on behalf of the Committee on Railroads and our colleagues in this great country.

Madam Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 2001. This legislation gives relatives of those injured or killed in railroad accidents the same rights as the families of airline disaster victims.

These families deserve the same sensitive treatment we afford to others following air disasters. What could be worse than having someone you love involved in a railroad disaster, only to find that there is no place to call for information, no one to explain whether one's husband, wife, son, or daughter was on that train, whether they were injured or deceased, but instead having to wait for hours to get any word, and at the same time, being hounded by lawyers for a lawsuit.

This legislation addresses all of those issues. It calls for the rail passenger carrier to have a plan for providing and publicizing a toll-free number for families to call. The carrier must outline a process for notifying the families before notifying the public. This notification should be carried out in person, when possible.

This legislation ensures that families will be consulted about all remains and personal effects, to the best of the rail passenger carrier's ability. It says these possessions will be returned to the family unless needed for the crash investigation, and that unclaimed possessions will be held for 18 months.

Madam Chairman, this legislation gives the families of all passengers the right to be consulted about the construction by the rail passenger carrier of any monument for the disaster victims. It designates a point of contact person to act as a liaison for families. It provides for mental health and counseling services for family members, and it prohibits unsolicited communications concerning lawsuits.

These assurances extend to the families of the employees, as well as the passengers, as all deserve, compassionate treatment. Every time we put a loved one on a train in this country, we should feel confident that he or she is safe. Should a tragic accident occur, however, we have a right to know we will be informed, treated fairly, and helped through the process.

This legislation does just that. The Railroad Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act offers the same treatment to families affected by rail disasters as we currently ensure for those affected by airline disasters. Legislating consistent treatment for both these groups is the fair thing and the right thing to do.

As an advocate of increased passenger rail alternatives for our traveling population, I feel very strongly that this legislation is exactly the type of framework we need in place to deal with unforeseen tragedies. While we work harder and invest more funds to prevent such rail incidents, we still must be prepared at all times to react appropriately and in a timely manner.

I am very pleased that this Congress is moving so quickly to pass H.R. 554. I urge our Senate colleagues to move quickly on passage so we can give this bill to President Bush as soon as possible.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUINN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT). I also would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff on our side and his side for preparing the legislation this morning.

While we will receive a lot of advice during the course of his term, in the next few years I am expecting advice from the gentleman and his staff, from my staff and others, but I am also expecting some advice from one Jack Quinn, Senior, back home in Buffalo, New York, who put in over 30 years at the South buffalo Railroad, who will also offer me some advice, and offered me a little this morning already. He called to say that I need a haircut. As we go through this, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 554, the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 2001.

Although passenger trains are a very safe way for people to travel, even railroads sometimes have accidents that cause serious injuries and loss of life. When rail passenger accidents do happen, they can occur in relatively remote locations and/or in the middle of the night. Moden communications allow for the transmission of news of the event to travel around the nation only minutes after it happens. Families with relatives on board can only hope and pray that their loved ones were not among those killed or injured. In some cases, the families are not even certain whether their loved one was on the train that had the accident. The tragic accident at Bourbonnais, IL, in March 1999 that took the lives of 11 Amtrak passengers and injured 49 others was the most recent such tragedy.

At these times, it is imperative that the needs of the families of the accident victims be treated with as much compassion as possible and that their need for information about their loved ones be promptly and accurately addressed.

The purpose of this legislation is to help create a process that, at a minimum, does not make an already highly emotional situation even more traumatic for family members. It requires that all passenger railroads engaged in interstate transportation submit a plan to the Secretary of Transportation and the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) to address the needs of families of passengers involved in any railroad accident where there is major loss of life. The plan must address a number of key areas, including the publication of a reliable toll-free number to handle calls from family members, procedures for developing passenger lists, and a process for notifying family members. In addition, the plan must specify the ongoing obligations (such as the disposition of the traveler's personal effects) that the carrier has with respect to the information and services to be provided to the family members throughout the duration of the disaster.

In recognition of the need for a professional and reliable focal point to be responsible for interacting with family members, H.R. 554 provides that the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board will identify a Board employee to serve as the Federal Government's point of contact and serve as a liaison between the railroads and the family members. The bill further instructs the NTSB Chairman to designate an independent nonprofit organization that has experience with disaster relief efforts, such as the Red Cross or the Salvation Army, to be responsible for coordinating the emotional care and support of the families of passengers involved in the accident. At such trying times, it is extremely important that families be handled by individuals and organizations experienced in providing compassionate assistance.

I would like to stress, however, that this legislation is not in response to any inaction or any inappropriate actions by Amtrak. Indeed, Amtrak has already adopted many of the elements called for in this bill, and Amtrak supports this bill that largely codifies its current practices. However, under the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, Amtrak is no longer the only railroad that can conduct interstate rail passenger operations. Since that law was enacted, a number of states have begun efforts to launch new conventional or high-speed rail passenger services. Therefore, we need to be prepared for a future of multiple rail passenger service providers.

One element of this bill I find particularly important is the prohibition against unsolicited communications by attorneys until 45 days following an accident. In times of tragedy, family members are especially vulnerable to the unscrupulous who would prey upon them. Only last week, an Amtrak passenger train rear-ended a CSX freight train just outside of Syracuse, NY. More than 60 people were injured, many of whom were physically challenged and traveling as a group. Along with the emergency responders, there were two men at the scene soliciting for legal work related to the accident. The men were handing out business cards and other material. This kind of shameless behavior is unethical; our bill would make it also illegal.

Although I am pleased that in its Statement of Administration Policy the Bush Administration supports passage of this important bill, I am concerned that the Administration indicates that it believes there may be First Amendment problems with this section of the bill (Section 2(g)(2)). To the best of my knowledge, the Administration has not contacted the Committee to outline the reasons for its concerns with the prohibition on unsolicited contact by attorneys after a rail accident. I hope that the Administration is aware of the 1995 Supreme Court decision in Florida Bar v. Went For It, Inc., in which the Court ruled that the First Amendment did not prohibit the Florida Bar from prohibiting lawyers from sending targeted direct mail solicitations to victims and relatives for 30 days after an accident. I see no difference between this decision and the prohibition in our bill.

In addition, I hope the Administration is aware that, under current law, this same type of prohibition applies to unsolicited communications to families of the victims of airline crashes. In the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act of 1996, we recognized the importance of the need to provide families of aircraft accident victims with reliable information and compassionate treatment. I have spoken with aviation accident families and they have told me that the 1996 legislation has worked well in assisting families in the most difficult of times. During our consideration of that Act, the Association of Trial Lawyers of America wrote to the Committee regarding that Act's aviation disaster assistance provisions and stated, in relevant part:

* * * This legislation will lend much-needed support to the families of victims of airline disasters.

In particular, the Association strongly supports sec. 5. This provision states the sense of Congress that state bar associations should adopt rules prohibiting unsolicited contact concerning a legal action with victims or aggrieved families within 30 days of an accident. ATLA's longstanding Code of Contact goes even further, and entirely prohibits unsolicited contact, regardless of when the accident occurred. We believe that the 30 day time period you provide in the bill is a reasonable minimum period during which victims and their families should not be bothered against their will with the sometimes painful question of compensation.

However, we urge the committee to go further, by strengthening this bill to also prohibiting unsolicited contact by anyone concerning potential claims they or their loved ones may have. Until a family decides to consider its options with regard to compensation, no party should take advantage of them during this delicate emotional time.—(Association of Trial Lawyers of America, September 10, 1996)

I applaud the Association of Trial Lawyers and the many State Bar Associations that have supported our efforts to stop this unethical conduct. I look forward to working with the Administration to address any new concerns that it has.

We have provided some solace to the families of victims of aviation disasters. We should do no less for those who choose to ride our nation's passenger trains.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to support the Rail Passenger Family Assistance Act. This bill should be enacted into law because it is the honorable thing to do. In the 106th Congress, I cosponsored a similar bill, H.R. 2681, which the House passed on October 4, 1999, by voice vote, but the Senate did not act on the bill. I look forward to a different outcome this year.

We all hope and pray that our constituents will get to their destinations safely while traveling. But the harsh reality is that sometimes tragedies do occur. Sometimes a plane or train crashes, causing a major loss of life.

In times like these, when families face the shock and pain of losing a loved one, the least we can do is provide every possible consideration to them, including grief counseling and general emotional support, ensuring their privacy, and helping them to arrange a fitting memorial service.

After the Valujet and TWA 800 airplane tragedies in 1996, this type of family assistance was established for the families of loved ones lost in airplane crashes, but such services do not exist for families of those lost in interstate and intercity rail passenger service.

While Amtrak has established an informal family-assistance program, there is no federal law requiring these services for families of victims of railroad disasters. In addition, because the 1997 Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act mandated competition in intercity rail passenger service, Amtrak will no longer be the sole rail carrier. New rail carriers will be established to compete with Amtrak. Such competition demonstrates the need for the Federal Government to enact a family assistance program.

Under the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act that we are considering today, a program will be established modeled after the program that was established for families of victims of airline disasters.

The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) will designate one of its employees to

be the contact person within the Federal Government with victims' families. That person's name and telephone number will be published, and the person will be the liaison between the victims' families and the rail carrier.

The NTSB will then designate an independent disaster-assistance organization, such as the Red Cross, to focus on the emotional needs of the families: providing grief counseling and a private place in which to grieve, helping them to arrange memorial services and funeral arrangements, and preventing contact by lawyers, or their agents, for 45 days after the tragedy, in order to help families to begin the healing process before taking any possible legal action.

It is my hope that our constituents across the Nation will get to their destinations safely when traveling by interstate or intercity rail, whether it be the Amtrak Cardinal Line which passes through West Virginia between Huntington and White Sulphur Springs, or any other carrier anywhere in the Nation. However, when a rail tragedy does happen, we must provide every possible consideration to victim's families to help them through the tragedy. This bill does that.

Finally, the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act will have no significant impact on the Federal budget, based on the Congressional Budget Office estimate for H.R. 2681, the bill passed by the House in 1999. Therefore, I encourage the Senate to consider the bill as soon as possible, and the President sign it into law, for the sake of victims' families.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he or she has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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 ''Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 2001''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. ASSISTANCE BY NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD TO FAMILIES OF PASSENGERS INVOLVED IN RAIL PASSENGER ACCIDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 11 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1138. Assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents

''(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after being notified of a rail passenger accident within the United States involving a rail passenger carrier and resulting in a major loss of life, the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board shall—

''(1) designate and publicize the name and phone number of a director of family support services who shall be an employee of the Board and shall be responsible for acting as a point of contact within the Federal Government for the families of passengers involved in the accident and a liaison between the rail passenger carrier and the families; and

''(2) designate an independent nonprofit organization, with experience in disasters and posttrauma communication with families, which shall have primary responsibility for coordinating the emotional care and support of the families of passengers involved in the accident.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD.—The Board shall have primary Federal responsibility for—

''(1) facilitating the recovery and identification of fatally injured passengers involved in an accident described in subsection (a); and

''(2) communicating with the families of passengers involved in the accident as to the roles of—

''(A) the organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2);

''(B) Government agencies; and

''(C) the rail passenger carrier involved,

with respect to the accident and the post-accident activities.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF DESIGNATED ORGANIZATION.—The organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) shall have the following responsibilities with respect to the families of passengers involved in the accident:

''(1) To provide mental health and counseling services, in coordination with the disaster response team of the rail passenger carrier involved.

''(2) To take such actions as may be necessary to provide an environment in which the families may grieve in private.

''(3) To meet with the families who have traveled to the location of the accident, to contact the families unable to travel to such location, and to contact all affected families periodically thereafter until such time as the organization, in consultation with the director of family support services designated for the accident under subsection (a)(1), determines that further assistance is no longer needed.

''(4) To arrange a suitable memorial service, in consultation with the families.

''(d) PASSENGER LISTS.—

''(1) REQUESTS FOR PASSENGER LISTS.—

''(A) REQUESTS BY DIRECTOR OF FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES.—It shall be the responsibility of the director of family support services designated for an accident under subsection (a)(1) to request, as soon as practicable, from the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident a list, which is based on the best available information at the time of the request, of the names of the passengers that were aboard the rail passenger carrier's train involved in the accident. A rail passenger carrier shall use reasonable efforts, with respect to its unreserved trains, and passengers not holding reservations on its other trains, to ascertain the names of passengers aboard a train involved in an accident.

''(B) REQUESTS BY DESIGNATED ORGANIZATION.—The organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) may request from the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident a list described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) USE OF INFORMATION.—The director of family support services and the organization may not release to any person information on a list obtained under paragraph (1) but may provide information on the list about a passenger to the family of the passenger to the extent that the director of family support services or the organization considers appropriate.

''(e) CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BOARD.—In the course of its investigation of an accident described in subsection (a), the Board shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure that the families of passengers involved in the accident—

''(1) are briefed, prior to any public briefing, about the accident and any other findings from the investigation; and

''(2) are individually informed of and allowed to attend any public hearings and meetings of the Board about the accident.

''(f) USE OF RAIL PASSENGER CARRIER RESOURCES.—To the extent practicable, the organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) shall coordinate its activities with the rail passenger carrier involved in the accident to facilitate the reasonable use of the resources of the carrier.

''(g) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

''(1) ACTIONS TO IMPEDE THE BOARD.—No person (including a State or political subdivision) may impede the ability of the Board (including the director of family support services designated for an accident under subsection (a)(1)), or an organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2), to carry out its responsibilities under this section or the ability of the families of passengers involved in the accident to have contact with one another.

''(2) UNSOLICITED COMMUNICATIONS.—No unsolicited communication concerning a potential action for personal injury or wrongful death may be made by an attorney (including any associate, agent, employee, or other representative of an attorney) or any potential party to the litigation to an individual (other than an employee of the rail passenger carrier) injured in the accident, or to a relative of an individual involved in the accident, before the 45th day following the date of the accident.

''(3) PROHIBITION ON ACTIONS TO PREVENT MENTAL HEALTH AND COUNSELING SERVICES.—No State or political subdivision may prevent the employees, agents, or volunteers of an organization designated for an accident under subsection (a)(2) from providing mental health and counseling services under subsection (c)(1) in the 30-day period beginning on the date of the accident. The director of family support services designated for the accident under subsection (a)(1) may extend such period for not to exceed an additional 30 days if the director determines that the extension is necessary to meet the needs of the families and if State and local authorities are notified of the determination.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

''(1) RAIL PASSENGER ACCIDENT.—The term 'rail passenger accident' means any rail passenger disaster occurring in the provision of—

''(A) interstate intercity rail passenger transportation (as such term is defined in section 24102); or

''(B) interstate or intrastate high-speed rail (as such term is defined in section 26105) transportation,

regardless of its cause or suspected cause.

''(2) RAIL PASSENGER CARRIER.—The term 'rail passenger carrier' means a rail carrier providing—

''(A) interstate intercity rail passenger transportation (as such term is defined in section 24102); or

''(B) interstate or intrastate high-speed rail (as such term is defined in section 26105) transportation,

except that such term shall not include a tourist, historic, scenic, or excursion rail carrier.

''(3) PASSENGER.—The term 'passenger' includes—

''(A) an employee of a rail passenger carrier aboard a train;

''(B) any other person aboard the train without regard to whether the person paid for the transportation, occupied a seat, or held a reservation for the rail transportation; and

''(C) any other person injured or killed in the accident.

''(i) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as limiting the actions that a rail passenger carrier may take, or the obligations that a rail passenger carrier may have, in providing assistance to the families of passengers involved in a rail passenger accident.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1137 the following:

''1138. Assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. RAIL PASSENGER CARRIER PLANS TO ADDRESS NEEDS OF FAMILIES OF PASSENGERS INVOLVED IN RAIL PASSENGER ACCIDENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part C of subtitle V of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''**CHAPTER 251—FAMILY ASSISTANCE**

''Sec.

''25101. Plans to address needs of families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents.

''§ 25101. Plans to address needs of families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents

''(a) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, each rail passenger carrier shall submit to the Secretary of Transportation and the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board a plan for addressing the needs of the families of passengers involved in any rail passenger accident involving a train of the rail passenger carrier and resulting in a major loss of life.

''(b) CONTENTS OF PLANS.—A plan to be submitted by a rail passenger carrier under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(1) A plan for publicizing a reliable, toll-free telephone number, and for providing staff, to handle calls from the families of the passengers.

''(2) A process for notifying the families of the passengers, before providing any public notice of the names of the passengers, either by utilizing the services of the organization designated for the accident under section 1138(a)(2) of this title or the services of other suitably trained individuals.

''(3) An assurance that the notice described in paragraph (2) will be provided to the family of a passenger as soon as the rail passenger carrier has verified that the passenger was aboard the train (whether or not the names of all of the passengers have been verified) and, to the extent practicable, in person.

''(4) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will provide to the director of family support services designated for the accident under section 1138(a)(1) of this title, and to the organization designated for the accident under section 1138(a)(2) of this title, immediately upon request, a list (which is based on the best available information at the time of the request) of the names of the passengers aboard the train (whether or not such names have been verified), and will periodically update the list. The plan shall include a procedure, with respect to unreserved trains and passengers not holding reservations on other trains, for the rail passenger carrier to use reasonable efforts to ascertain the names of passengers aboard a train involved in an accident.

''(5) An assurance that the family of each passenger will be consulted about the disposition of all remains and personal effects of the passenger within the control of the rail passenger carrier.

''(6) An assurance that if requested by the family of a passenger, any possession of the passenger within the control of the rail passenger carrier (regardless of its condition) will be returned to the family unless the possession is needed for the accident investigation or any criminal investigation.

''(7) An assurance that any unclaimed possession of a passenger within the control of the rail passenger carrier will be retained by the rail passenger carrier for at least 18 months.

''(8) An assurance that the family of each passenger or other person killed in the accident will be consulted about construction by the rail passenger carrier of any monument to the passengers, including any inscription on the monument.

''(9) An assurance that the treatment of the families of nonrevenue passengers will be the same as the treatment of the families of revenue passengers.

''(10) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will work with any organization designated under section 1138(a)(2) of this title on an ongoing basis to ensure that families of passengers receive an appropriate level of services and assistance following each accident.

''(11) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will provide reasonable compensation to any organization designated under section 1138(a)(2) of this title for services provided by the organization.

''(12) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will assist the family of a passenger in traveling to the location of the accident and provide for the physical care of the family while the family is staying at such location.

''(13) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will commit sufficient resources to carry out the plan.

''(14) An assurance that the rail passenger carrier will provide adequate training to the employees and agents of the carrier to meet the needs of survivors and family members following an accident.

''(15) An assurance that, upon request of the family of a passenger, the rail passenger carrier will inform the family of whether the passenger's name appeared on any preliminary passenger manifest for the train involved in the accident.

''(c) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—A rail passenger carrier shall not be liable for damages in any action brought in a Federal or State court arising out of the performance of the rail passenger carrier in preparing or providing a passenger list, or in providing information concerning a train reservation, pursuant to a plan submitted by the rail passenger carrier under subsection (b), unless such liability was caused by conduct of the rail passenger carrier which was grossly negligent or which constituted intentional misconduct.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the terms 'rail passenger accident' and 'rail passenger carrier' have the meanings such terms have in section 1138 of this title; and

''(2) the term 'passenger' means a person aboard a rail passenger carrier's train that is involved in a rail passenger accident.

''(e) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as limiting the actions that a rail passenger carrier may take, or the obligations that a rail passenger carrier may have, in providing assistance to the families of passengers involved in a rail passenger accident.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle V of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to chapter 249 the following new item:

''251. FAMILY ASSISTANCE ..... 25101''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mrs. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 554) to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents, pursuant to House Resolution 36, she reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1045

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 13, 2001, I call up the bill (H.R. 559) to designate the United States courthouse located at 1 Courthouse Way in Boston, Massachusetts, as the ''John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse,'' and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 559 is as follows:

H.R. 559

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 1 Courthouse Way in Boston, Massachusetts, shall be known and designated as the ''John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 13, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Madam Speaker, as I begin my remarks on H.R. 559, I want to thank and commend our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for one, not only bringing this matter before the attention of the House, but also for pushing for its expedited consideration.

I was in my district in Ohio as all Members were earlier this week. They all were not in Ohio, they were all in their districts. And the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) was kind enough to call and indicate this was a bill that was not only deserving of the body's attention, but it was deserving of expedited attention.

Madam Speaker, I also want to commend the leadership of the House for giving it every consideration.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 559 designates the United States courthouse located at 1 Boston Way in Boston, Massachusetts as the John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse. It is only fitting that the courthouse in Boston bear the name of our witty, compassionate and amiable colleague in the House.

Mr. MOAKLEY has been a staple in this body since his election to the House in 1972. Congressman Moakley was born, raised and lived most of his adult life in South Boston, something he is very proud of. He began his long distinguished career in public service at the age of 15 when he enlisted in the United States Navy and served in the South Pacific during the Second World War.

Upon returning from his service in World War II, he attended the University of Miami, and later received his law degree from Suffolk University Law School in Boston.

At the age of 25, Congressman MOAKLEY was elected to the Massachusetts State Legislature, serving in both the State House of Representatives and the State Senate for 18 years before being elected to the Boston City Council.

In 1972, as I mentioned before, Congressman Moakley was elected to the United States House of Representatives.

After his first term in the House, Congressman MOAKLEY was appointed to the Committee on Rules. He later became chair of the Committee on Rules in 1989. He is now serving as the Committee on Rules ranking member. With his affable personality, he was able to give everyone a fair shake that came before his committee, even during some of the more than difficult political debates that we, from time to time, have in this Chamber.

In addition to his work on the Committee on Rules and being an ardent supporter for South Boston's transportation infrastructure, Congressman MOAKLEY continues to be dedicated to ending human rights violations around the world, particularly in Central America. This naming is a fitting tribute to our colleague.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill and encourage my colleagues to join in support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), for his cooperation on this matter. I want to thank the leadership, the Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership, for all their cooperation, and, in particular, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader; the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; as I mentioned, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader; and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

I really appreciate everybody here working together to move this legislation to the floor expeditiously, and it is for our very dear friend, JOE MOAKLEY.

Madam Speaker, this is a very special moment for me. JOE MOAKLEY has been my teacher and he has been my mentor. He has, as I have said many times over the last couple of days, been like a second father to me, and he is my best friend.

As many of my colleagues know, I worked in JOE MOAKLEY's congressional office for over 13 years. I have seen him solve problems, both large and small. I watched as he steered countless millions of dollars to his district and to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for sensible economic development.

There is not a Federal project in Massachusetts from the Berkshires to Cape Cod that does not have JOE MOAKLEY's fingerprints all over it.

I watched him help colleges and universities build new buildings, research facilities, classrooms and laboratories.

I watched him champion the cause of health care, because as he said on Monday, he knows probably better than most of us the miracles of medical science.

Madam Speaker, I have seen him immerse himself in constituent casework. If someone stops him at a local diner or on the street with a problem, JOE MOAKLEY is immediately on the phone, usually using some very colorful language to get his point across in order to solve that problem. And I have even seen JOE stare down death squads in El Salvador.

JOE MOAKLEY's commitment to human rights in that war-torn country played a mighty role in ending the Salvadoran war, which caused over 80,000 innocent civilians' lives.

I returned to El Salvador with JOE in November of 1999 to mark the 10th anniversary of the murder of the 6 Jesuit priests, the case in which JOE successfully exposed the truth.

Everywhere we went in El Salvador, even in the most remote villages, people remembered what he did. They would come up and give him a big hug and say thank you and tell him how much he impacted their lives.

In return, JOE would sing his favorite Irish tunes, if you are Irish, Come Into the Parlor, or Southey, My Hometown, or his personal favorite, Redhead, and I am not sure that they knew what the heck he was singing, but they all fell in love with him. They all appreciated what he did and they will remember him forever.

In 1996, I was elected to the United States Congress, and I would not have won that race if it were not for JOE MOAKLEY. There is no way that I can adequately say thank you to him for helping me realize my dream.

Today we are naming the U.S. courthouse in Boston, a building that, quite frankly, would not be there if it were not for JOE MOAKLEY. We are naming it the John Joseph Moakley Federal Courthouse.

It is an appropriate tribute for two reasons. First, that new courthouse is already serving as a catalyst for economic development in that area of South Boston with new construction springing up all around it. And so much of JOE's career has been about promoting economic development and creating jobs.

He joked the other day that his favorite bird is the crane, and if you visit Boston, you will see cranes all over the place.

The second reason why I think this is appropriate is that that courthouse is a symbol for justice, and JOE MOAKLEY's entire life has been dedicated to fighting for justice, especially for those who do not have a powerful ally or who are not well committed; whether it is fighting to help Mrs. O'Leary find her lost Social Security check, or whether it is fighting on behalf of refugees from El Salvador who were too afraid to go back to their homeland during that war, or whether it is fighting for health care or for Medicare or for hospitals or for anybody who has any problem, JOE

MOAKLEY is always out there, front and center, fighting for justice.

He was one time asked what his favorite compliment was, and he replied being called a regular guy. Well, JOE MOAKLEY is the most extraordinary regular guy I have ever known, and like everyone in this House, and I would say like everybody who knows him, I love him a lot.

Madam Speaker, we are all sad that JOE announced that he will not seek reelection in the year 2002, but I want to remind everyone here that 2 years is a long time. JOE MOAKLEY will be with us on this floor, telling his Irish stories, singing his Irish songs and fighting the good fight.

I, again, want to thank all of my colleagues for bringing this to the floor so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN).

Mr. QUINN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for his leadership on this issue. We were going to invite the Massachusetts Republican delegation down here to speak today, but, you know, that does not exist. There have been a couple of great Republicans in the Congress from Massachusetts. Of course, the great Silvio Conte and Mr. Torkelson, who my colleagues took care of and Mr. Blute, who my colleagues took care of, and so we are without a Massachusetts Republican delegation. But, nonetheless, I rise this morning to represent all of the Members on our side of the aisle in talking about JOE MOAKLEY for a couple of minutes here this morning.

A good thing, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) pointed out, is that sooner or later everybody will have a chance to talk about us, sooner or later; some sooner, some later. But by doing this naming today, we get a chance to talk this morning about a good friend in JOE MOAKLEY. I want to talk to JOE this morning, not about him, because he is with us. I do not want to talk to him.

I want to thank JOE MOAKLEY personally for the work he has done with me on our weatherization and our LHEAP program where we have been able to restore some money back into this Federal budget to take care of people who have to make decisions about whether or not they are going to heat their homes or put food on the table; not an easy decision, not an easy road to hoe for people in the northeastern part of our country.

JOE and I have teamed up together to do that these last couple of years, and I have learned from JOE MOAKLEY more in these last couple of years than all of my years in education, all my years in government, all my years in public life. And I do not know JOE MOAKLEY's district exactly, but I will tell you, JOE, and I know you like to be called a regular guy, which you are, but I have a feeling that that district back there in Massachusetts when you care about the rest of the regular guys, you are caring about the teachers. You are caring about the cab drivers and the truck drivers. You are caring about the electricians and the carpenters. You are caring about the people that really make this country what it is.

And I, for one, want to thank you for doing that. I also want to let you know, JOE, whether you know it or not, you have taught a lot of us here in the House on both sides of the aisle, not only to be Members of Congress, but how to act as respectful gentlemen and from all of us, we appreciate that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I guess, to a certain extent, I do not want to talk about what JOE MOAKLEY has done, because, to me, that is not the measure of a man. It is not the measure of the reason I like JOE, and I think the reason JOE is so well loved in his own district. It is what he is.

I grew up in Massachusetts, and for all of my life, like JOE, I live in my own hometown. Like JOE, I live in my own neighborhood. And I want to tell my colleagues, all of my life, I have heard about JOE MOAKLEY, as I heard about Tip O'Neill, as I heard about TED KENNEDY, as I heard about James Michael Curly, as I heard about John Kennedy. In my world, there were many political giants. But, for me, most of them came before me. And I knew some of them in passing. I knew Mr. O'Neill a little bit. My father knew him better.

This is the first time in my life I have had an opportunity to get up close to someone who is a living icon in my world, and it is the first time in my life that I know that all the things I heard about him were not just the typical media fluff that many of us around here worry about. We are all worried about our image. We are all worried about what people say about us. And JOE MOAKLEY could not care less because he is what he is, and what he is is a regular guy.

I say that representing a district that almost is a mirror image of JOE's district. We do represent all of those people. I will tell you that JOE MOAKLEY would have been the exact same person if he did not get into politics, if he had gone the way of so many of his friends and gone to work as a Teamster, or gone to work as a longshoreman or gone to work as a bus driver, like many of the people he grew up next to, like many of the people I grew up next to, would have been the same person, would have still joked, would have still sang songs, would have still had fun, and would have still been loved by all of his neighbors and friends.

□ 1100

The fact that we have had so much of an opportunity to get the best from JOE MOAKLEY does nothing more than enriches us. I can only say that I am personally happy and proud to have gotten to know him as more than a political icon, as a person, a person that so many people in Massachusetts love and a person that so many people in Massachusetts wish only the best for.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is really a great honor for me to be able to stand up and speak on behalf of this resolution. If there is anyone who deserves it, it is JOE MOAKLEY. I can honestly say that, for the time that I have been in Congress, no one has personified to me more what it means to be a Congressman than JOE MOAKLEY. If everybody in this House were like JOE MOAKLEY, we would get along much better; we would get a lot more done.

We would realize that partisanship is important, but yet it stops. We should be able to reach across the aisle and shake hands and have a drink and share a joke and make a cutting remark or humorous remark about one of our colleagues in a way that really shows the camaraderie that we should have.

From the time I came here, JOE MOAKLEY reached out to me. He was, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) have said, a good guy in the very best sense of the word.

Yet, he was also an outstanding Congressman, a man who fought and fights so hard for his district, a man who obviously believes the principles for the Democratic party, fights hard for those principles; but at the end of the day, is willing to sit down and talk with anyone, no matter what their party affiliation happens to be.

He reaches out for people who need help. He is a person who I know, speaking for Members on my side of the aisle, when they needed a favor, when they needed help, when they needed a break, the guy they went to on the other side was JOE MOAKLEY. He never let party divisions stand between him and them.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) said, JOE MOAKLEY represents a working class district. He represents real people. There is nothing phony. There is nothing built-up by the media. This is the real thing. When one sees JOE MOAKLEY, one is seeing what a real person is.

Today, to be honoring him in this way, it is important. It means a lot. But on the other hand, if there was never any courthouse named after JOE MOAKLEY, if there was never any plaque or citation put out for JOE MOAKLEY, he would always be remembered by those who knew him, those who served with him in Congress.

And as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) has said, probably most importantly of all, the average guy on the street corner in his district, the average guy in the bar, the average guy driving the bus, the average guy going to work every day, he realizes that JOE MOAKLEY, in every sense of the word, represented those people here in Congress, the people who otherwise would not have a strong voice, the people who are so busy working day to day they cannot afford to be getting involved in exotic causes. They have to know that they have somebody who is on the firing lines for them day in and day out.

The fact that so many projects went to JOE's district as opposed to mine or the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), we take that in stride, realizing that was JOE fighting for his district, and, quite frankly, doing a better job than we were for ours.

So I am proud to join with all of my colleagues today in honoring JOE MOAKLEY and speaking on behalf of this resolution and saying it has been a true source of pride and honor for me to be able to work with JOE MOAKLEY. I wish him the best of health. I wish him the very best to himself that he has given to so many of us for so many years.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), my classmate and colleague.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this opportunity to say some words about JOE MOAKLEY, JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY, but all of us know him as JOE.

He was described the other day by folks from Massachusetts as a lunchbucket Democrat and politician; and a politician obviously defined in this sense, as a servant of the people. When one is talking about a servant of the people, it is everybody.

JOE worked over 50 years and continues to work now for a better quality of life for everyone, rich or poor, and all those in between. He is known for his policy work whether it is housing, whether it is the environment, whether it is employment, El Salvador or Cuba.

He happens to make sure that he is happiest when people are working. When they are employed and there are numerous economic development projects going on in his district, he is smiling the most. As he said just the other day, that the favorite bird for him is the crane. When one looks all over his district in Boston, one sees one crane after another. One sees construction projects blooming in the Boston skyline and that means development, it means progress, it means jobs and a better quality of life for all of JOE's constituents.

His life is a lasting example of honor. He treats others with respect and dignity; and in turn, he is liked by everyone, as we have heard from Members on both sides of this aisle.

He is compassionate, but he is certainly not weak. He is strong, but he is always considerate of others. He has a sense of responsibility that has permeated his being for a long, long time. At the age of 15, as I am sure my colleagues have heard or will hear, he forged his documents and enlisted in the Navy and went into World War II. Today some people would probably say he misrepresented something and try to run him out of government; but for JOE, this was the right thing to do to get in there, be a patriot, and to represent and work on behalf of his country.

Tom Oliphant wrote a column about JOE the other day; and in it he said something that was very touching. He said JOE MOAKLEY treats everybody the same. So even if you are a king or President, you get to be treated like his constituent. That says a lot about JOE. It is exactly the way that he has always treated with respect the people whom he represents and whom he considers family.

So it is fitting that this courthouse be named after him. It is fitting because that is where he grew up, that is where he played and ran around in the rail yards that used to pass through there, chasing watermelons and other fruit off of the trains as they went by.

I am proud and I consider it an honor to join others here today in saying that this courthouse will be appropriately named for JOE MOAKLEY. It represents jobs. It represents progress and development. Most of all, it represents justice and fairness.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, as we await the arrival of other speakers, we reserve the balance our time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a great void in our delegation and in this institution as JOE MOAKLEY announces that he will not run for another term. But it is altogether fitting and appropriate that we gather here to name the courthouse overlooking Boston Harbor on behalf of JOE MOAKLEY.

There is a great scene in the movie the Ten Commandments where Moses, Charlton Heston, is confronted by Pharaoh, his father who has adopted him and raised him, where the father says to him, What have you done for me, Moses? My son, Ramseys, Yule Brenner, has done so much for me.

At that point, Moses pulls back the cloth and says, Behold, I have built you a city.

If someone asks me, if someone asks our delegation what has JOE MOAKLEY done, we could pull back the same cloth in the Moakley Courthouse and look out and say, Behold, JOE MOAKLEY has rebuilt Boston.

One would look out on this clear and clean water of Boston Harbor that was once polluted. One can look at the jewels of the Boston Harbor, the islands, now the Boston Harbor National Park. One could look at the Central Artery, Moses parted the Red Sea, what JOE MOAKLEY has done is reunite the city of Boston by putting the Central Artery underground so that this city that was divided for 50 years is now once again united when the Central Artery, the Big Dig, is completed, the civil and political engineering feat of the last 50 years, finding the money and then designing it. Then the Moakley Courthouse above from which one can see the Evelyn Moakley Bridge named for his beloved wife.

JOE MOAKLEY talked to kings and pages with the same language. If we ever do have a Mount Rushmore for congressmen, JOE MOAKLEY should be up there with his great friends, John McCormack and Tip O'Neill as the symbols of everything that Congress should stand for. He is a great man. We are honoring a great man by placing his name on this courthouse.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution naming the Federal courthouse in Boston in honor of my colleague, JOE MOAKLEY. No Member of Congress deserves this honor more than the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend JOE.

I have had the honor of serving on the Committee on Rules with JOE for more than 22 years. No person better epitomizes what is good about public service in this country. JOE has served with distinction, with good humor and with class.

Years ago, he personally and courageously took on the death squads in El Salvador following the murder of four nuns in his district as well as six Jesuit priests. It was his dogged determination and hard work that brought an end in that sad chapter in El Salvador's history. JOE's district in Boston did not reap great rewards from his courageous fight, but all of mankind did.

JOE MOAKLEY, as we have heard earlier, enlisted in the Navy in World War II at the age of 15, lying about his age so he could fight the enemies of our Nation. I guess he was big for his age at the time, but no one in Congress today has a bigger heart than JOE MOAKLEY.

JOE served as chairman of the Committee on Rules for 5 years and has served as ranking Democrat for the past 6 years. Whether in the majority or in the minority, JOE has served with class. He has never been mean to his adversaries, but he has always been firm in his convictions and vigorous in his pursuit of the values and ideals of the Democratic Party.

JOE has made the decision to step down after this term in Congress after having fought valiantly in recent years against a series of ailments and will continue to fight against his ailments as he has done with courage, grace, and dignity. We look forward to his continued service in this body in the months ahead.

Boston and all America can be proud of this great Congressman. He is one of the last of the great Boston pols, a man who is proud to represent his district and to serve his country. Naming the beautiful Federal courthouse overlooking Boston Harbor in his honor is the very least we can do.

JOE MOAKLEY is a great Congressman. He is and always will be a shining example to the entire country about what is good in public life today.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a seatmate on the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my good friend from Massachusetts and Committee on Rules colleague, JOE MOAKLEY. Anyone familiar with the Committee on Rules' work knows that it often entails long hearings, very late nights, and early morning wake-up calls just to get our work done for the next day.

But JOE MOAKLEY makes our sacrifices much easier to bear with a twinkle in his eye and his quick wit. He keeps us on our toes, and he keeps us chuckling even when the joke is at his own expense.

If more Members could do their party's bidding on both sides of the aisle with JOE's flare, there would be a lot less partisan rancor around here and many more smiles on the faces of our colleagues.

Today, we not only honor JOE MOAKLEY, but we also thank him for his invaluable contributions to this institution, to the lives of everyone he has touched, and all of us who have had the privilege of knowing him.

I was not here when a young JOE MOAKLEY came to Washington some 30 years ago, but I am very certain that this institution and his constituents and every Member he has come in contact with is better for his work here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican, and JOE MOAKLEY is a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat, and most people would, therefore, put us at odds; but I am here to tell you, and to turn a phrase, with enemies like that, who needs friends?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding to me, and thank the Members that are assembled here today.

JOE MOAKLEY's sense of humor was infectious for all of us; and one can sense, I think, the affection that we all feel for him today.

In Massachusetts, people think that one is supposed to be good at politics. We take it very seriously. In the instance of JOE MOAKLEY, he is heir to the great legacy of the great McCormack and the great O'Neill.

There are two parts of this business in Congress. There is the outside business, and there is the inside business. JOE MOAKLEY was good at both of them.

The problem in this institution, like most institutions of legislative life today across America, is that the people that are good at the outside part of it can never become good at the inside part of it because they profess a disdain for the institutions of which they serve, thereby never buying into consensus, never having the chance to do the great governing that has to take place in legislative life.

JOE MOAKLEY understood both parts of legislative life. One has to be good at the outside part of it, and one has to be very good at the inside part of it. Hence, committee assignments. I know people's eyes glaze over when they hear that, but the members of the delegation were always on good committees, primarily because of McCormack, O'Neill, and MOAKLEY.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) said to me a moment ago when somebody mentioned, well, Jeez, JOE treated everybody alike. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) said, In our delegation, he sure did. He thought we were all on his staff.

But it was a joy to be part of his success in this institution. There is still going to be a lot of good days as we move along as well.

Let me just close on this note: I bumped into the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) today, a terrific guy. He said to me, ''You know, I never voted the way JOE MOAKLEY voted in the years I have been in Congress, but there was nobody whose company I enjoyed more at dinner. There is nobody that I enjoyed talking to more about the great stories that he told and still will have an opportunity to tell.''

I am indeed very grateful for many of the good things that have come my way in legislative life here in the Congress because I consider it an honor to serve here. JOE MOAKLEY has been responsible for much of the success that I have had within this institution.

I am indeed grateful today and happy to be part of this and only wish our friend from South Boston, if one asked him where he was from, he would not say Boston, he would say he was from South Boston, our friend JOE MOAKLEY.

□ 1115

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say that when I picked up my paper last Monday and read the news of JOE MOAKLEY's illness, it made me extremely sad; and I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for calling to my attention this opportunity we have as a body to appreciate one of our own.

JOE MOAKLEY is a pretty good partisan, and that is fine. It is his institutional role to stick up for people who have a shared point of view of his own, and he has done that and he has done it well. But he has never in all the time I have known him done that in any manner that was ungentlemanly or inconsiderate.

On a more personal basis, when we have those moments in our lives when we can get beyond our institutional roles, he is a friend. I can remember as a young guy in the minority, probably a little bit out of line, messing with something that was not in a committee on which I served and, therefore, considered by many to be perhaps none of my business, having to trek up to the Committee on Rules with the second-ranking Democrat on the Committee on Rules who showed me patience, tolerance, encouragement, consideration, and a helping hand in the committee for me to get an amendment that was important to me to the floor so he could cheerfully vote against it. That was a pretty decent thing, quite frankly.

So I welcome this opportunity. And I should say, by the way again on a more personal note, we should remember that JOE MOAKLEY is from south Boston. If we forget, we should just notice that is where the accent came from. I had not realized until my brother went to work with the Boston Patriots, the New England Patriots, that for all my life I had been mispronouncing his name. I, in my misguided youth, had learned that his name was Charlie Armey. It was only by JOE's compliments towards my brother that I learned his name is ''Chawley Aumey.'' I often refer to Charlie with affection as my brother Chawley Aumey, and I think of JOE MOAKLEY every time.

So thank you again for giving us this opportunity, and I thank the gentleman for giving me just this moment to speak with very, very real affection for a real person. As Evey, his wife, would have said, He's a person. And we ought to know that and we ought to appreciate that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader, for his very kind words and his eloquent words. I want him to know I appreciate them and everybody in the Massachusetts delegation, I think everybody in Massachusetts, really appreciates those words.

The gentleman points out that even though JOE was a solid bread-and-butter Democrat, that he had this talent to kind of cross party lines. There is not a single person, even those who disagree with him on an issue, that do not walk away from a fight saying, He's a good guy; I liked him a lot.

We really do appreciate the gentleman's kind words, and we appreciate his working with us to bring this to the floor today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. One final moment. I would just say to JOE, ''Mr. Chairman, stay with us.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in thanking the majority leader for really speaking, I think, on behalf of the whole House in his very personal eloquent statement. We will have to be forgiven, those of us who do this as a profession, because, to be honest, we are all reacting personally in these last couple of days.

JOE MOAKLEY had enormous benefits to the country, to this institution, to the city and the State, but for us also the personal was there. We could not come into this Chamber on the worst of days, having encountered all kinds of unpleasantness, and not have our spirits uplifted by sitting with JOE. There was no way that anyone could fail in his presence to be cheered. And for that personal element, even in this time of trial for him, he has been cheering the rest of us up. Typical of this really quite extraordinary man.

I also want to talk about another aspect in which he is extraordinary. He is a great stereotype breaker. One of the things we suffer from in this country is this assumption that if we are A, we cannot be B; if we are X, we cannot be Y. JOE MOAKLEY showed us that we could be. There is a lot of talk about civility now. No one had to tell JOE MOAKLEY that a person could be a deeply committed advocate of issues, not simply a partisan in the sense of being a Democrat but a partisan Democrat who cared a lot about what was necessary to improve the lot of those people in our society who were not going to do well on their own, no one had to tell him that someone could be deeply committed without being truculent or belligerent. No one had to tell that a passion for doing the right thing in public policy was incompatible with friendliness, and we have seen that demonstrated here.

We have talked about people in whose tradition JOE MOAKLEY was, and Tip O'Neill is the one who comes most to mind with me, because MOAKLEY and Tip O'Neill shared something which I think is a defining thing about greatness. We throw this word around a lot; but to me, in our political system, it means among others things this: that someone can be a master of a given set of rules. Tip O'Neill and JOE MOAKLEY were both masters of the old politics. They were both masters of politics in the old school.

JOE MOAKLEY, 50 years ago in south Boston, was beginning a very impressive career in politics as it then was. And both of them, first Tip O'Neill then JOE MOAKLEY, showed that an individual could be a master of the old ways and welcome the new. Too often people who are good at one set of arrangements feel threatened by change. JOE MOAKLEY was not threatened by change. He understood that being a basic Social Security-getting, job-getting Democrat at home did not mean a person could not worry about human rights abroad. JOE MOAKLEY bridged by the greatness of his personality his commitment, his caring about individuals and humanity at large, a lot of things people have tried to pull apart.

It is for that reason that we will be impoverished personally by not having his companionship here on the floor when he leaves this House, and this Nation will be impoverished by someone who did so much to try to get us to put aside artificial differences.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this discussion. I have not known the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) as well as many of the previous speakers, but I have to say that when I first appeared before the Committee on Rules a few years ago as a trembling freshman and presented my case on an amendment, it was interesting to watch the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

He initially was shuffling papers, then he began listening to me, and then he turned to the person next to him and I could see him say, ''Who is this guy?'' And after I made the presentation, he made some complimentary comments and took the trouble after the meeting to come and speak to me about my proposal and explain how it could be improved.

That was the beginning of a friendship. And even though I cannot claim the close friendship that some of the old-timers here have, it has always been a good relationship. We joke with each other, we talk with each other, we always greet each other in the hallways. He always strikes me as what a longstanding Member of Congress should be, a kindly older gentleman who is helping and aiding those around him and always cheerful, always helpful, and always trying to help us do our best for the country.

We need more Members like that. And the other comments about his civility, I believe, are well taken. He is a very civil person in every sense of the word and truly a gentleman who deserves the honor that he is being given today. We cannot say enough good about him.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for moving on this courthouse quickly with both sides of the aisle embracing this. This is very, very important at this time; and I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for not only the way he has gone about this but his remarkable friendship with JOE MOAKLEY over the years.

When I got elected to the Congress, I had never been in a legislative body before, and I was a little inexperienced; and I remember getting here and butting heads with JOE MOAKLEY. Then I quickly surrendered.

JOE is a remarkable guy. Many of us have heard the stories about what he has done in terms of building Boston and what he has meant to that community, with the Big Dig, depression of the Artery, the beautiful courthouse, the sense of humor that he had. Amazing.

All of us have read the story about JOE's illness, and his initial remark was, ''The doctor told me that I should not get any green bananas.'' Remarkable sense of humor. The jokes on the floor. But also his commitment on so many issues.

I remember, and it was mentioned earlier, in the wake of the burial of the murdered Jesuits and nuns in El Salvador in 1989, Speaker Foley appointed JOE to head the special task force to investigate the El Salvadoran government. It was JOE MOAKLEY who led the way there and exposed violations of human rights that have made a dramatic difference there. What a legacy his work on human rights in El Salvador. An incredible legacy.

Many of us had been fighting over the years to try to get the School of the Americas shut down, could never get the votes in the House, until JOE MOAKLEY took it up. He said I will offer this and we will get it passed. That is JOE MOAKLEY.

The personal relationships with Members, not only all he has done for his own district but everyone's district. When we go to the dean of the delegation from Massachusetts and we ask him for help, we are more effective in our districts. I will tell a quick story, if I can get 30 seconds more. Malden Mills in my district in Lawrence and Lowell, a great factory that burned down a few years ago. Aaron Feuerstein, the owner of the mill, kept all the workers working at Christmas time. Kept them all employed. He developed Polartec for cold weather. We were looking for a way to get it to the Marines, get it to our service members, because it is cutting-edge fabric.

Aaron came down and said, ''How do I do this?'' I said, ''Well, I will tell you how we will do it. We will go to see JOE MOAKLEY.'' Needless to say, the contracts have been signed, and the Marines are now wearing Polartec.

So this is a great honor to a great man, and I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. MOAKLEY's counterpart; and Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take 5 minutes of my time and yield it to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for him to control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will have an additional 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I hear all these nice things being said about JOE MOAKLEY by Members of the Massachusetts delegation, Members on this side of the aisle; and I have to say that I probably more than any other Member of this House know JOE MOAKLEY to be a real fighter. In fact, he has abused me regularly up in the Committee on Rules and I know plans to continue that pattern over the next couple of years. He is one who clearly does stand for his principles very firmly.

But I will agree with the arguments that have been made by my colleagues that he is extraordinarily civil in the process. Just yesterday I followed a statement that he made about the fact that he is at a point in his life where he does not purchase green bananas any longer because he does not know if he will be around long enough for them to ripen. Well, we know that JOE MOAKLEY is going to be around for a long time. He continues to fight very hard. But the fact is I presented him yesterday with some green bananas upstairs in the Committee on Rules, and he told me that he would much rather have the gavel than the green bananas that I presented to him.

□ 1130

I let him hold the gavel momentarily. But I will tell my colleagues that I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY). I have had the privilege of serving on that Moakley Commission in El Salvador, and he did tremendous work and was so dedicated in that effort.

He has represented the Democrats extremely well in the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules is one of the most partisan committees in the institution, and yet we have been able to work in a bipartisan way on lots of different issues.

I am proud to have worked with him on bringing about a complete overhaul of the rules structure here in this House. We did that in a bipartisan way. Were it not for JOE MOAKLEY, we would not have been able to proceed with what was one of the boldest reforms since 1880 in this institution. On lots of issues, we have been able to find areas of agreement. Of course, the attention is focused on areas of disagreement. But he is a fighter who is going to continue to be with us for a long time to come, and I am looking forward to continuing to get the wit and wisdom of JOE MOAKLEY upstairs and down here on the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his kind words. Those of us in the Massachusetts delegation have not heard so many nice things said about Massachusetts Members of Congress in a long time, but we really appreciate it. We appreciate the heartfelt comments. It means an awful lot to us, and I know it means an awful lot to JOE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for leading us in this resolution.

It is so appropriate that we are naming a courthouse after JOE MOAKLEY. We probably should also name a post office, and maybe we will do that at a later point in time. Because certainly, as has been referenced here, JOE MOAKLEY has delivered the mail. I mean, he has delivered the mail for his district. He has delivered the mail for Massachusetts.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) has said, he more than anyone, along with Tip O'Neill, is responsible for rebuilding the city of Boston. And that will be a lasting monument to JOE MOAKLEY, as well as Tip O'Neill.

But appropriate I say a courthouse because a courthouse is a symbol of justice. And I thought it was fascinating the other day, because some of us attended his press conference, where he stated publicly that, as he looked back on his political career, the one aspect of his legacy that he was most proud of is what he did in El Salvador. What he did in El Salvador was really to begin the process of stopping a civil war that took oh so many lives. It was about justice. It was about social justice and economic justice.

Beyond buildings and beyond bridges and beyond harbors, really the heart and the soul and the core of JOE MOAKLEY is social and economic justice. And that is why it is so appropriate to name the ultimate symbol of a democracy, a courthouse, after JOE MOAKLEY.

On a personal note, I want to thank JOE MOAKLEY for his wisdom, his counsel, for his kindness, his advice, and help to me. I know I speak for everyone in Massachusetts when I say, we respect him and, as importantly, we love him.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) who announced his retirement from the Congress this week. With his departure, we will lose one of our finest, wittiest, and longest serving Members. We in the Massachusetts delegation will lose our dean, our load star, and the patron saint of South Boston.

Even before his years as chairman and later ranking member of the Committee on Rules, JOE was a force not to be tangled with. In nearly 3 decades of service in the House, he cites among his most notable accomplishments his fight for peace and justice in El Salvador during the conflict-ridden 1980s. He is known for that and a lot more in Massachusetts.

Congressman MOAKLEY has literally lifted the city of Boston up. He has set an example for all of us in his efforts to improve the lives of working families, and his deeply personal style will be remembered.

Speaking of lifting the city of Boston up, JOE has spent the last decade securing crucial transportation funding for the Boston Metropolitan area, which faces formidable transportation challenges. JOE recognized that large investments were necessary to keep the great and historic city of Boston in a prominent place in the global economy, and soon Boston will be a shining example of efficient transportation that will be a tribute to JOE's tireless work.

JOE has been an important part of my political life, too. When I was elected in 1991, JOE cleared the way for me to join the Committee on Appropriations and so helped me define my role in Congress. And I am grateful to him.

JOE's recent diagnosis of incurable leukemia touches all of our lives. It takes a special breed of person to respond with such grace and equanimity.

JOE, I wish you the best. We all wish you the best. Our thoughts and prayers will be with you always.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for bringing this bill before us today. It is but a small recognition of JOE MOAKLEY's dedication to public service and of his great accomplishments for the people of Massachusetts.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me also congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I join my colleagues from the Massachusetts delegation and those Members of the House who have come to the floor today to pay honor and tribute to an outstanding American, a quintessential Irish statesman who I think, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) pointed out, is not only a link to the past but a handshake and a look into his eyes is peering into the future.

I spoke with JOE the other day, and he said with a great deal of pride how he assumed office on the same day that Tip O'Neill was taking John Kennedy's place in the House of Representatives and John Kennedy was going on to the Senate and JOE MOAKLEY was taking Tip O'Neill's place in the great State of Massachusetts Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, JOE MOAKLEY simply embodies everything that is rich about public service and public life. I commend the delegation for its salute and tribute to Congressman MOAKLEY.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my most admired colleagues in the House of Representatives, Congressman JOE MOAKLEY of Massachusetts who today is the subject of legislation before this body, that has been written in his honor.

JOE MOAKLEY is the quintessential Boston Irish public servant. For more than 50 years he has served his Nation, his State of Massachusetts, and the hard-working men and women of South Boston in one form or another. In the long, and inspiring tradition of such great men as former Speaker Tip O'Neill, JOE has been the kind of Representative that has shown time and time again that he is a leader on the national and international stage, yet has remained ever loyal to the people of South Boston and all of Massachusetts.

When I first arrived here as a freshman Member in 1999, JOE MOAKLEY, who was then and now Dean of the New England House delegation, was one of those remarkable people I looked to as a model of how I wanted to conduct myself as a Member of Congress. With character, dignity, devotion, and loyalty, Congressman MOAKLEY continues to serve as constant reminder that we are indeed part of a noble profession.

JOE MOAKLEY's remarkable time in public service began when he was a mere 15 years old, when he enlisted in the U.S. Navy for service in the South Pacific during the Second World War. After graduating from college in Florida, and law school, JOE MOAKLEY ran for the Massachusetts State Legislature in 1952 where he served until 1960. And in 1964, he ws elected to the Massachusetts State Senate where he served until 1970. It was in 1972, after briefly serving on the Boston City Council, that he was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the 9th District.

It was not long after he began his second term that he gained a seat on the House Rules Committee, where still serves today as ranking member. In 1989, he was made chairman of that committee. As chairman, he conducted himself with his characteristic sense of integrity and humor.

Through all his years of service which he continues today, he has worked tirelessly for his district, giving them the same full measure of devotion that he gave to other matters, such as human rights abuses in Central America, which he helped investigate and report on. His actions helped expose injustice, and likely contributed to the end of a brutal civil war in El Salvador.

I have always believed that the measure of a person's life is not contained merely in the years they spend in office, but rather in how their actions in office continue to positively affect the neighborhoods, district, and people they served, long after their time in service has drawn to a close. If a person's actions have improved the life of even one person, or one family, or one community, then there is no end or limit to what their service has meant to others. And for JOE MOAKLEY, there is no end in sight.

No matter how long I spend as a Member of this body, I am now, and will always be, proud to say that I served with JOE MOAKLEY.

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

We are waiting for a couple of other speakers, but I want to take this opportunity to say something that is important to say. I am a former staffer of JOE MOAKLEY. I am one of the few people who ever left his staff. Most of the people who have worked for him have worked for him for many years, and they have done so because they admire him and respect what he stands for. But members of the staff who are in Massachusetts, those who are here in Washington, those on the Committee on Rules, do not have the opportunity to come up before the mike and to say anything, and I want to say a few words on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, if they were able to speak here today, they would express their incredible gratitude to JOE, not only for what he stands for, but for his friendship and for his support over the many years. People who work for him and people who deal with him, it is not just people who work for him directly, people who are part of the staff, people in the House dining room, the credit union, all love him because he has a way of connecting with people. He has a way of expressing humor that endears himself to these people.

I want to say on behalf of his staff how grateful we all are to everybody who has spoken here today and who has offered tributes. It means an awful lot to all of us because we feel that we are part of his family as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking the time to honor our dear friend, JOE MOAKLEY.

I think above all, JOE communicates. The dedication of this Post Office to him fits his ability to communicate with people, whether it is a funny story, in which there are endless numbers, and they just kind of flow out of JOE, or whether it is something as serious as dealing for justice for the people of Central America to which he and the gentleman from Massachusetts played such an important role. I consider JOE not only a friend but a mentor. We served together on the Committee on Rules for 14 years. He was always insightful. He was always there to break the tension with a great joke. He is a person that knows how to seize the moment and make the most of it politically. I will miss him when he leaves this institution. I understand that he will not be seeking reelection. In my estimation, he is one of the finest people that has ever served in this body.

I want to say something about Central America because a lot of people don't recall JOE's activity there because they were not here. There has been such large turnover since the late 1980s. The death squads in El Salvador, as the PBS special that recently played across the country showed, it was JOE MOAKLEY's persistence and courage that changed the complexion of life in that country and for many Central Americans. He had great courage in standing up for them. He is a man that I have great admiration for, and it is only fitting that we name this Post Office after him, but that we pay tribute to his great service.

Mr. Speaker, he was there for me in every battle that I ever had in this institution, in my leadership battles, in my battles with respect to putting together an organization that would get the votes on the House floor, he is a wonderful human being.

JOE, thank you for all of your great service. There will be service ahead for you here and we want you to know that we love you. We stand by you and that you are the best. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield another 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for purposes of control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control an additional 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure to name the courthouse in Boston the Joe Moakley Courthouse. JOE has been a great friend to all of us. He has been a great strong right arm of this caucus and this House. He has played a pivotal role in the leadership of this House in many, many different ways: as a member of the Committee on Rules, as the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, a member of our leadership organization, as a member of our ranking Members' organization. We admire tremendously the service that he has brought.

What really sets JOE MOAKLEY apart is his relationship with his constituents. We all know that he has all of these wonderful roles, dean of the delegation for Massachusetts, ranking member on the Committee on Rules, a leader in the House in so many ways. He has done so much in Central America. He has done so much with many of his constituents in many, many ways. But I think that above all else is his humanity, his humanness, his relationship with each of us individually and collectively. He is to me the embodiment of public service. At his press conference where he announced his retirement, JOE said the people I represent are more than constituents, they are family. That is the way JOE MOAKLEY treated everyone. He treated everyone he met, his constituents, even total strangers as part of his family.

□ 1145

He was always funny, he was always friendly, he was always warm, he was always loving of other people. And he always will be. I think, more than anything that we can say about JOE MOAKLEY today, we can see that he has embodied in everything that he has done the humankindness and love that all of us should like to represent.

We love you, JOE, and we look forward to working with you in the days ahead in this Congress to make things better for the people of America and the people of Massachusetts.

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

I want to thank our leader the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for his remarks. He mentioned JOE's humanity. I think all of us agree with him when he says that Joe treated us all like family, and he treated us all with an incredible amount of respect. JOE MOAKLEY is probably the most genuine person that any of us know. There is not a phony bone in his body. That is why people love him so much, because when he speaks to you and even when he disagrees with you, it is from his heart. It is because of what he believes. I very much treasure that trait in him and very much value his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for all of his cooperation and for all of his generosity with the time. I want to thank on behalf of all the Massachusetts delegation and the people of Massachusetts everybody who has spoken here today. Words cannot express adequately how much it means to all of us that you have come here today to express your support and your friendship and your love for JOE MOAKLEY.

I want to thank all my colleagues for getting behind this initiative. This is the right thing to do. JOE MOAKLEY is going to be with us for the next couple of years, and we are going to be able to continue to enjoy his humor and to watch him in action. But I think this is the appropriate way to say to JOE, ''thank you.'' It does not do justice to all that we should do to thank him, but this is a small gesture of our affection.

As I said at the end of my remarks when I opened up here, I will say it again, JOE, we all love you a lot.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 559.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, many Members have come over to the floor today, Members that know JOE MOAKLEY far better than I, and have shared their personal stories of his dedication and his compassion, his fierce competitiveness, his desire to be a good Democrat and serve well the constituents of South Boston and a lot of stories about his wit.

I can only tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as a House we are united in our desire to honor our longtime colleague; and there is no honor more fitting than what we plan to do today and that is to name the United States courthouse in Boston after one of Boston's sons, JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding time and say to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) what a wonderful tribute he has organized on behalf of a wonderful man that I know all of our colleagues are distressed to learn is facing the fight of his life but someone whom we all know could face that fight like no other in this House, with charm and dignity and sense of importance in life and humor that none of us, I do not think, could have if we were in his shoes right now facing what he is facing.

I just want to close by saying I cannot think of anybody, and I know my father feels the same way, that would better have his name on really now a landmark in Boston like the Federal courthouse than JOE MOAKLEY. I think what a tribute it will be to have that beautiful courthouse which he was such a major part in bringing about bear his name right next to the bridge that bears the name of his late wife.

All of Boston and all of Massachusetts and all of New England and all of this country and all over the world for the people that JOE MOAKLEY has stood for, this is a great tribute to him. I ask my colleagues to join me in urging passage of the Joe Moakley Federal Courthouse Building.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation as a tribute to a great American and outstanding Congressman, JOE MOAKLEY.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I have the privilege of working closely with JOE. Serving on the Rules Committee is often a thankless job. It requires late hours and uncertain schedules. For the ranking Democrat, that job is even more difficult. Yet JOE approaches his task with dedication and never-ending energy.

I can remember waiting around for many light-night sessions when we were entertained by his stories. Even under the most difficult circumstances, JOE never lost his wit and sense of humor.

JOE represents the best of Democratic ideals of compassion and justice. He has championed the rights of the poor, the neglected, and oppressed, not only in this country but throughout the hemisphere.

He has served his Boston constituents with honor and dignity. He has skillfully used his position to bring Federal Government services to his community. He is the best that government has to offer.

It is highly appropriate to name a Federal courthouse after JOE. A courthouse is where citizens seek justice from their government. That is JOE's legacy.

When JOE MOAKLEY was diagnosed with leukemia, his doctor recommended that he consider retiring from Congress and doing what he wants to do. JOE replied that serving in Congress is what he wants to do. That's JOE MOAKLEY—serving others rather than thinking of himself.

There is no way our Nation can fully thank JOE for his service, but this is a fitting attempt.

I have enjoyed my service with JOE over the years and I will treasure the remaining time in the 107th Congress.

Good luck, JOE.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 559, a bill to designate the Federal Courthouse in Boston in honor of Congressman JOE MOAKLEY. It is with great respect that we honor one of Congress' most prolific workers and dedicated Members with this designation.

JOE MOAKLEY is a true Bostonian. He was born in Boston on April 27, 1927. He attended local schools, and at the young age of 15 joined the U.S. Navy, serving in the South Pacific during World War II. After the war, JOE attended the University of Miami. Upon his return to Boston he attended Suffolk University Law School and received his law degree in 1956.

In 1952, at the age of 25, JOE was elected to the Massachusetts legislature. From 1952 until 1960 he served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and from 1962 until 1970, he served in the Massachusetts Senate. He specialized in urban affairs and environmental legislation.

In 1971, topping the ticket with a record-breaking vote in both the primary and general elections, JOE MOAKLEY won a seat on the Boston City Council. Just 2 years later he was elected to represent the Ninth Congressional District. After his first term he was appointed to a seat on the House Rules Committee—a seat previously held by former Speaker Tip O'Neill, Jr., his close friend and mentor.

In June 1989, Congressman MOAKLEY was appointed chairman of the House Rules Committee, which controls the flow of legislation and set terms for floor debate. In 1995, Mr. MOAKLEY became the committee's ranking member.

All of us will be known for our legislative achievements but few will be remembered for their broad concern for humanity. For JOE MOAKLEY, it is one of the ways in which he distinguishes himself. In 1989, JOE embarked on his most ambitious mission concerning abuses of human rights. His outrage at the blatant murder of six Jesuits, their housekeeper and her daughter in 1989 in El Salvador propelled him into a national investigation that culminated in the Moakley report. This searing document revealed the involvement of several high-ranking Salvadoran military officials in the murders. The findings in this report resulted in the termination of United States military aid to El Salvador. It also led to his concern with the School of Americas. More importantly, the people of the small village of Santa Marta had their sense of justice and fairness renewed and refreshed by the diligence and hard work of JOE MOAKLEY.

Although JOE's concern for abuses of human rights brought him international attention, he proudly remained a ''bread and butter'' and ''nuts and bolts'' politician—caring and concentrating on the people of the Ninth Congressional District in his beloved Boston. His efforts resulted in securing funds for, among other things, the dredging of Boston Harbor, renovation of the World Trade Center, bridges for access to the Boston waterfront, the Juvenile Justice Center at Suffolk University, Boston Public Library, and economic development in the Miles Standish Industrial Park in Taunton.

His constituents benefited from his dedication to environmental protection. He was instrumental in establishing the Boston Harbor Islands National Park, and as previously mentioned, he secured funds to clean up Boston Harbor. He did not forget historic preservation—Faneuiel Hall, The African Meeting House, the Old South Church, the Freedom Trail, the U.S.S. *Constitution*, and the Boston Customs House all received necessary funding to preserve these American treasures.

During his career, over 5,100 congressional actions bear the name JOE MOAKLEY. His interests include support for the Olympics, regulatory review, Medicare, human rights, civil rights, violence, police protection, education, environmental protections, energy assistance programs for the poor and elderly, landmark legislation designating arson as a major crime, merchant marines issues, and international affairs. JOE MOAKLEY has received numerous awards and honors including an honorary doctorate from Suffolk University, and an honorary doctorate from Northeastern University in political science.

Of course, no picture of JOE MOAKLEY would be complete without mentioning his boundless Irish wit, his legendary expertise at telling a story, his unfailing courtesy, kindness, and immense generosity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with an Irish blessing for our esteemed colleague JOE MOAKLEY:

May the friendships you make,
Be those which endure,
And all of your grey clouds
Be small ones for sure.
And trusting in Him
To whom we all pray,
May a song fill your heart,
Every step of the way.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I support H.R. 559 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, JOE MOAKLEY is a great American. At the age of 25 his political career began with a seat on the Massachusetts State Legislature. This was just the beginning of a long and active political career, serving on both the Massachusetts State House of Representatives and the Massachusetts State Senate. JOE MOAKLEY started his service to the Ninth District of Massachusetts in 1972. His long record of service to the Democratic Party was rewarded when he was appointed chairman of the Rules Committee in June 1989. JOE MOAKLEY has shown his continued dedication through his service as ranking member on the Rules Committee since 1994.

JOE MOAKLEY is a very dedicated man who deserves the honor designating the John Joseph Moakley Courthouse in Boston, MA. I supported a bill proposing this honor for JOE MOAKLEY in the 106th Congress and am pleased to support this bill again.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with JOE, and his presence in the U.S. Congress will be sorely missed. I will always consider JOE as my friend.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 559, a bill to designate the new Federal courthouse in Boston as the John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, our friend and colleague JOE MOAKLEY has been an outstanding Member of this House working tirelessly for the people of his district and our Nation. Like his friend and our former Speaker Tip O'Neil, JOE has never forgotten where he came from and has never forgotten that ''all politics is local.''

The people of JOE's district have benefited greatly by his leadership in the Hosue—and hundreds of millions of tax dollars have been returned to JOE's district and State to improve major infrastructure and other public projects.

Projects include the dredging the Boston Harbor, the reconstruction of the Barnes Building—the last major operating military facility in Boston, the South Boston Piers Transit Way, the modernization and expansion of the Boston transit system, the renovation and modernization of South Station and Logan Airport—and the list goes on.

I have enjoyed working with JOE on human rights issues. JOE's dedication to fairness and justice was demonstrated in his leadership in bringing to justice the ruthless murderers of six Jesuit priests and their housekeeper in El Salvador in 1989.

JOE's ability to work with other Members and his ability to get things done helped him lead the Rules Committee for 6 years. JOE's humor and unfailing courtesy have set a high standard for all of us to follow in the House.

It is most fitting and proper that we honor JOE MOAKLEY by designating the new Federal courthouse in Boston as the John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 559, designating the John Joseph Moakley Courthouse.

My colleague from Massachusetts is a legislator's legislator, fighting for the people of his district. He has lived by Tip O'Neill's adage that all politics is local, and under his leadership, Massachusetts has benefitted, as he has carried bills promoting high tech businesses, creating jobs, and developing the local economy.

It is therefore fitting that a courthouse in his district bear the name the John Joseph Moakley Courthouse.

He is a remarkable man. Serving our nation in World War II, going to college and then earning his law degree at night, serving in the Massachusetts State Legislature and the Boston City Council, and finally being elected to the U.S. Congress. He has filled big shoes, serving on the Rules Committee in the seat previously held by former Speaker Tip O'Neill, Jr., ascending to its chairmanship when Democrats held the majority, and ranking member in the minority.

He has a strong commitment to human rights, a passion for gentle debate, a keen sense of humor, and the ability to resolve difficult disputes.

I can think of no better or more fitting tribute to a man who has devoted his career to promoting the rule of law for our nation and his constituents.

I wish him my prayers and good thoughts in fighting his recently diagnosed leukemia, and I wish him God's blessings and the strength that comes from faith.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the many accomplishments of my friend, Mr. JOE MOAKLEY of Massachusetts. I stand before you to commend a man who embodies infinite courage and legendary patriotism. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the dedicated service of Congressman JOE MOAKLEY.

Bound by a sense of service to country, JOE lied about his young age to enlist in the U.S. Navy. Risking his life to defend our country during World War II only marked the beginning of his career in public service. JOE rose through the ranks of local government and was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972. It has been my distinct honor to work with him the past 22 years, and in that time I have come to recognize him, as have many others, as a man driven by principal and conviction.

During his tenure in the House, JOE has become a renegade for human rights. His desire to find answers to the brutal murders of innocent civilians in El Salvador led a divided country to an eventual peace agreement in 1992. His leadership, his passion and his dedication to civic justice will truly be remembered.

Most significantly, I have admired JOE for his tireless commitment to the people of the Ninth District of Massachusetts. JOE is a member of this body who will truly be missed. While this tribute cannot begin to communicate his greatness as a leader and friend, I can say that this body has been made better by his presence and will be lesser in his absence. Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join with me today in celebrating the accomplishments of Congressman JOE MOAKLEY.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 13, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 524) to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to successfully integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices, and to authorize the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assess critical enterprise integration standards and implementation activities for major manufacturing industries and to develop a plan for enterprise integration for each major manufacturing industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 524

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 ''Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act of 2001''.

TITLE I—ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Commercial transactions on the Internet, whether retail business-to-customer or business-to-business, are commonly called electronic commerce.

(2) In the United States, business-to-business transactions between small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses and their suppliers is rapidly growing, as many of these businesses begin to use Internet connections for supply-chain management, after-sales support, and payments.

(3) Small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses play a critical role in the United States economy.

(4) Electronic commerce can help small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses develop new products and markets, interact more quickly and efficiently with suppliers and customers, and improve productivity by increasing efficiency and reducing transaction costs and paperwork. Small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses who fully exploit the potential of electronic commerce activities can use it to interact with customers, suppliers, and the public, and for external support functions such as personnel services and employee training.

(5) The National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership program has a successful record of assisting small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses. In addition, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, working with the Small Business Administration, successfully assisted United States small enterprises in remediating their Y2K computer problems.

(6) A critical element of electronic commerce is the ability of different electronic commerce systems to exchange information. The continued growth of electronic commerce will be enhanced by the development of private voluntary interoperability standards and testbeds to ensure the compatibility of different systems.

SEC. 102. REPORT ON THE UTILIZATION OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) ADVISORY PANEL.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (in this title referred to as the ''Director'') shall establish an Advisory Panel to report on the challenges facing small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses in integrating and utilizing electronic commerce technologies and business practices. The Advisory Panel shall be comprised of representatives of the Technology Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership program established under sections 25 and 26 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k and 278l), the Small Business Administration, and other relevant parties as identified by the Director.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Advisory Panel shall report to the Director and to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the immediate requirements of small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices. The report shall—

(1) describe the current utilization of electronic commerce practices by small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses, detailing the different levels between business-to-retail customer and business-to-business transactions;

(2) describe and assess the utilization and need for encryption and electronic authentication components and electronically stored data security in electronic commerce for small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses;

(3) identify the impact and problems of interoperability to electronic commerce, and include an economic assessment; and

(4) include a preliminary assessment of the appropriate role of, and recommendations for, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices.

(c) FINAL REPORT.—Within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Advisory Panel shall report to the Director and to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a 3-year assessment of the needs of small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices. The report shall include—

(1) a 3-year planning document for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program in the field of electronic commerce; and

(2) recommendations, if necessary, for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to address interoperability issues in the field of electronic commerce.

SEC. 103. ELECTRONIC COMMERCE PILOT PROGRAM.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology's Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, in consultation with the Small Business Administration, shall establish a pilot program to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses in integrating and utilizing electronic commerce technologies and business practices. The goal of the pilot program shall be to provide small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses with the information they need to make informed decisions in utilizing electronic commerce-related goods and services. Such program shall be implemented through a competitive grants program for existing Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology established under section 25 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k). In carrying out this section, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program shall consult with the Advisory Panel and utilize the Advisory Panel's reports.

TITLE II—ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION

SEC. 201. ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION ASSESSMENT AND PLAN.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Director shall work to identify critical enterprise integration standards and implementation activities for major manufacturing industries underway in the United States. For each major manufacturing industry, the Director shall work with industry representatives and organizations currently engaged in enterprise integration activities and other appropriate representatives as necessary. They shall assess the current state of enterprise integration within the industry, identify the remaining steps in achieving enterprise integration, and work toward agreement on the roles of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and of the private sector in that process. Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall report to the Congress on these matters and on anticipated related National Institute of Standards and Technology activities for the then current fiscal year.

(b) PLANS AND REPORTS.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Congress a plan for enterprise integration for each major manufacturing industry, including milestones for the National Institute of Standards and Technology portion of the plan, the dates of likely achievement of those milestones, and anticipated costs to the Government and industry by fiscal year. Updates of the plans and a progress report for the past year shall be submitted annually until for a given industry, in the opinion of the Director, enterprise integration has been achieved.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(2) the term ''enterprise integration'' means the electronic linkage of manufacturers, assemblers, and suppliers to enable the electronic exchange of product, manufacturing, and other business data among all businesses in a product supply chain, and such term includes related application protocols and other related standards; and

(3) the term ''major manufacturing industry'' includes the aerospace, automotive, electronics, shipbuilding, construction, home building, furniture, textile, and apparel industries and such other industries as the Director designates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 524.

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

There was no objection.

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

During a busy day, most Americans probably do not stop to think about the impact small manufacturing has on all of our lives. In fact, most Americans would be surprised to learn that it is all but impossible to get through a day without using and benefiting from the many products created by our Nation's small manufacturers. Everything from the alarm clock ringing in the morning, to the clothes we wear, to the communications equipment C–SPAN uses to broadcast these House proceedings live can be attributed in part to small manufacturing.

It is not surprising, then, that small manufacturers contribute so greatly to our Nation's economic growth and prosperity. Small manufacturers employ over 12 million Americans, translating to nearly 1 in 10 workers nationwide. It is estimated that a manufacturing sale of $1 results in an increase of total output in the economy of $2.30. As they seek to remain a driving force in our Nation's economy, one of the greatest challenges facing small manufacturers in the coming decade will be the need to implement successful e-commerce business strategies allowing them to better compete in the burgeoning information age.

It is estimated that sales in electronic commerce alone will reach nearly $3.2 trillion by the year 2003. Small manufacturers who successfully embrace new technology and all its benefits will be able to capitalize on the growing trend in online sales and have the potential to increase both their productivity and revenues. Beyond online sales, e-commerce can help small manufacturers develop new products and markets while at the same time allowing them to interact more quickly and efficiently with their suppliers and customers.

I am pleased to join the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 524, the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act. H.R. 524 will allow the director of the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, which we all know as NIST, to establish an advisory panel comprised of both government and private sector representatives that will provide Congress with a comprehensive report detailing the challenges facing small manufacturers in integrating and utilizing electronic commerce technologies.

The report will also require a 3-year blueprint for NIST's Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, or MEP, in the area of electronic commerce. MEP, with over 400 centers in all 50 States, has been a valuable technology transfer resource for many small manufacturers nationwide. By establishing a 3-year plan, we will have a better idea of how NIST MEP can be most useful in helping small manufacturers overcome the barriers they face in the electronic world.

Finally, H.R. 524 establishes a limited e-commerce pilot program administered through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, in conjunction with the Small Business Administration, aimed at assisting small manufacturers to integrate e-commerce business strategies. Last Congress, the House passed legislation mirroring H.R. 524 by voice vote. Unfortunately, Congress adjourned before the Senate could act on the measure. I am hopeful we will be able to get the bill signed into law this year. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act of 2001.

Let me close my formal remarks by commending my colleague, good friend, and partner, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), for his tenaciousness, for his innovativeness and for the hard work that has produced this product.

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I too want to commend my very good friend and distinguished colleague in his, I believe, maiden remarks on the floor here as the new full Committee on Science chairman.

I want to express my gratitude to both the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for their spirit of bipartisanship which is a continuation of the good working relationship which our committee enjoyed in the last several sessions but certainly bodes well in this new session.

Certainly the fact is not lost that the first action in this new session of the committee is reporting a Democratic bill. For that I am very grateful. I want to say how much I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman from New York and continuing that great spirit of bipartisanship which the Committee on Science has been so well renowned for and to say how delighted we are that he will be leading our full committee efforts here in committee and on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 524, the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act. H.R. 524 represents a bipartisan effort to assist small and medium-sized enterprises to bringing their businesses online. H.R. 524 is the same text as H.R. 4429 which was reported by the Committee on Science and passed by the House in the 106th Congress.

The bill before us today reflects again a bipartisan consensus. I, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), along with other Members, decided to reintroduce this legislation because of the challenges small and medium-sized businesses face in implementing the electronic commerce activities. As large corporations move their business transactions online, small companies in the supply chain must go online as well. However, many of these small companies lack the information they need to make informed decisions on choosing e-commerce products and services. The Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act addresses this problem.

First, H.R. 524 establishes an advisory panel to assess the e-commerce needs of small businesses. This advisory panel should represent an equal partnership between industry, government, and other affected groups. The Manufacturing Extension Partnership, working with the advisory panel, will establish a pilot program at MEP centers to provide small businesses with the information they need to make informed, intelligent purchases of e-commerce products and services.

□ 1200

This bill also addresses the issue of interoperability in the manufacturing supply chain. Adoption of e-commerce practices within a supply chain can be hindered by the lack of interoperability of software, hardware, and networks in exchanging product data and other key business information.

For example, a recent study indicated losses of $1 billion in terms of productivity due to interoperability problems in the automotive supply chain. Other industries with complex manufacturing requirements could be expected to suffer similar losses.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, has supported the first phase of an automotive supply chain interoperability study in my home State of Michigan. This program was highly successful and strongly supported by industry. H.R. 524 builds upon this preliminary effort. NIST would perform an assessment to identify critical enterprise integration standards and implementation activities and report back to Congress.

I want to thank also the gentlewoman from Maryland (Chairwoman MORELLA) for working with me on this legislation in the last Congress and also want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor in the 106th Congress as well.

Of course, I want to thank our new Committee on Science chairman, as I just mentioned, the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman EHLERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for cosponsoring this legislation and supporting bringing it to the floor so expeditiously. I hope this represents the first of many bipartisan Committee on Science bills that we will bring to the floor of the 107th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing extension partnership has a proven track record of helping thousands of small businesses across the country. The National Institute of Standards and Technology has continually worked in partnership with the private sector to make advancements that benefit countless American businesses.

In closing, I believe this bill represents sound and reasonable policy that builds upon the impressive history of these Federal agencies. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) to the ranking member position on the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards; and I look forward to working with him. We have been friends for many years, first in the Michigan House, then the Michigan Senate, and now in the Congress, and especially on this particular subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 524, the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act of 2001. Small manufacturers play a vital role in our society. Each and every day we all rely on

the many goods they produce to help sustain and improve our lives. Small manufacturers are an integral part of our communities, employing hundreds of our friends and neighbors and acting as anchors that help to foster growth and prosperity in many small towns across our Nation. In our inner cities, it is often small manufacturers that have helped to spur urban renewal and act as the industrial foundation in our metropolitan areas.

Recently I visited a factory in my district. It is a classic example of what I just described here. A gentleman purchased a faltering plant which was on the verge of bankruptcy. It had 50 employees. He reinvigorated it; and through good management and advanced techniques of manufacturing, including communication, he became a supplier of parts for the Chrysler Corporation, now the Daimler Chrysler Corporation. At the time I visited, he had 250 employees and he said he had work for 500, if he could only find qualified individuals to work there.

He also showed me a machine that was producing parts for the Chrysler minivan. He had produced 2 million of those parts for the Chrysler Corporation, without one single rejection by them for defects. He was very proud of his record. That is the type of thing small manufacturers do so well.

The future success and growth of many small manufacturers such as that will increasingly rely on their ability to adapt to the ever-changing electronic business environment. In a recent survey, nearly 80 percent of small manufacturers reported having a Web page, which is good; but only 25 percent indicated they used the Internet for direct sales. This means that most small manufacturers are missing out on an estimated $3.2 trillion in e-commerce sales over the next 2 years. They are also missing out on the opportunity the Internet offers to spur new product development and markets while at the same time streamlining and improving their daily business operations.

There are many obstacles preventing small manufacturing from fully engaging in the new electronic-driven business environment. Costs associated with integrating even the most basic e-commerce initiatives, coupled with the uncertainty and the fast-paced changes in technology, often hinder small manufacturers' attempts to venture into the electronic world.

Just as an example, encryption is a very important part of business commerce. Very few small manufacturers have the expertise to deal with encryption problems and ensure the security, privacy, and integrity of their transmissions.

In addition to that, we need standardization of protocols between large manufacturers and their suppliers. We have to have enterprise integration and interoperability. If the smaller manufacturers are going to be able to communicate with the large number of manufacturers that they supply, they should not have to be required to put in different systems for every manufacturer they deal with.

In addition to this, a lack of qualified trained technology workers in the marketplace today makes it difficult to successfully integrate technology into the workplace in a meaningful way. Over half the small manufacturers surveyed revealed that human resource shortages were a major problem when trying to implement their e-commerce plans.

I would add parenthetically here that I have introduced legislation to improve K–12 math-science education, which would go a long way toward solving the problems that are indicated in the previous paragraph and that I also mentioned earlier for the manufacturer in my district who could not find the employees he needed.

H.R. 524 is an important piece of legislation because it will help us get a better picture of all of the barriers preventing small manufacturers from successfully implementing electronic commerce strategies by having both government and private-sector representatives take a closer look at the problem.

In addition, the limited pilot program created by H.R. 524 will tell us what is and what is not working in the workplace. NIST's Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, or MEP, working in conjunction with the Small Business Administration, is uniquely suited to assist small manufacturers in this endeavor. The hundreds of MEP centers all across the country have a proven track record in effectively providing small manufacturers with the advice and expertise they need in order to succeed.

I am pleased to join the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), as an original cosponsor of H.R. 524.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act of 2001.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Electronic Commerce Enhancement Act of 2001, a bill that recognizes the importance of the Internet and e-commerce to our economy. This bill also recognizes the importance of business-to-business transactions by small- to medium-sized businesses via the Internet. As technology continues to grow, unfortunately, many small- to medium-sized companies have not been able to utilize the potential of the Internet as a business tool. In order to help these companies contribute to economic growth, this bill assists in developing tools to alleviate the problems of interoperability.

H.R. 524 will help promote electronic commerce in these small- to medium-sized companies by identifying the challenges that they face and establishing programs to assist them in overcoming these obstacles. These programs include the electronic linkage of manufacturers, assemblers, and suppliers that will enable them to exchange product, manufacturing and other business data within the supply chain. By allowing the National Institute of Standards and Technology technology to assist small- and medium-sized businesses to successfully integrate electronic commerce, Congress will promote effective standards for helping these businesses prosper in our economy.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for their work in recognizing the importance of small businesses, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his work in passing this bill in the 106th Congress, and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his new leadership on the Committee on Science and on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the senior member of the committee.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly want to thank him as chairman of the Committee on Science for bringing this issue to the floor and for his strong support of it.

Obviously, the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Technology for the last years, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), who introduced this legislation, I wanted to commend him and indicate my very strong support for it.

Introduction of this bill represents a very strong bipartisan effort to assist small- and medium-sized businesses as they move their operations into an e-commerce environment.

Enacted, this legislation will also improve the interoperability of the electronic transfer of technical information in the manufacturing supply chain. The lack of interoperability between software, hardware, and networks in exchanging product data and other key business information obviously is hurting U.S. productivity.

The costs of this barrier are enormous. According to a study conducted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology of product data exchange in the automotive sector alone, the inability to efficiently exchange product data through the automotive supply chain conservatively costs about $1 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced in the 106th Congress, reported out of the Subcommittee on Technology,

which I chaired and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) was the ranking member, and at that time the bill was then passed unanimously by the House.

The bill would also allow the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with business and industry to develop voluntary standards, standards that will assure that U.S. firms will and can continue to exploit the power of the Internet to collaborate with trading partners and through greater speed and agility to participate in the global markets.

Again, I thank my colleagues for bringing this important issue to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 524.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 524, but I do so with some reservation. I am troubled by the bill on two particular grounds: first, its potential negative impact on e-commerce; and, two, its encroachment on the Committee on Energy and Commerce jurisdiction.

Let me take the negative impact on e-commerce and explain this more fully. H.R. 524 ''authorizes the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assess critical enterprise integration standards and implementation activities for major manufacturing industries and to develop a plan for enterprise integration for each major industry.''

Mr. Speaker, such an authorization seemingly grants an open invitation to a Federal Government entity, NIST, to meddle in voluntary standard-setting activities by private parties relating to business-to-business electronic exchanges.

□ 1215

Such a governmental intervention could harbor substantial negative repercussions for e-commerce. Voluntary standards-setting activities by private, non-governmental parties have been credited with the vibrancy and innovation associated with our e-commerce industry. Industry enterprise integration or business-to-business exchanges are a critical component of our e-commerce sector. Today, transactions on such exchanges represent 85 percent of the total value of e-commerce.

The Federal government injecting itself into a business-to-business exchange standard-setting activities in our view on the Committee on Commerce holds no other promise but to retard dynamic and innovative change synonymous with e-commerce.

Moreover, authorizing such a government intervention sends the wrong signal to our trading partners in Europe. The European Union Commission is favorably inclined to inject itself into private standard-setting activities. This makes for a bad recipe for the future of global e-commerce.

Too, Mr. Speaker, my other concern is with jurisdiction. As the title of H.R. 524 clearly denotes, electronic commerce is the focal point of this legislation. The Committee on Energy and Commerce is the committee of jurisdiction over matters relating to electronic commerce. The committee's jurisdiction over electronic commerce is perfectly clear. E-commerce is a mere subcategory of interstate and foreign commerce and, as such, is undeniably within the purview of the committee's longstanding jurisdiction.

The committee also has repeatedly dealt with e-commerce issues, as exemplified by its leadership role on the following issues: No. 1, encryption; No. 2, electronic authentication of electronic signatures; No. 3, data security; and No. 4, interoperability.

H.R. 524 is within the committee's jurisdiction and should have been referred to it. The time for such a referral may have passed, but I assure the Members that we, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, will vigorously exert our jurisdiction over interstate commerce irrespective of the medium; that is, electronic or mobile.

The committee will carefully monitor NIST standard-setting activities, as outlined in H.R. 524.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to some of the comments made by the gentleman from Florida.

Obviously, in the last session we dealt with this issue and it passed unanimously through the House as far as the jurisdictional issue. I understand that some of the committee jurisdictions are still, as we speak, being delineated and settled.

I understand the gentleman's concern about having NIST establish structures in terms of the interoperability issue, but I want to assure the gentleman from Florida that the automotive industry spoke strongly in favor of this legislation, based on their experience in Michigan that they had with a program called STEP, which, as I mentioned, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership based in Ann Arbor, Michigan, had worked with the automotive industry to put in place.

It has been a very successful program, and the automotive industry, which is greatly impacted by this legislation, was very strongly supportive and worked with our leadership of the subcommittee and the full committee to ensure that we would not be setting precedents or addressing some of the issues, perhaps, that the gentleman has concerns about.

But we will be mindful of that, and hopefully enjoy support on passing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if I could make one last comment about also my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan, and congratulate him on his ascension to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Environment, Technology, and Standards, of which this morning I was selected as the ranking member.

I just want to say, as my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) indicated, we have had the privilege of serving together in the State House in Michigan, the State Senate, and then coming to Congress together.

I want to say that I am delighted to be able to work with someone who has been a long-time friend, and someone who, throughout his tenure both in the Michigan legislature as well as here in Congress, has been recognized as one of certainly the most thoughtful and effective Members of both the State legislature and Congress.

I look forward to working with our new leadership, the new Chair, and of course my long-time friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), of the subcommittee.

I also want to thank our former Chair, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), for her just absolutely great administration of our subcommittee. I think if we looked at the full committee and our subcommittee, we probably would have one of the best track records of bipartisanship in the entire Congress, and certainly all of us on the Democratic side in that subcommittee really appreciated her role, and the fairness and objectivity and spirit of bipartisanship that she carried throughout her tenure as the chair of the subcommittee. Again, I thank the chairman and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 524.

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. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 524 will be followed immediately by a 5-minute vote on the question of passage of H.R. 554, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 6, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Collins
Flake
Hostettler
Paul
Schaffer
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman
Bonilla
Bono
Burton
Capito
Cooksey
Cubin
Davis, Thomas M.
Istook
Lewis (CA)
Mollohan
Ortiz
Putnam
Thornberry
Towns
Watkins
Young (AK)

□ 1242

Mr. SCHAFFER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 14 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

RAIL PASSENGER DISASTER FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of passage of the bill, H.R. 554, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 4, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Ford
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps

Pickering	Schiff	Terry
Pitts	Schrock	Thomas
Platts	Scott	Thompson (CA)
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (MS)
Pomeroy	Serrano	Thune
Portman	Sessions	Thurman
Price (NC)	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Tiberi
Putnam	Shays	Tierney
Quinn	Sherman	Toomey
Radanovich	Sherwood	Traficant
Rahall	Shimkus	Turner
Ramstad	Shows	Udall (CO)
Rangel	Simmons	Udall (NM)
Regula	Simpson	Upton
Rehberg	Sisisky	Velazquez
Reyes	Skeen	Visclosky
Reynolds	Skelton	Vitter
Riley	Smith (MI)	Walden
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Rodriguez	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Roemer	Smith (WA)	Waters
Rogers (KY)	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Rogers (MI)	Solis	Watts (OK)
Rohrabacher	Souder	Waxman
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Weiner
Ross	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Rothman	Stark	Weldon (PA)
Roukema	Stearns	Weller
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Wexler
Rush	Strickland	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Stump	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Wilson
Sabo	Sununu	Wolf
Sanchez	Sweeney	Woolsey
Sanders	Tanner	Wu
Sandlin	Tauscher	Wynn
Saxton	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Scarborough	Taylor (MS)	
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	

NAYS—4

Flake	Schaffer
Paul	Tancredo

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Foley	Royce
Bono	Fossella	Sawyer
Burton	Gilchrest	Slaughter
Capito	Gutierrez	Thornberry
Clyburn	Istook	Towns
Cooksey	Lewis (CA)	Watkins
Cubin	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)
Davis, Thomas M.	Mollohan	
	Ortiz	

□ 1257

Mr. FLAKE and Mr. SCHAFFER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TANCREDO changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 14 and 15 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 14 and ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 15.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 14 and 15, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to attend the recorded votes today, February 14, 2001. I was traveling with President George W. Bush on his visit to my district in West Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both rollcall No. 14 and 15.

AFFECTING REPRESENTATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY MEMBERSHIP OF SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 279) affecting the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Senate Members of the Joint Economic Committee, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, and specifically section 5(a) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1024(a)), the Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate shall for the duration of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, for so long as the majority party and the minority party have equal representation in the Senate, be represented by five Members of the majority party and five Members of the minority party.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM FEBRUARY 14, 2001, TO FEBRUARY 26, 2001, AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2001, OR FEBRUARY 16, 2001, TO FEBRUARY 26, 2001

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 32

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 26, 2001, and that when the House adjourns on Monday, February 26, 2001, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 15, 2001, or Friday, February 16, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon Monday, February 26, 2001, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1300

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, February 26, 2001, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTERNATIONAL BASIC EDUCATION

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues that I, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), will this afternoon be briefly addressing the importance of an issue we care passionately about: children's education, children's basic education, girls' education, and our U.S. international assistance dollars in helping developing countries make schools and educational opportunities available.

Last Congress I had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on International Relations. From that position, I began to focus on identifying which foreign aid dollars could actually make a lasting difference and bring systemic changes in the areas that we are trying to help.

Too often we are just late to the crime scene. Whether it is famine, war,

epidemic, we are just trying to pick up after the catastrophe has already occurred. We need to commit our scarce foreign assistance dollars in ways that help bring lasting improvements, build better opportunities, and prevent these cycles of tragedy.

As I researched the question, I became convinced of the value of one development investment in particular: international basic education. I was intrigued to learn that educating children, particularly making a special effort to get girls into schools, because so often they are not allowed to participate, yields a higher rate of return than virtually any other effort we can make in the international developing world.

The data seemed almost too good to be true. With increased education, women live healthier lives. They marry later, live longer, have fewer children, and their children have vastly superior survival rates. The data compiled by the World Bank and other international organizations report that for every year of education a little girl receives beyond grade four, there is a 10 percent reduction in family size, a 15 percent drop in child malnutrition, a 10 percent reduction in infant mortality, and up to a 20 percent increase in wages and microenterprise development.

The statistics support what economists and development experts already know: educating children, again especially girls, creates a powerful impact, improving the lives of little children, subsequently improving the lives of their families, and improving the lives resulting later in the villages and the entire communities.

After hearing all this, I had a strong desire to actually see some of these schools, see our U.S. assistance dollars in action; and so along with my colleague, the gentleman from Green Bay, Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), we made a bipartisan effort sponsored by some of the NGOs that are implementing these assistance dollars to look firsthand to see how this was working.

Our trip left me with a rock-solid conviction that the data on girls education is correct. In both Ghana and Mali, our taxpayer dollars have made a significant difference in the lives of children and families. And even more effectively than the dollars that are used, we were struck by the deep commitment in terms of USAID officials, the professionals in the NGO community implementing these programs, the families and the personnel from the countries making these little schools run themselves. This is driving systemic change in these areas.

We visited many classrooms, spoke to parents and community leaders and learned firsthand of the changes being made. This picture reflects a meeting with parents we had in a very small rural village. This individual, the village hunter, the one responsible for bagging the game to feed the village, told us that with the children even getting basic primary education, the cotton traders buying their products can no longer cheat them by the scales. They use the children to make certain they get a fair deal. Time and time again we heard of this kind of change.

We heard from parents that now children can help them find when they are buying medicine that has already got expiration dates; they will help them watch for expiration dates on foods and help them write letters; that schools are a safe place for them to be. They no longer have to worry about the children when they go to market.

We heard from the village chief and president of a parents' association tell us that educating a little girl is like lighting a dark room. He said that their school is giving priority to girls' participation in enrollment, making a difference for the first time in bringing girls into primary education and the opportunities that flow from that. The parents told us that once the girls learn to read and write they teach others in the family and they become better mothers. Even in a young teenager's years, they are doing it.

I just want to, in closing, show you one of the little girls participating in one of the schools that we observed. This little girl wants to be a doctor and help others in her community. Her chances without our assistance dollars would be a million to one. But with our assistance dollars, this dream is possible.

We need to continue our commitment in this area, and I am very pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin and others in a bipartisan effort to continue to support this work.

U.S. DOLLARS ARE WORKING IN INTERNATIONAL BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is to build a little bit on some of the comments that we have just heard from my companion and good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

We did travel together for 7 days in Ghana and Mali and did see some very good things and got some great news from a continent that, quite honestly, has seen less of good news and more of sobering news in recent months and years. The purpose of our brief time there was to measure education reform in general in those countries, but also, more importantly, to deal with the issues my good friend has pointed to of the role of girls' education in those countries and the pace of reform in that area.

We looked at a project called SAGE, Strategies for Advancing Girls Education, as it was being implemented in those two countries. That is a partnership involving USAID dollars and the expertise of the Academy for Educational Development and some wonderful other NGOs in the area and, of course, local leaders.

Now, I am quick to admit to my colleagues, as I was to my traveling companions, that I am a skeptic in this area. Twelve years ago, my wife, Sue, and I taught high school in east Africa, and we were very much aware of the institutional and cultural barriers that exist, particularly in the developing world, barriers which all too often prevent girls from going to school and finishing their education. I readily admit today that I came out a true believer, a great believer in the progress that our dollars are making in those countries.

There are so many heroes that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I can point to in these educational reforms. Of course, the local leaders and the parents' groups, who have to embrace these reforms in order for them to have a chance. Also wonderful organizations like Save the Children and OXfam. But in the brief time that I have, I would like to focus in particular on one program, a program involving USAID dollars and the Academy for Educational Development and something called the Life Skills Curriculum in the country of Mali.

Through this wonderful program, educators are able to weave throughout their curriculum valuable life skills, especially in the area of preventable health. My colleague and I watched with great interest as teachers would use lessons on, for example, how to prevent dysentery as part of their instruction on grammar so that these lessons truly were a part of the curriculum at every stage and at every level.

As I said, I was a skeptic. Those of us who have taught in the developing world are often struck by how irrelevant our lessons can often be, especially in countries that have an education system which is a holdover from a colonial power. Where I taught, we had the old English system, the English style, rote learning. But what we are seeing in countries like Mali is a new style of education, a new style that involves practical lessons day in and day out, and involves students talking to each other and building upon their own experience.

My colleagues can see to my left here a picture. This shows a young lady in Ghana. What she is using, because of the shortage of paper, she is using a little chalkboard, a little slate board to help her get through her lessons. That shows some of the material disadvantages that these students often have.

My next chart shows something which may appear very reasonable and normal and everyday to those of us in the West but is a quite remarkable characteristic of reform in education in Mali and Ghana, and that is having breakout groups, where students are no longer stuck in that old rote-learning pattern that is a holdover from the colonial days. Instead, they talk about lessons in a very real way, and they

apply those lessons, especially those life-skills lessons, to their own experience and they use it to learn grammar, they use it to learn math, they use it to learn science. And the beauty of this is, even if these children, Lord forbid, are unable to go on to secondary school, unable to go on to high school, unlikely to go on to college, they will have learned valuable lessons on preventive health care.

We know these lessons will go a long way in preventing some of the great health challenges that we have seen.

□ 1315

It will pay off in the long-run in these countries. It will pay off for America. It is a wonderful thing.

The good news is our dollars are working. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) for the wonderful experience he included for me. It was truly a great experience.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish everyone a happy Valentine's Day.

As we know, this is the day that everyone speaks from the heart. This is a day more flowers, especially roses, are given to loved ones, more chocolate and other boxes of candy are purchased. But I would like to call attention to this heart day and our heart health.

While we celebrate Valentine's Day, let us not forget our heart and the signs it gives off, or in some cases, signs that do not give off that are important.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963, a congressional mandate designated February as American Heart Month. Because Valentine's Day is the day of the heart, it is fitting to raise awareness that heart disease kills nearly one million Americans every year, which is about 41 percent of deaths here in the United States.

Heart disease is the number one killer of Americans. Every 33 seconds an American dies from heart disease, and every 21 seconds someone suffers a heart attack. Due to these statistics, Americans need to become more educated on heart disease risks, prevention, and treatment.

Heart disease is also the number one killer for women. About one in five women have some form of heart disease. Even though surveys show that women view breast cancer as a much greater risk to their health than heart disease, the reality is that a woman's lifetime risk of dying from heart disease is one in two, whereas it is one-in-nine lifetime risk for contracting breast cancer, which is also important to be educated and seek examination.

High cholesterol and hypertension are two of the main causes of heart disease, which is alarming considering the following statistics. Approximately 50 percent of women have cholesterol levels of 200/dL or higher. Seventy-nine percent of black women and 60 percent of Caucasians over the age of 45 were classified as having hypertension.

Further, women often experience other AIDS-related diseases, such as arthritis and osteoporosis that can mask heart disease symptoms and delay the seeking of necessary medical care.

There are also critical preventive measures that include tobacco-use cessation, regular exercise, reduced daily alcohol intake, and controlled blood pressure that women should know of and take to try to avoid this fatal disease.

While heart disease is also the number one killer in my State of California, the good news is that heart disease in California is less than the national average. We must ensure that fighting this disease is on the forefront of our agenda.

In addition to having annual checkups, screening and participating in regular exercise, it is important to be aware of the heart attack symptoms, which include uncomfortable pressure, fullness, squeezing or pain in the center of the chest lasting more than a few minutes; pain spreading to the shoulders, neck and arms; chest discomfort with light-headedness, fainting, sweating, nausea or shortness of breath; atypical chest pain, stomach or abdominal pain, nausea, or dizziness.

Women typically do not have the crushing chest pain, which is considered a classic symptom. As a result, women's symptoms can be overlooked until it is too late.

Heart disease is a critical health issue. Both men and women need to understand how they can prevent and detect heart disease. Both men and women need to become aware of heart attack symptoms and what to do if they experience any of these symptoms. We need a national effort to raise awareness of this disease.

Perhaps most of all, as the new co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I urge all of my colleagues to please make sure they understand the facts and that they, their mothers, sisters, brothers, uncles, daughters all get screened on an annual basis.

So, happy Valentine's Day, Mr. Speaker; and let us not forget the heart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ELECTION REFORM

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here on the floor of the House this afternoon submitting this special order on election reform.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address an issue that has been prominent in the minds of many Americans over the past few months but has been on my mind since 1993.

Twenty election reform proposals have been introduced in the House of Representatives since the opening of the 107th Congress. I applaud the thoughtful and expedient response of my colleagues as I myself am soon to unveil my own proposal for strengthening America's voting system and have, in fact, organized my first town hall meeting during the President's Day recess on this specific issue.

When I was elected Secretary of State for the great State of Rhode Island, it had the oldest voting equipment in the entire Nation. Beginning in 1993, as a State representative and then as Secretary of State, I worked with my colleagues in the legislature, the State Board of Elections, local canvassing authorities, and the public to investigate voting problems throughout the State and develop effective solutions.

By May of 1994, our Commission reported the need to replace our antiquated Shoup lever voting machines with optical scanning equipment. Because it is cost effective, it would help increase voter participation.

By the end of 1996, the procurement process had begun; and by September 1997 primary local elections, the optical scan equipment was firmly in place. In both 1998 and 2000 elections, these machines were in full operation throughout the State of Rhode Island.

Implementation of the new optical scan equipment was cost effective because it was cost neutral. Rhode Island's revenue neutral laws ensured that the expenses for staffing, storage, and transportation of voting equipment and printing and mailing ballots all equal the cost of establishing this new system. We also met our goal of increasing voter participation by increasing the number of registered voters by nearly 60,000 from 1993 to the year 2000.

Finally, ensuring timely accuracy in tabulating votes was also a top priority. Because the optical scan machines read voting ballots by sensing the mark within a defined period indicating the vote, this method ensures the clear intent of the voter is transmitted and tabulated.

This system also provides an audit trail for each ballot and enabled the use of ballots printed in multiple languages. However, since the machines were not accessible to blind or sight-impaired voters, I also introduced the Braille and Tactile ballot initiative to ensure that those who have lost their sight or are sight-impaired maintain their right to vote independently.

As Congress works with the President to explore ways to modernize the machinery of voting, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in applying proven success stories such as what we have done in Rhode Island.

Models exist for accurate, efficient, and cost-effective election reform, which we should utilize in our efforts to ensure true democracy in America. Our voters deserve no less.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S TAX CUT PLAN

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, as someone who campaigned on the platform of providing tax relief for working American families, I am particularly proud today to announce my support for President Bush's plan to lower income tax rates across the board and to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I would like to address two issues today: number one, why I am supporting this plan; and, number two, what our opponents are saying about this plan and address those issues fairly and squarely.

First, why do I support this plan? Well, I support it because it is going to make a meaningful difference in the lives of so many working families here in the United States.

For example, for a married couple raising two children on a salary of $50,000 combined, they will receive a 50 percent tax cut. That is a savings of $1,600 a year. Now, a savings of $1,600 a year for that family translates into an extra $133 of groceries in their refrigerator every month for those two children that otherwise would not be there.

Now, as someone who himself grew up in relatively humble circumstances, raised by a single mom on a salary of a secretary with three children, I do not have to guess about how much working families and single mothers need tax relief. And that is why I am so enthusiastic in my support of President Bush's tax cut plan.

Now, not everybody agrees with me here. Our opponents have two things they are saying about this bill. And I believe these things are myths. But let us go ahead and address them squarely.

The first thing they say is this tax cut is simply too big, it does not leave enough money to shore up Social Security, Medicare and pay down the debt.

Well, here is the truth: 70 percent of this tax surplus goes to shore up Social Security, provide for prescription drugs, pay down the debt, with only 30 percent being used to return to taxpayers in the form of tax relief, the very folks who are responsible for this tax surplus.

Now, they say we could leave that 30 percent here in Washington, D.C. And I suppose we could. But what would happen? Congress would simply spend that money. Whether it is Republican Congress, Democrat Congress, or alien Congress, that money will be spent. It deserves to be returned to the people who paid these excessive taxes.

The second myth they say is that this is a tax cut just for the rich. Well, let us look at that little myth there. For a secretary making $38,000, a single mom raising three children, she will get a 100 percent tax cut, she will pay no taxes under this plan. For her boss, the lawyer making $100,000 a year with two kids, he will get a 16 percent tax cut. Secretary, 100 percent. Attorney, 16 percent. The low-income Americans are the big winners under this plan.

Now, why is that? Because we take the lowest rate of 15 percent and lower it down to 10 percent and we double the $500 per child tax credit.

Now, with that said, some folks say, well, that is all fine and good for the single moms and folks at the low end of the spectrum, let us just have taxes for the special people, let us not have the taxes for what they call the rich.

Well, once again, all of us pay taxes and all of us are entitled to tax relief. The truth of the matter is that the top 10 percent of wage earners in this country pay 66 percent of the taxes. These are the same people who every year create hundreds of thousands of jobs. Are these folks not entitled to the tax relief? Should we not encourage them to provide additional jobs in this economy?

In summary, this tax relief is desperately needed. It is going to make a meaningful difference in the lives of single moms and working families. A tax cut is not too big and it is not just for the rich.

In closing, let me say this. The leading cause of divorce in the United States today is arguments about money. On this Valentine's Day, we have a happy message of hope for married couples who are struggling to make ends meet: Help is on the way.

TRIBUTE TO MS. IMOGENE MATTHEWS OF GARY, INDIANA

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure that I pay tribute to one of the most caring, dedicated, and selfless citizens in Indiana's First Congressional District, Imogene Matthews of Gary, Indiana.

After serving the constituents of Northwest Indiana in my Gary District Office for the last 10 years, Imogene announced her retirement this past December.

Imogene Vanetta Matthews was born on April 15, 1954, in Gary, Indiana. Imogene, affectionately known as Moby, was the youngest girl of 11 children born to Emmett and Pauline Matthews. A lifetime native of Gary, Indiana, Imogene graduated from West Side High School in 1972.

One need look no further than her career choices after high school to determine what kind of person Imogene is. From her beginnings at the Gary Manpower Administration helping to place young children in day-care centers and homes, to her years of service as executive secretary for Gary Mayor Richard G. Hatcher, to the last person she assisted in her capacity as a Federal caseworker in my office, she has dedicated her life wholly to public service.

I was fortunate enough to have Moby on my staff as a Federal caseworker since 1989. Her commitment to her work and the people of Northwest Indiana eventually earned her a position as my Deputy District Director.

□ 1330

During her tenure in my office, she has worked selflessly to ensure the well-being of all those around her. Her exceptional knowledge and expertise in dealing with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Social Security Administration are unparalleled. While serving on my staff, she reunited dozens of families, helping loved ones attain the privilege of U.S. citizenship and aiding those already in the U.S. by acquiring the passports and visas they needed to visit their relatives abroad.

You only needed one meeting with Imogene to see the revelation that her choice of vocation is not only a result of the responsibility she feels to a community she loves but is also a reflection of her deep and abiding compassion for those around her. Federal casework can be a thankless task. But Moby never wavered. Regardless of the barriers that faced her, Imogene threw herself into her work with the patience and perseverance of Job. Her overwhelming commitment to following through on her promises made her an absolute miracle worker. My office is often the last resort for many of my constituents with problems. Imogene never let anyone feel desperate or afraid. On the contrary, she was a great source of hope to many people who had nowhere else to turn. She treated everyone who walked into my office with the dignity and respect they deserved, regardless of their situation in life or the details of their problems. After working with her for a decade, I can say easily that her kindness knows no bounds.

As one might expect, Imogene selflessly gives her free time and energy to her community as well, her friends, and, most importantly, her family. Imogene is a member of the NAACP as well as the Young Women's Christian Association. She is also an active volunteer for the American Association of Retired Persons and is a member of the Friends of the Gary Public Library. In addition to these important activities, Imogene promotes another cause that is near and dear to her heart. She is an avid Chicago Bulls fan and a Michael Jordan fan. Pictures of Michael Jordan adorned her office along with a life-size cutout of M.J.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me

in commending Imogene ''Moby'' Matthews for her lifetime of dedication, service and compassion to the residents of northwest Indiana. She has touched the lives of many residents and she will be sorely missed not only by those she has helped with her outstanding service and uncompromising dedication but by myself and my staff who have seen her extraordinary expertise and felt her deep compassion and love. She will never be replaced.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day to American citizens and not just because it is Valentine's Day but because the President has also declared it National Guard and Reserve Day. I am encouraged that our national leadership is finally paying tribute to the citizen soldiers that play such a vital role in the protection of democracy and of our Nation's defense.

The National Guard has been there in every war and conflict that this Nation has ever fought. They were there in the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, both World War I and World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Operation Desert Storm and, most recently, Operation Allied Force in Kosovo. The National Guard is an integral part of America's military today, serving side by side with its active duty counterparts all over the world. They meet the security needs of our Nation, both at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the National Guard is the only component in our military that has a dual mission. Their Federal mission is to serve as an essential partner with the country's Army and Air Force, responding to security needs worldwide. Just as important is their State mission of meeting the needs of our citizens during emergencies and disasters. The Guard, with its long history of assisting and protecting local communities, is well prepared to play this critical role in this critical mission area.

I would like to take this opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to highlight the accomplishments of the South Dakota Army and Air National Guard. 4,452 people strong, the individuals of the South Dakota National Guard are some of the finest citizens in my State. They have served their Federal mission dutifully through deployments. As personnel from the 109th Medical Battalion deployed to Jamaica to perform medical readiness training, the 153rd Engineering Battalion worked on vertical construction in Hohenfels, Germany, and the 109th Engineer Group participated in warfighter exercises in Gafenwoehr. In just 3 years, the 147th Field Artillery's two battalions completed conversion to the multiple launch rocket system, and I have just gotten word that the 1085th Medical Company has been given the order to prepare the unit for full deployment to Bosnia. In addition, the 114th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard has deployed more than 500 people in support of the Aerospace Expeditionary Force and is getting ready for their fourth deployment enforcing the no-fly zone in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, these extraordinary individuals have also responded to their State mission, being called on just this past summer to fight the Jasper fire in the Black Hills of South Dakota. This fire was the biggest ever in the history of my State. The 285 soldiers and airmen that were called to active duty to help fight this fire were there to meet the challenge just like they have always been. Their quick response is a credit to the hardworking individuals and their dedication to their job as citizen soldiers.

One can see by looking at the call of duty of the South Dakota National Guard that their responsibilities are escalating. However, at the same time we have unfortunately witnessed a decline in fully funded personnel accounts and end strengths. As the National Guard's number one priority, we must continue to devote attention to full-time manning. Adequate personnel and support are absolutely necessary to ensure a ready and accessible Guard.

Following these lines, we must take steps to ensure that our Nation's forces are capable of fighting and winning two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts. Procurement and modernization play a central role in this. They are crucial elements to our ability to respond to multiple engagements and threats to our national security. Unfortunately, the Army and Air Force are currently wearing out weapons systems and support mission equipment. This is a direct result of the rate at which we have deployed on peacekeeping missions. As we begin to work through the defense authorization and appropriations cycle this year and in the future, more attention must be given to procurement of new weapons systems and to combat capability for all forces.

It is critical that Congress and the new administration provide funding levels sufficient to ensure that America's military capabilities are in line with our superpower responsibilities. We also must take steps to reassess our deployment strategies. Currently there is a great mismatch between U.S. force levels and overseas commitments. In the past decade, U.S. forces, which have included members of the South Dakota National Guard, have been deployed 35 times to places like Panama, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and even East Timor.

In the 40-year span of the Cold War era, our military was only deployed 10 times. Today, the U.S. Armed Forces are 40 percent smaller but 30 percent busier than they were just 10 years ago. A national strategy that clearly indicates where and under what circumstances deploying American servicemen and women is necessary needs to be developed.

In addition to this increased operations tempo, Congress continues to identify new roles for the National Guard. These include defense against domestic terrorism, national missile defense, and defense against cyber-terrorism.

Members of the South Dakota National Guard form an essential part of our national security team. They are active participants in the full spectrum of operations, from the smallest contingencies to major theater conflicts. They are indispensable forces who truly embody our forefathers' vision. Their dedication to service, Mr. Speaker, and the outstanding manner in which they perform their duties exemplify the notion of the American citizen soldier. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say thank you to them today.

REGARDING AMERICA'S MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Washington sometimes speaks with its own language. We talk in this town of taking risks, laying it on the line, or getting out on the edge, when the only cost of failure is to our pride or perceived prestige.

Out there beyond the Beltway, in many cases beyond America's shores, are people who really do take risks. They lay their lives on the line every day and they do so because we ask them to. They are, of course, America's finest, our men and women in uniform. And while some in this town may spare them a passing thought now and again, they are thinking of us, and Americans like us, every day. That is what devotion to duty means.

It is unfortunate but correct to note that those soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines are never more prominent in our thoughts than when something goes wrong. Our hearts went out to the families of the sterling sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*. We mourned the loss of brave Marines lost in recent aviation mishaps. And today our thoughts are with the families of soldiers killed and injured in an Army helicopter accident.

There is a message in these events, if we care to hear it. It is that even in times of greatest peace, the profession of arms is fraught with hazard. The world demands that we train hard, and realistic training brings real dangers. American interests require that our forces be forward, and those distant waters can mask unseen threats. And the requirement for technological leadership means that flaws in new systems can occasionally take a fearsome price.

So let us give thought on this Valentine's Day, this day dedicated to love,

to those men and women who put love of country above all. We are free to speak our minds in this Chamber because, out there, they have accepted the job of keeping us free. We are able to run what we call political risks because they take on mortal risks.

We talk at some length about how to properly compensate our men and women in uniform. That debate goes on. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we owe a humbling debt to America's servicepeople that goes far beyond the monetary. Indeed, it is not too much to say that, in the framers' phrase, they defend our lives and our sacred honor. Such a gift is truly beyond price.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 83rd anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and the 10th anniversary of freedom from Soviet occupation. I am especially proud of my Lithuanian heritage at this time of the year.

From the first Independence Day on February 16, 1918 until their reassertion of their independence on February 16, 1991, freedom from foreign domination has been a hard-earned dream for the Republic of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian people withstood unspeakable abuse under Soviet military forces that occupied Lithuania from 1940 to 1991 with dignity and restraint. In Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, there are many reminders kept of the sacrifices made for freedom. The Vilnius KGB museum consists of a basement jail that has cells and torture chambers where secret police detained and interrogated Lithuanian prisoners before sending them into Siberian exile. The Lithuanian parliament building hosts a section of bullet-scarred barricades that were used in 1990 to ward off Russian tanks. Also, the Vilnius TV tower, which is the tallest structure in the city, has a monument to the 14 unarmed, freedom-loving Lithuanians who were murdered on January 13, 1991 by Soviet soldiers during their attempt to take over the tower.

In the 10 short years since the reestablishment of its independence, the Republic of Lithuania has restored democracy, ensured human rights, secured the rule of law, developed a free market economy, cultivated friendly relations with neighboring countries and successfully pursued a course of integration into the European Union. 2001 will be another critical year for Lithuania as it works to attract foreign investment and gain admission into NATO. Lithuania deserves our recognition for its perseverance in the face of immense challenges. It has proven not only to be a faithful friend to the United States but also a tenacious ally, as demonstrated by their recent assistance in our peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia. I hope we will not jeopardize their future security by withholding NATO membership beyond 2002.

In closing, I would like to thank the outgoing Ambassador from Lithuania, Mr. Stasys Sakalauskas, for his service in Washington, D.C. and his dedication to improving U.S.-Lithuania relations. I also welcome the new Ambassador who will be named at the end of this month, and I look forward to working with him.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 83rd anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, due to the cancellation of my flight, I missed the vote last night on H.R. 2, the Social Security and Medicare Lock-box Act of 2001. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of the bill.

This legislation signifies our commitment to protect seniors' benefits. It ensures that Medicare and Social Security funds will only be used for their intended purposes and not be spent on other government programs. I believe this is a major step toward long-term reform that will assure all workers and retirees that these programs will be there for their future.

□ 1345

REPEALING THE 5-YEAR LIMITATION ON INTEREST DEDUCTIBILITY FOR STUDENT LOANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to re-introduce a bill important to all students—H.R. . In the 105th Congress, we passed legislation that allows students to deduct interest paid on student loans. We did this to make it easier for all Americans to bear the enormous costs of higher education, and I supported this effort whole-heartedly.

My bill improves this law by removing the current 60 month limitation period for deducting student loan interest. As the law currently stands, if your student loan is older than 5 years from when it came due, you are not eligible for a tax deduction.

This limitation needs to be removed. Higher education has become increasingly expensive and is creating a financial burden on graduates well beyond the first five years of graduation. According to the General Accounting Office, the average student loan in 1980 was $518; in 1995, it rose to $2,417, an increase of 367%. Tuition at 4-year public and private colleges and universities has risen nearly three times as much as median household income in the past 15 years. As a result, it is becoming harder for students to graduate from college or graduate school without the help of student loans.

Students that graduate with student loans start out a few steps behind those without it. It is harder for them to save for emergencies or to invest money for their future. It is also harder for them to meet day-to-day expenses. This tax deduction will help.

All interest accrued on student loans should be deductible. Congress can send the message that we value higher education and recognize the financial responsibility students have made by allowing the student loan deduction for the life of the loan.

This will do two things: It will encourage individuals to go to college or graduate school, and it will reduce the cost of an education. Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that the way to achieve the American Dream is through education, and that everyone should have this opportunity.

It is absolutely essential that we continue to invest in our most important hope for our children—education. I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. .

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the attached Committee on Ways and Means rules for the 107th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2(a)(2).

The Committee adopted these Rules on February 7, 2001.

If you have any questions please contact John Kelliher at x69150.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—MANUAL OF RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 7, 2001

(Prepared for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means by its staff)

FOREWORD

This manual has been prepared to assist Members of the Committee on Ways and Means, its staff, and the public. It presents in two parts various rules that affect the organization and procedures of the Committee on Ways and Means. Part I contains rules adopted by the Committee for the 107th Congress. Part II contains selected Rules of the House of Representatives, which are also a part of the rules of the Committee, affecting all standing committees of the House.

PART I.—RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE 107TH CONGRESS

Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, provides in part:

* * * 1. (a)(1)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), the Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable.

(B) A motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, each shall be privileged in committees and subcommittees and shall be decided without debate.

(2) Each subcommittee is a part of its committee and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules, so far as applicable.* * *

* * * 2. (a)(1) Each standing committee shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules—

(A) shall be adopted in a meeting that is open to the public unless the committee, in

open session and with a quorum present, determines by record vote that all or part of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public;

(B) may not be inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House * * *.

In accordance with the foregoing, the Committee on Ways and Means, on February 7, 2001 adopted the following as the Rules of the Committee for the 107th Congress.

A. GENERAL

Rule 1. Application of Rules

Except where the terms ''full Committee'' and ''Subcommittee'' are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Ways and Means and its Subcommittees as well as the respective Chairmen.

Rule 2. Meeting Date and Quorums

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. However, the Committee shall not meet on the regularly scheduled meeting day if there is no business to be considered.

A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two Members shall constitute a quorum at any regular scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one Member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

Rule 3. Committee Budget

For each Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the Majority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the Minority Members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by Minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall present the same to the Committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no substantial change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the Committee.

Rule 4. Publication of Committee Documents

Any Committee or Subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or Subcommittee prior to distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall contain on its cover the following disclaimer:

Prepared for the use of Members of the Committee on Ways and Means by members of its staff. This document has not been officially approved by the Committee and may not reflect the views of its Members.

Any such print, document, or other material not officially approved by the Committee or Subcommittee shall not include the names of its Members, other than the name of the full Committee Chairman or Subcommittee Chairman under whose authority the document is released. Any such document shall be made available to the full Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to its public release.

The requirements of this rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports which are required to be submitted to the Committee under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

Rule 5. Official Travel

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee, its Subcommittees, or any other Committee or Subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the official travel;

(2) The date during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and

(4) The names of Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such Subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

Rule 6. Availability of Committee Records and Publications

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee. The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

Rule 7. Websites

The minority shall been entitled to a separate website that is linked to and accessible only from the full Committee's website. For any website created under this policy, the Ranking Minority Member is responsible for its content and must be identified on the introductory page.

All Committee websites must comply with House Regulations.

The content of a committee website may not:

(1) Include personal, political, or campaign information.

(2) Be directly linked or refer to websites created or operated by campaign or any campaign related entity, including political parties and committees.

(3) Include grassroots lobbying or solicit support for a Member's position.

(4) Generate, circulate, solicit or encourage signing petitions.

(5) Include any advertisement for any private individual, firm, or corporation, or imply in any manner that the Government endorses or favors any specific commercial product, commodity, or service.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES

Rule 8. Subcommittee Ratios and Jurisdiction

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to Subcommittees under paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 shall be considered by the full Committee and not in Subcommittee. There shall be six standing Subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Trade; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Social Security; a Subcommittee on Human Resources; and a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats on any Subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Republicans to Democrats on the full Committee.

1. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 15 Members, 9 of whom shall be Republicans and 6 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements including multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and nontariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the U.S. Customs Service, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with nonmarket economies.

2. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Republicans and 5 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other Subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the Chairman of any other Subcommittee having jurisdiction.

3. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Republicans and 5 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters that relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Committee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

4. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Republicans and 5 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal Old-Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old-Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

5. The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 13 Members, 8 of whom shall be Republicans and 5 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act including welfare reform, supplemental security income, aid to families with dependent children, social services, child support, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means that relate to the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974, and provisions relating thereto.

6. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Republicans and 4 of whom shall be Democrats.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures that, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

Rule 9. Ex-Officio Members of Subcommittees

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a Subcommittee. However, their absence shall not count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular Members of the Subcommittee. Ex-officio Members shall neither vote in the Subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for purposes of determining the ratio of the Subcommittee.

Rule 10. Subcommittee Meetings

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its Subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view toward avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings.

Rule 11. Reference of Legislation and Subcommittee Reports

Except for bills or measures retained by the Chairman of the full Committee for full Committee consideration, every bill or other measure referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate Subcommittee in a timely manner. A Subcommittee shall, within 3 legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a Subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make request in writing to the Subcommittee that the Subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within 7 legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the Subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the Subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least 2 legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 3(d)(2) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 12. Recommendation for Appointment of Conferees

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Committee Members as the Chairman may designate. In making recommendations of Minority Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

C. HEARINGS

Rule 13. Witnesses

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee at least 48 hours in advance of his appearance a written statement of his proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with formatting requirements as specified by the Committee and the Rules of the House. Failure to comply with the 48-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. In addition to the requirements of clause 2(g)(4) of Rule XI, of the Rules of the House, regarding information required of public witnesses, a witness shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his position and shall provide sufficient copies of his written statement to the Clerk for distribution to Members, staff and news media.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must include on his statement or submission a list of all clients, persons, or organizations on whose behalf the witness appears. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or Subcommittee involved. Written statements from noncitizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

Rule 14. Questioning of Witnesses

Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All Members shall be limited to 5 minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first after which Members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other Members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members and the number of Majority and Minority Members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage Members of the majority.

Rule 15. Subpoena Power

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chairman of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

Rule 16. Records of Hearings

In accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hearing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the

transcript of his testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes that substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall correct their own testimony and return transcripts as soon as possible after receipt thereof. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure that is the subject of the hearing.

Rule 17. Broadcasting of Hearings

The provisions of clause 4(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a Subcommittee:

(1) An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

(2) No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

(3) Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through an appropriate designee.

(4) Still photography during a Committee meeting will not be permitted to disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee Members or witnesses.

(5) Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

D. MARKUPS

Rule 18. Reconsideration of Previous Vote

When an amendment or other matter has been disposed of, it shall be in order for any Member of the prevailing side, on the same or next day on which a quorum of the Committee is present, to move the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence over all other questions except the consideration of a motion to adjourn.

Rule 19. Previous Question

The Chairman shall not recognize a Member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the Member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

Rule 20. Official Transcripts of Markups and Other Committee Meetings

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other meetings of the full Committee and the Subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as ''uncorrected,'' shall be available for inspection by the public (except for meetings closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House), by Members of the House, or by Members of the Committee together with their staffs, during normal business hours in the full Committee or Subcommittee office under such controls as the Chairman of the full Committee deems necessary. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or Subcommittee office. If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or Subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup, such transcript may be released upon the signature and to the custody of an appropriate committee staff person. Such transcript shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting sessions

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or distributed to the public in any way except by a majority vote of the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, Members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule shall likewise be observed.

Rule 21. Publication of Decisions and Legislative Language

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a Subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each Member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a Subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each Member of the Committee.

E. STAFF

Rule 22. Supervision of Committee Staff

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 9 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning Committee expenses and staff.

Pursuant to clause 6(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the full Committee, from the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions, shall ensure that each Subcommittee receives sufficient staff to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

Rule 23. Staff Honoraria, Speaking Engagements, and Unofficial Travel

This rule shall apply to all majority and minority staff of the Committee and its Subcommittees.

a. HONORARIA.—Under no circumstances shall a staff person accept the offer of an honorarium. This prohibition includes the direction of an honorarium to a charity.

b. SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS AND UNOFFICIAL TRAVEL.—

(1) ADVANCE APPROVAL REQUIRED.—In the case of all speaking engagements, fact-finding trips, and other unofficial travel, a staff person must receive approved by the full Committee Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, from the Ranking Minority Member) at least 7 calendar days prior to the event.

(2) REQUIRED FOR APPROVAL.—A request for approval must be submitted in writing to the full Committee Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) in connection with each speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or other unofficial travel. Such request must contain the following information:

(a) the name of the sponsoring organization and a general description of such organization (nonprofit organization, trade association, etc.);

(b) the nature of the event, including any relevant information regarding attendees at such event;

(c) in the case of a speaking engagement, the subject of the speech and duration of staff travel, if any; and

(d) in the case of a fact-finding trip or international travel, a description of the proposed itinerary and proposed agenda of substantive issues to be discussed, as well as a justification of the relevance and importance of the fact-finding trip or international travel to the staff member's official duties.

(3) REASONABLE TRAVEL AND LODGING EXPENSES.—After receipt of the advance approval described in (1) above, a staff person may accept reimbursement by an appropriate sponsoring organization of reasonable travel and lodging expenses associated with a speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or international travel related to official duties, provided such reimbursement is consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. (In lieu of reimbursement after the event, expenses may be paid directly by an appropriate sponsoring organization.) The reasonable travel and lodging expenses of a spouse (but not children) may be reimbursed (or directly paid) by an appropriate sponsoring organization consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(4) TRIP SUMMARY AND REPORT.—In the case of any reimbursement or direct payment associated with a fact-finding trip or international travel, a staff person must submit, within 60 days after such trip, a report summarizing the trip and listing all expenses reimbursed or directly paid by the sponsoring organization. This information shall be submitted to the Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, to the Ranking Minority Member).

c. WAIVER.—The Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) may waive the application of section (b) of this rule upon a showing of good cause.

PART II.—SELECTED RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Part II of the Manual of Rules of the Committee on Ways and Means consists of selected Rules of the House of Representatives, which are also a part of the Committee's rules and which affect its organization, administration, and operation. The rules cited herein are not exclusive of other rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the Committee, but rather are considered to be some of the more important rules to which frequent reference is made.

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

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

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATION FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations. The allocation for fiscal year 2001 printed in the House Report 106–761 is increased to reflect $8,303,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $4,392,000,000 in additional outlays for emergency appropriations, as detailed in the following table:

Subcommittee (Purpose)	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, the FDA and Related Agencies (Primarily for the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund)	$3,563,000,000	$3,088,000,000
Defense (Primarily for the repair of U.S.S. Cole)	249,000,000	185,000,000
Energy and Water Development (Primarily for nuclear nonproliferation)	214,000,000	133,000,000
Foreign Operations (Primarily for debt restructuring and international disaster assistance)	467,000,000	55,000,000
Interior (Primarily for Wildland fire management)	1,689,000,000	710,000,000
Legislative Branch (Primarily for the FHA general and special risk program account)	52,000,000	36,000,000
Transportation (Primarily for federal aid highways)	718,000,000	193,000,000
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government (For the Counterterrorism Fund)	55,000,000	
Veterans, HUD and Independent Agencies (Primarily for FEMA disaster relief)	1,296,000,000	−8,000,000

Those allocation adjustments will change the allocation of House Committee on Appropriations to $609,656,000,000 in budget authority and $636,827,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001. The aggregate total will increase to $1,537,861,000,000 in budget authority and $1,506,048,000,000 in outlays.

Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at extension 67270.

FIRE SAFETY AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, late last month the Office of Compliance reported on its comprehensive fire-safety inspections of the three Library of Congress buildings.

After previous dire warnings over the last two years from the House Inspector General and the Compliance Office about the state of fire protection in the Capitol and congressional office buildings, I had hoped for a better report on conditions at the Library. Unfortunately, the Compliance Office found that the Library buildings suffer from many of the same deficiencies as the Capitol and congressional buildings.

I strongly believe that Congress must take every reasonable step to maximize the physical safety of the thousands who work in the Capitol complex every day and of the millions who visit every year. Congress also has a responsibility to safeguard the numerous valuable artifacts, many of them irreplaceable, which are housed in the Capitol and among the Library's collections.

In view of the Compliance Office's findings at the Library, the new Chairman of the House Administration Committee [Mr. NEY] and I have written jointly to the Architect of the Capitol, who has responsibility for maintaining the Library's buildings, asking for a detailed report on the status of his efforts to correct the deficiencies there. Specifically, we have requested detailed plans, timelines, and an identification of any additional resources needed to complete the task. We have also written to the House Inspector General, who has demonstrated substantial expertise in fire-protection matters, asking his office to participate in regular meetings with Architect and Library staff, offer whatever guidance he deems appropriate, and monitor progress, as he does in connection with ongoing fire-safety work in the House.

Last September the Architect unveiled before the House Administration Committee a staff reorganization plan that places all AOC fire-safety work under the supervision of a single senior-level subordinate, as proposed in a bill (H.R. 4366) that I introduced in the last Congress. The AOC is clearly moving in the right direction and I appreciate the progress he has made. The Chairman and I look forward to working with the Architect to ensure the deficiencies previously noted, and those just identified at the Library, are remedied as soon as practicable. I include for the RECORD the texts of our letters to the Architect and the Inspector General of the House:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2001.

Hon. ALAN M. HANTMAN, AIA,
The Architect of the Capitol,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. HANTMAN: We have received the recent Office of Compliance report on its fire-safety inspections of the Library of Congress buildings. As you know, the Office found numerous fire-safety deficiencies in the three Library buildings, the same types of deficiencies found last year during thorough inspections of the Capitol and congressional office buildings. We are greatly concerned about the report and the grave danger posed to Library employees, visitors, and to the Library's enormous collection of books and artifacts, many irreplaceable, by decades of inadequate attention to fire-safety matters. We know you share our concern, and trust that you also share our determination to see these additional deficiencies corrected at the earliest possible date.

Toward that goal, we ask that you provide us immediately with a comprehensive report on the status of AOC efforts to correct deficiencies found in the Library buildings. Please provide detailed plans for the correction of deficiencies that remain uncorrected, including an identification of any additional resources that you may need to complete the work and timelines for its completion. We also ask that you assess the level of fire protection now afforded to the Library's most valuable artifacts, and indicate how you will prioritize the correction of deficiencies related to their protection.

We appreciate the progress that AOC has made in addressing fire-safety deficiencies in the House office buildings since the Inspector General's and Compliance Office's previous reports. We hope the Library can benefit from the AOC's experience in addressing those deficiencies. In that vein, we encourage you to incorporate into your approach for the Library the use of frequent, regular meetings among AOC, Library, and House Inspector General staff, to coordinate efforts and facilitate communication . A similar approach has worked well in the House.

Thanking you for your prompt attention to this request, with kindest regards, we remain

Sincerely yours,
BOB NEY,
Chairman.
STENY H. HOYER,
Ranking Minority Member.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2001.

Hon. STEVEN A. MCNAMARA,
Inspector General, House of Representatives, Ford House Office Building.

DEAR MR. MCNAMARA: As you know, the Office of Compliance just reported on the results of its fire-safety inspections of the Library of Congress buildings. The Compliance Office found numerous fire-safety deficiencies in the three Library buildings, the same types of deficiencies that it and your office found during prior inspections of the Capitol and House office buildings. We are greatly concerned about the danger posed to Library employees, visitors, and to the Library's valuable collection of books and artifacts, many irreplaceable, by the effects of decades of inadequate attention to fire safety. We are eager to help the Architect of the Capitol reverse these effects.

Your office has considerable expertise in such matters, and you continue to oversee the Architect's efforts to correct fire-safety deficiencies in the Capitol and House buildings. We write to ask that you similarly monitor the AOC's work to correct the fire-safety deficiencies at the Library, offer the AOC and the Library whatever guidance you may deem appropriate, and keep the Committee apprised of progress. As work progresses, should you have any concerns, please bring them to the Committee's attention immediately. To coordinate efforts and facilitate communications, we have urged the Architect to incorporate into his approach at the Library a plan to conduct regular, frequent meetings among AOC staff, Library staff and your staff, as he has done in the House.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, with kindest regards, we remain

Sincerely yours,
BOB NEY,
Chairman.
STENY H. HOYER,
Ranking Minority Member.

BUDGET PRIORITIES AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the most important issue facing this Congress is the amount of the tax cut that has been proposed by the President and by the majority party, and a majority of Americans apparently think that this tax cut would be in their best interests. Today I would like to make five points why I disagree, and try to explain why I think a cut of this proposed magnitude is potentially disastrous.

The five points that I would like to make are, one, CBO's 10-year surplus projections are highly unreliable; secondly, the tax cut is skewed to benefit those who need the assistance the least; third, I believe that this tax cut is fiscally irresponsible in that it is substantially understated; fourthly, the tax cut ignores the financial catastrophe that we know is going to occur when the baby boom generation retires in another few years; and, fifth, it does not address what I believe is our highest priority, which is to pay off our public debt before we do anything else with the surplus.

On point number one, Mr. Speaker, the projections upon which we assume that we can afford the tax cut are highly dependent upon economic performance that is, at best, uncertain in the near term, and really has no credible basis over the long term. CBO has increased their estimates from 2.8 percent to a little above 3 percent annual growth, but if they are off by as much as eight-tenths of one percent, $4 trillion of the surplus goes away.

GAO Comptroller David Walker testified before the Congress that ''no one should design tax or spending policy pegged to the precise numbers in any 10-year forecast.'' He also said it is important to remember that while projections for the next 10-year period look better, the long-term outlook looks much worse.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, it is important to understand that the effect of the tax cut applies primarily to those who in fact pay the most taxes. But the top 1 percent, people whose incomes are over $320,000 a year, now pay about 21 percent of the taxes. One percent pays 21 percent of the total Federal taxes; yet they would get 43 percent of the benefit. Eighty percent of the population would receive less than 29 percent of the entire tax cut benefit.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, while the tax plan proposes a $1.6 trillion cut, it does not include the additional interest costs that are incurred because it is not applied to paying down the debt. It also raises the number of people who will be subject to the alternative minimum tax from 2 million today to 27 million households by 2010. Virtually everybody over $75,000 over a year in income is going to get hit with the alternative minimum tax. They are going to be screaming at the time, and we are going to have to fix it at a substantial cost that is not factored in here. I should also say the estimates do not protect military retirement nor civil service retirement.

Fourthly, the baby boomer crisis. Once the baby boom generation that was born right after World War II starts to retire, we are going to be in the position of only three workers for every retiree. That creates a situation that is untenable. So after we get out past 2011, when all these estimates are pegged, we are going to find that for the next life span we are as much as $22 trillion short in Social Security and $12 trillion short in Medicare.

The best thing we could do right now is to currently fund that unfunded Social Security liability. If we put $3.1 trillion aside, as we would do if we were facing this in our own family or in a private corporation, we could fund that unfunded liability and not leave that burden to our children and grandchildren to do so.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me say that our highest priority should be to pay down the debt. That is the best way we can invest in our future, and that is the best gift we can give to our children and grandchildren. We do it in our own family; we ought to do it in the Nation's best interest as well.

THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to be here today to talk about something I think that is critically important to the future of this country. I want us to look, if we will, deep into the 21st century, and I think we start that by looking back historically and seeing where we have come from. I want to talk a little bit about the economic future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, after all, as a government, the people of this country expect us to be an economic model, to provide a structure, an economic structure, that will enable the private sector to flourish.

It has worked as well, Mr. Speaker, as any plan that has been put together in the history of mankind. We have something here in this country that is very special. This economic model, this experiment we are on now for over 225 years, has taken us to be the most powerful Nation in the world, not only economically, but also militarily and politically.

Let us look back, Mr. Speaker, just a few short years, back into 1990. We just came out of the decade of the '80s. Ronald Reagan had served us 8 years wonderfully as our President. He had spent a lot of his time focusing on the Soviet Union and the Cold War, and actually we saw the fall of the Soviet Union in the late decade of the '80s.

But if you looked at what was happening fiscally in our country, Mr. Speaker, at that time, we were in pretty bad shape. Economically we were headed down the wrong path. If you go back to 1990, you would have found annual deficits in the range of $250 to $300 billion a year. You had a mounting debt that was climbing a quarter of a trillion dollars annually.

Many of us who were in the private sector at that time thought that the economic experiment that we were involved in in this country was headed for an economic disaster as we moved toward the 21st century.

But as you know, in 1990, with the leadership of President Bush, the first step was taken to change the economic direction of this country. As a matter of fact, those changes, led by President Bush, probably cost him his reelection in 1992.

Then again in 1993, under the leadership of President Clinton, another big step was taken to sort of build the wall around that foundation that President Bush had built to get us headed back in the right direction. With that economic plan in 1993, this government, this economic model that we are involved in here, began to head in the right direction and lower its deficits and head toward a day where we could actually pay our bills on an annual basis and would not be swallowed with red ink.

I know when I ran for Congress in 1996 it was the major campaign theme. The major campaign theme was balancing the budget, removing the deficits, the annual deficits that we had. So this is not something that is new, not something we just started talking about. This is important stuff for the long-term health of this country.

Under the leadership of the House and the Senate, Speaker Gingrich, Majority Leader LOTT in the Senate, and President Clinton, in 1997 a Balanced Budget Act was put into place, put into law, which was a plan, a blueprint, to lead us out of red ink and lead us into an era when we could actually pay our bills. This model we have is so wonderful that we actually achieved that goal of getting away from deficits about 5 years ahead of that schedule. The 1997 Balanced Budget Act had us balancing the budget in, I think, the year 2003–2004, but we actually achieve that about 3 or 4 years ahead of that schedule. We have a wonderful window of opportunity here now to continue the work, to continue the job.

Mr. Speaker, the budget process is like a business plan. It is like a business plan that our businesses all across this Nation do on an annual basis. They sit down and they look at what kind of business they want to do, what their objectives are, what parts of their business they have to fund, what revenue they can expect to come in, and then they put all that together in a budget and then they go out and implement it.

Mr. Speaker, that business plan allocates, in the case of our Federal Government, limited Federal resources to our priorities that we think are important.

Mr. Speaker, the surplus is currently projected at $2.7 trillion. That is if we do not use Social Security and Medicare. We all know the CBO, Mr. Speaker, which I have a summary here which we want to examine a little bit closer as we spend some time in this next hour, the CBO report talks about a $5.6 trillion figure over the next 10 years, and that is true; but we know that of that $5.6 trillion, that about half of it is money that comes into the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare Trust Fund.

So we really ought to all get on the same page and talk about the current surplus, the projected surplus, Mr. Speaker, being at $2.7 trillion, because even just as late as yesterday this House voted, I think unanimously, to reinsert its belief that the Social Security funds and the Medicare funds ought to go in a lockbox, and they ought not to be touched for any purpose, other than those two specific purposes.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want to spend the next hour examining some of the

priorities that this Nation needs to deal with as we have this debate about surpluses, about tax cuts and about our economic plan.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am glad to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to spend a few minutes talking about his perspective.

□ 1400

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for taking this time today.

I hope that everyone will pay particular attention to some of the comments that many of our colleagues are going to be making. We will have the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), who will be on the floor momentarily, and will talk very accurately about the fact that we really do not have a surplus.

When we look at the Social Security trust fund, the Medicare trust fund, the Military Retirees trust fund, highways, airports, that really and truly, there is no $5 trillion, 600 billion surplus.

We ask our colleagues, particularly our friends in the majority, to not just look at part of the CBO report, but take a look at the whole report. Notice where they make a very sound observation in that, first off, projecting the economy of the world for 10 years is almost impossible. No one pretends to be accurate. Yet, here we are now all of a sudden taking 10-year projections, and we hear $5.6 trillion of surpluses, and we have folks beginning to act like it is real, really beginning to say, ''We are going to spend that money like it is real.''

Here we ask Members to consider one major fact, that 70 percent of the projected surpluses that we are talking about do not occur until the years 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Who of us can project tomorrow, much less 2011?

When we go past 2011 for this same CBO report, the $5,600,000,000,000 surplus, they show through another chart that we have serious problems. In fact, it is projected in the next 20 years after 2010 we will be consuming 200 percent of our gross domestic product every year. We all know if that were to happen, if it were to happen this year, that Congress would have a very difficult time dealing with that kind of an economic situation.

What the Blue Dogs have suggested in the past, are suggesting today, and will be suggesting tomorrow, let us understand a few basics: The $5 trillion, 600 billion number we have here is a projected surplus. We think the conservative thing to do is to be conservative with those surpluses.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) observed a moment ago, the actual number of these projected surpluses that we have to deal with is 2.7, because we have already decided in an almost 100 percent bipartisan way that we are no longer going to spend the Social Security and Medicare surpluses in the unified budget. We are setting them aside in a lockbox.

Now, I was not very happy with the cuteness of the vote yesterday, of the actual bill yesterday, because it left a loophole. I hope the American people will hold us accountable not to the loopholes of being able to potentially spend these trust funds twice, which was possible by that resolution yesterday, but to really and truly mean it when we say we are not going to spend, and let us put it more positively, we are going to take this short-term benefit that we have with Social Security in which we are taking in more than we are paying out to today's beneficiaries and we are going to take that money and pay down the debt held by the public.

That is good. When I say that is good, that is being interpreted by the markets as being good. Everyone perhaps looking right now or listening to this right now should ask themselves, and answer a simple question, would they rather have 6¾ percent home mortgages or 9¾ percent home mortgages? When we are buying a new car, would we rather have a 6, 7, 8 percent loan, or an 18 percent loan?

As a result of the economic policies that have been followed over the last 8 or 10 years and the budget actions taken by the Congress over the last 6 or 8 years, we now find ourselves in a position in which the markets are reacting. Yes, we are collecting more tax revenue because people are making more money. That is good. That is not bad. But the question we have to ask is, how long will it continue?

We had a budget alternative, the Blue Dogs, last year which focused on reducing the national debt. This is our budget again this year. We had a budget that focused on saving Social Security first. My personal preference is, I wish we would have had the first serious discussion on this floor this year on saving Social Security and Medicare.

I happen to represent a rural district, and my hospitals and now my nursing homes, my nursing home constituency has been pointing out over the last several months, we are hurting, too. The BBA of 1997 reduced the reimbursement rates of the nursing homes, as well as the hospitals, below what it cost them to stay in business. We have to address that, and that is going to cost some money.

I want to make it very, very clear, the Blue Dog Democrats favor cutting taxes. We are very strongly in favor of dealing with the marriage tax penalty; a perfect day to discuss it, Valentine's Day. We are for it. We will vote for it. We encourage it to be in the final package.

We are for dealing with the estate tax, the so-called death tax. We believe that it is not helpful to have a penalty assessed to a small businessman or woman that spent a lifetime building up their business, and it will be in our budget.

We would like to see across-the-board tax cuts, if that is possible for us to do.

Some of us, myself being in this category, I would like to see us take this opportunity now to do more than just complain about the energy problems of this country.

A couple of years ago we had a depression in the oil patch. No one was worried about the domestic oil and gas producers, who were going broke in droves because no one can produce oil and gas at $7 a barrel, but no one was concerned about it then because we were all enjoying the cheapness of energy.

Well, today everyone, including those of us living in the oil patch, are complaining about the price of energy. Why would this not be a good time to look at using the Tax Code to accomplish some much needed improvements in our energy policy in this country?

A simple question I ask, and unfortunately it is not in the President's plan yet, but the President has said, I am amenable to change. I have submitted my plan to the Congress. We would like to hear Congress's opinion on where we go. I would like to see us deal with this.

I would like to see us deal with some environmental incentives, some production incentives, doing some things we clearly need to do for the benefit of this country. Most everyone would agree to that. There are a lot of things going on on both sides of the aisle to prepare us for this national energy policy. I mention that because that is not in the current numbers we hear being kicked around.

I know I have other colleagues that want to take a little bit of time now, so let me kind of summarize where we are as far as the Blue Dogs' input into the budget considerations this year. I can summarize it pretty quickly: Let us bring a budget to the floor of the House first. Let us not bring tax bills to the floor that everyone will feel inclined to vote for because they do not want to explain why they are opposed to it. Why not deal with the budget first, bring the budget out, and agree on what the budget should look like.

Here it is pretty simple. In a $5.6 trillion projected surplus, Social Security is 2.5 of that, Medicare is .4 of that, that leaves $2.7 trillion. How much of that $2.7 trillion surplus can we afford to spend on a tax cut? That is a simple question.

A lot of folks are saying, ''There he goes, he is talking about spending like it is their money. Taxes are our money.'' No, let us not continue to forget that the Social Security system has an unfunded liability of almost $9 trillion. Part of that money we are talking about I think needs to be devoted back to saving Social Security. That is not in the current discussions that we hear. Medicare, the same.

For military retirement, we will hear from the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) in a moment, it is several hundred billions of dollars. Let us deal with that first. Then let us also agree how much additional spending we want

to make in the area of defense. How much is it going to be required to make sure we maintain the strength of America that has allowed peace to become a prevalent word in this world today? How much?

We are going to build a missile defense system. The cheapest version I have heard is $50 billion over the next 10 years, probably more than that. So we are saying, let us have a tax cut. Let us put at least half of that projected surplus, though, against the debt. Let us have an absolute tough decision on spending.

Let us revise or bring back what worked so well for us over the last several years, at least prior to 1997. Let us put some caps on discretionary spending that we agree to, numbers, and then let the appropriators spend that money, but let us stay within that discretionary level.

We can do it. It can be done. We can meet the needs of defense, of veterans, of education, of health care, of agriculture. We can do all of these things if we truly reach out in a bipartisan way.

That term is getting overworked, but here today, we are on the floor. We would love to have a discussion with someone on the other side of the aisle regarding some of the points that I have made, that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) has made, that our other colleagues will make here in a few moments.

The basics are, we think we ought to have a budget first. Let us have that debate first, and then let us debate the makeup of the tax cut and how much money we are going to spend or save. But even more importantly, let us not forget that the first priority today should be saving Social Security first. If we do not do that, if we do not make a serious effort to do that this year, it will be postponed for another 4 years, because we will never be able to bring it up in the climate that will be present here.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, who has been in this Congress a long time and is recognized as probably the major deficit hawk in Congress. I know that he is very pleased that we have come so far with the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, and I know that he is somewhat pained by the fact that we may be reversing that policy with really good spending caps in place.

I say to the gentleman from Texas, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act did put into place some very good spending caps. Those have expired I think as of this year. I really believe that it may be time for Congress to look again at what worked for us in 1997 and has really helped us tremendously, and hopefully we would take another step on the spending side to make sure that we do not let spending run out of control again.

Mr. STENHOLM. If the gentleman would yield again briefly, Mr. Speaker, the problem with the 1997 budget caps were that they were unrealistic. There was not anywhere close to a majority on the majority side of the aisle to live up to it. Therefore, it is extremely important that when we set the caps, be realistic. We have to increase money in the defense of this country, I will say that.

As I say that to the gentleman, I am talking about spending the people's money, because Congress does not make money. The only way we get money to spend is we have to tax people to get it. I am prepared to say, we have to spend a little bit more of our taxpayer dollars on defense. So let us put that in the budget. Let us not be unrealistic, as we were in saying we are going to increase defense but we are going to cut health care, we are going to cut agriculture, we are going to cut highways, we are going to cut justice, knowing the votes are not there.

This is where bipartisanship has to come forward. We will have a significant number of Democrats and a significant number of Republicans that can agree on a realistic set of caps.

Mr. BOYD. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think the important point is that any prudent business person would establish what the spending levels are first before they begin to implement any part of the budget. I think that is what the gentleman is recommending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), another leader in the Blue Dogs. He came in the same year as I did, after the 1996 election, and he has been a leader on these budget issues.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the opportunity to share this hour with my fellow Blue Dog Democrats, the voice of fiscal conservatism in this House. We have worked long and hard on fiscal issues: paying down the debt, cutting taxes, balancing the budget.

I am glad to be here with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), to talk about what will be the dominant issue in this Congress for the next several months.

I think we all understand that when we began this Congress, we all shared a commitment to try to work together in a bipartisan way. I was pleased to see President Bush, who I served with when he was Governor of Texas, come with a pledge to try to work in a bipartisan way, because for too long the two parties in this House and in this Congress have warred with one another in such a way that the American people have become tired of seeing the bickering that exists here, and perhaps we have an open window of opportunity to work together in a more congenial and more bipartisan way in the common interest of all the American people.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I think the President's first test of bipartisanship will probably be the proposal on tax cuts. The Blue Dog Democrats believe there are two ways to put more money in the pockets of the American people. One is to cut taxes, two is to pay down our national debt and realize the lower interest rates that will flow for all Americans if we are fiscally responsible enough to pay down our national debt.

It is not only the right thing to do for our children, not to pass that big debt to them, but it is the right thing for all Americans, because the combination of cutting taxes and paying down debt will put more money in their pockets.

Economists estimate that if we can pay down our national debt, the publicly-held portion of it, over the next 6, 8 or 10 years, that we can lower interest rates by 2 percent for all American families. Now, that is a big deal, if you have to borrow money.

I come from a poor district, where people have a relatively low average annual income, and a lot of folks I represent have to go to the bank occasionally to borrow money to buy a new car or to borrow money to buy a new home or to borrow money to send their children to college.

For a family that has to borrow $115,000, for example, to buy a new home, if they pay that out on a 30-year mortgage at a fixed rate, 8 percent interest would cost them a monthly payment of $844. If we can get interest rates down just 2 percent for that family, that monthly payment would be $155 less. That is $1860 a year that we could put in the pockets of that family if we could get interest rates down.

Paying down the national debt not only will prevent us from passing on that terrifically huge debt to our children for them to figure out how to pay off, but it will put money in the pockets of American families today; so that is the choice.

Are we going to be for the big tax cut that does not allow us to pay down the national debt, does not allow us to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for the future, that does not allow us room to strengthen our national defense? That is the choice that the American people and this Congress have.

I know we all believe in tax cuts, and I want the biggest tax cut that we can afford, but this Congress must operate the same way that we all know we must operate in our own households. When we sit down at the beginning of the month, we balance our checkbook and we determine what our income is, and we divide that income up among the bills that we owe.

If there is something left after we pay our bills, then maybe we can go out for a fancy dinner or maybe we can even decide to buy a little nicer automobile or maybe we can afford to take a trip, but at my household, and I know at yours, we decide that on a month-by-month basis.

I do not know anybody who has ever sat down at the kitchen table and said,

talking to their wife, you know, honey, I think, that we are going to be able to afford some things on down the line. I think I will probably get a raise every year for the next 10 years. And since I probably think I may get a raise, that means we have a surplus, and I think we ought to go ahead and spend that surplus now.

That is what this Congress is doing when this Congress decides to cut taxes in an amount equal to the surplus that is estimated to arrive here over the next 10 years. You would not do that at your household, and this Congress should not do it either.

We really have a very fundamental issue that I think every American family can understand. When you owe money, you pay your debt first. And if there is anything left, then we can cut our taxes, or we can spend on something like national defense or something that this Congress would like to support.

These budget estimates of surpluses are really funny numbers. We tell the Congressional Budget Office to develop an estimate of how much money might come into the Treasury over the next 10 years under a whole bunch of assumptions that do not make a whole bit of sense. One of the assumptions is that Federal spending go up at the rate of inflation.

Government spending, for the last 5 years, even under the Republican Congress, and all of us who have joined with them trying to hold down spending, government spending still went up at the rate of the gross domestic product. That is a fancy word, but it is a number that is bigger than inflation.

If we just continued to spend on defense at the rate of the gross domestic product, $450 billion of this surplus we are talking about over the next 10 years would disappear. If we simply continue to spend on education at the rate of the increase in the gross domestic product, $400 billion of that surplus would disappear.

What makes us think, after all of the efforts that we have made to be fiscally conservative and to hold down spending for the last 5 years, that we are going to be able to do even better than that? I hope we are better than that, frankly, but to cut taxes in an amount that prevents us from being able to meet the legitimate need of this country in areas like national defense is foolish.

I am convinced that the tax cut that the President has proposed is too big. We simply cannot afford it. So what can we afford? I think the Blue Dogs have a reasonable plan. We have always said, as this whole Congress has repeatedly pledged, we will not touch the surplus that accrues in the Social Security trust fund or the Medicare trust fund. Those trust funds are going to need every penny that will accrue in those funds.

What do we have left even under the optimistic estimate? We have about $2.7 trillion over 10 years. The Blue Dogs have said repeatedly take half of that and use it to pay down our national debt; take 25 percent of it and let us cut our taxes and let us set aside 25 percent to be sure that we save Social Security and Medicare and strengthen national defense and provide our kids with the kind of education that we know they need.

That is a fiscally conservative approach to budgeting, and the Blue Dogs believe foremost of all that we have to have a budget first.

The President sent his tax cut down here the other day. He has not sent his budget yet, and he has pledged to us that his tax cut will fit within his budget. Frankly, I do not think it will, but even if he moves the numbers enough to make it fit, there is going to be some things that will have to be neglected that I think most Americans want to protect; foremost among those is to protect Social Security and to protect Medicare.

Our seniors and those of us who will soon be seniors deserve the protection of a sound Social Security system, and we need to protect Medicare. Health care costs are going up. Many of the hospitals in my rural district are threatened with closing. I want to protect Medicare because those hospitals depend largely upon Medicare revenues to keep the doors open.

We believe in fiscal responsibility. The Blue Dog Democrats are going to fight for fiscal responsibility, and I am glad to join my colleagues on the floor today to advocate what I think is in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), my friend, one of the leaders of the Blue Dogs, for his fine leadership on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON), one of our new Members.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), it is a pleasure to be here today to talk about the importance of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman that when it comes to this type of issue, I am true to my Scottish heritage when it comes to money, especially the people's money.

I do not like deficits, and I do not like debt. It means that we live within our means. I come from the State of Utah. I feel the way a lot of my constituents feel. We conduct our lives in a way where we live within a budget. We try to face the future in a way where we pay down our debts when we have the opportunity to do so, and we try to plan for the future and invest in the future to make the world a better place for our children.

That is the type of attitude I think we ought to have as we approach this budget issue here in Congress, and that is why I am so proud to be associated with the Blue Dog coalition.

The Blue Dogs was first introduced to me when I was a candidate, and we sat down and we shared our thoughts about budget issues, about our desire to pay down the debt. Issues that make sense to me. Common sense solutions.

The Blue Dogs have a reputation of being up front with people about telling the truth, about trying to cut through a lot of the rhetoric that we have in terms of addressing such important issues. That is why I am proud to be here today with my fellow Blue Dogs to talk about these issues. I think as we look at this issue, it is important that we have the right perspective.

I have learned in my life as a businessman and in my personal life that it is very easy to get caught up in the short term day-to-day pressures and emotions of the moment, and that dominates your perspective. And, yet, we all recognize the benefit of taking a step back and taking the longer view when we make decisions.

We make better decisions when we do that; that same applies to Congress. I think too often we have a short-term perspective here. People look out to the next election when they make decisions.

We should not be driven by the next election. When we are making decisions, we should be looking at the next generation in how we make decisions on these important issues of maintaining fiscal responsibility, that is the perspective that I would like to have brought before this whole House of Congress.

Let us make it clear there will be tax cuts this year. I have certainly campaigned on the notion of tax cuts in terms of addressing the marriage penalty and estate tax issues, and I think there is great support within Congress to pursue that type of tax cut.

As we move forward in this tax cut discussion, I would offer a quick list of five items that should be considered, common sense considerations, that ought to be included in any discussion of these issues.

The first is that let us be up front about the nature of these budget projections. We ought to be skeptical about this. We are talking about a 10-year projection, and what is interesting is over 70 percent of the projected surplus takes place in the second 5 years.

Does it really make sense for us today to make a commitment assuming that is going to happen then? What is the rush to make that decision today? The responsible thing to do is to live within our means, do what we can to try to have our economy grow. And we hope that surplus occurs. We should all do what we can to make that occur, but let us be skeptical about the notion that this surplus is definitely going to happen.

I am a businessman. I have dealt with projections before. When we make projections of the future, the one thing we know, the minute we write it down on the paper is it is probably going to be wrong, so we ought to be cautious and we ought to be smart about that.

But let me talk about a future prediction where we can be certain, that is the second consideration we ought to keep in mind. The second prediction about the future is that we are going to have a whole bunch of baby boomers starting to retire in about 10 years, so wherever the economy goes, we know, in terms of the demographics of our country, we are going do have a lot more people moving into the retirement phase of their lives, and that is going to place far more pressure on Social Security and Medicare.

We have the opportunity now, while times are good, to address that issue. Let us not squander the prosperity we have today with short-term thinking. Let us take that longer view when it comes to Social Security and Medicare.

A third issue I will mention, a consideration we ought to think about as we look at these tax cuts. Most of us have put together a budget in our lives. Those of us in the business world have done that a lot. Everybody has probably done it for their own household, and when we look at a budget, simply stated, you look at money in and you look at money out. You have revenues and you have expenses, and you match them up, and you figure out what makes sense.

Right now we are only looking at half of that equation. How can we, as an institution, make informed decisions about tax cuts which affect the revenue side without also understanding how it fits with projected expenses?

□ 1430

I say that if we are going to behave in a responsible manner, it is important to look at the whole budget before we make decisions.

Fourth, the issue we ought to remember is let us recognize the true cost of any tax cut. The projections we have right now about the surplus are based on nothing happening, on taxes staying the way they are now. If we do have that surplus, the assumptions in these projections are that we are going to pay down our debt. As we pay down the debt, we lower government spending on interest on that debt. If we are going to cut taxes, there is going to be a corresponding increase in government spending because we are not going to be paying down the debt as fast and there is more of an interest expense.

We are going to pursue tax cuts, but as we talk about it, let us be honest. Let us talk about the full cost of any tax cut that we pass in Congress. There is a cost in terms of increased interest because the debt will not be paid down as fast.

A fifth point that is a consideration, as we look at tax cuts is the notion that paying down the debt creates so many benefits, so many benefits in the short term, so many benefits in the long term. We bring down interest rates. That is good. We give ourselves greater flexibility if we remove that as part of government spending. Right now interest is the third highest expenditure of the Federal government behind Social Security and defense. We all like the notion of trying to cut government spending. This is an easy one. All we have to do is show some discipline, pay down our debt and lower expenditures on interest. That makes sense to me.

I think that it is important to have this discussion today as Blue Dogs, but I think it is important to have this discussion with our friends across the aisle. If we can take that longer view and set aside considerations of just the next election, there will be a better opportunity to have some bipartisan consideration and to really affect this in a positive way. We ought to have a bipartisan agreement to be fiscally responsible. I think we share a lot of values on both sides of the aisles. I am convinced that the Blue Dogs are prepared to engage in those discussions.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) for coming. He is obviously going to be a very productive and bright Member of this Congress as we move through these critical times for this Nation.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I want to call on the gentleman from Mississippi who has been a leader on military views, particularly issues which relate to the welfare of our troops, all of our military men and women around the world; and obviously our national defense is maybe the most important role of this Federal Government.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is going to spend some time now talking about the budget, and I am honored to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for this opportunity.

If I were to walk into a town hall meeting and tell the people there that I discovered this magic cure to where our Nation can quit wasting a billion dollars a day, I would think that they would be excited about it.

People always say how about stopping wasteful foreign aid, which is about $13 billion, or why can we not cut back on food stamps which is about $30 billion. A $1 billion a day is $365 billion a year. If I can tell you that I had a way to quit wasting $1 billion a day of your tax money, I think you would be excited about it.

It is that easy. We just pay off the national debt. Each day this Nation squanders $1 billion in interest on the national debt. We did it yesterday, we did it the day before that, and we will do it tomorrow; and by the way, we are going to do it every day for the rest of your life until we pay off the national debt.

With that money do we educate a child, build a road, contribute to national security, fulfill our promise of lifetime health care to our retirees, no. That is why it makes it the most wasteful thing that we do as a Nation, is squandering your tax money in interest on the national debt.

What troubles me in this whole tax cut debate is how many of my colleagues from the Republican party are ignoring the fact that this Nation is $5.7 trillion in debt.

All of us have a tendency to think, well, I am 47 years old so I guess my generation has done my share of that debt because the Nation has been around for a long time. I wish that was true; but it is not. You see, almost all of the debt has occurred since 1980. And I think 1980 is a magical year. I hope we will keep it in mind during this whole debate. People say the Reagan years were a model for prosperity. They cut taxes and revenues went up and everything got better. Not quite true.

Actually during the Reagan administration with a Democratic House and Republican Senate, the debt doubled. All of the debt in the first 200 years of our Nation doubled in those 8 years. It set in motion a series of events which continued to get worse and only got better this last fiscal year when the Nation, for all of the talk of huge surpluses, had a tiny $8 billion surplus after we take into account the trust funds.

One of the things that I fear my Republican colleagues are doing, and I hope I am wrong and I want to give them an opportunity to tell me I am wrong, is misleading the American public as to the true nature of the debt. These are trust funds, and the key word here is trust. People in the military trust that money is set aside to pay for their retirements which adds up to $163 billion. They trust that that money is set aside and will be there to pay for their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, Americans know that a portion of their salary is taken out every month in their Social Security payment; and they trust that that money is being set aside so that when they retire, it will be there to pay their benefits. Americans who have a job also know that they are paying into the Medicare trust fund. Again, they are trusting their Nation to take that money and set it aside so when they get old, and if they get sick, we are going to help them with their medical bills.

Those people who work for our Nation have a trust fund as well. It is called the Federal Employees Retirement System. Again, money is taken out, it is supposed to be set aside so it is there to pay their benefits when they retire.

The net value of all of these trust funds is $2.348 trillion. But let me tell you the bad part. There is not a penny of it anywhere in any bank anywhere in the world. All there is for the $2.348 trillion are a bunch of IOUs. So when my Republican colleagues and our new President talk about all of this money

laying around in Washington, I challenge them to show me where that $2.348 trillion is. It is not there.

And so would you not think that since honesty is going to be the order of the day under this administration, the most honest thing that we could do is pay back the money that we owe them. The military retirees who defended our Nation in places like Vietnam, Korea, Kosovo, Desert Shield, Desert Storm, do you not think that we ought to honor their commitment by paying them back the $163 billion that we owe them?

How about the folks that have paid into Medicare with the assumption that that money is going to be there when they get old. Do you not think that we ought to pay that money back? And it is to date $228 billion that we owe. It is gone. All we have is an IOU.

How about Social Security. Between old age survivor's insurance and the disability under Social Security which you paid into, we owe you $1.66 trillion. How can there be a surplus when we owe you that much money. Their buzz word is it is your money. They are right, and I think we ought to pay it back. I think that is a higher priority than giving some Americans a tax break. The groups that I talk about constitute every American, and the most honest thing that we can do is pay you back.

So let me tell you what has happened in the first 11 days of the Bush administration that troubles me. This publication used to come out at the end of the month for decades. It was called the Monthly Statement of the Public Debt. It was available on the World Wide Web for every American to see on a monthly basis, whether the politicians were paying down the debt or making it bigger. Within 11 days of the Bush administration taking over, what forever was called the Monthly Statement of the Public Debt of the United States was changed to the Monthly Statement of Treasury Securities of the United States.

Now, I have just got a hunch if I were to walk into a restaurant or coffee shop anywhere in America and went up to an unsuspecting couple and said would you like some of the public debt, they would probably tell me, no. That is your problem. But if I went to that same couple and said how would you like some Treasury Securities, they would probably take me up on that deal.

Do you remember the book 1984 where when there was a word they did not like, they came up with a new word to disguise the nature of it and they called it ''news speak.'' Folks, this is news speak. This is an attempt by the Bush administration to mislead the American people as to the true nature of the public debt; and it is wrong. I have written the President. I do not think that he personally did it. I think somebody in his administration did it, but I want him to be aware of it. I think it ought to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time we as a Nation were honest with the American public and paid them back the Social Security that we owe to them; paid them back the Medicare that we owe to them; paid the military retirees the money that we owe to them; and paid the Federal employees the money that we owe to them.

Mr. Speaker, after we fulfill those commitments, then we start looking for new ways to give some American tax breaks.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. You can see that he does his home work. He understands these issues very well, and he has certainly been a leader on the military and budget side as it relates to the Federal debt.

At this time I would like to call on my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) who is a wonderful new member of the Blue Dogs, actually moved out of the blue puppy category into a sophomore.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and my good colleagues on the Blue Dogs Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago when I joined the Blue Dogs, I didn't know exactly what to expect, but I have discovered in the last 2 years that this is an organization of conservative Democrats that are very honest about what they say.

Mr. Speaker, everything that we have heard here today is exactly as it is. One of the great things about being a Blue Dogs member, and there are 33 of us, is that one can rely on the information that one receives. What the American people have been receiving in terms of the speeches that have been made here this afternoon is the truth. If the truth is known to the American people, I think that they will agree what we are talking about in terms of paying down the debt is an important component of this budgetary process and something that we ought to be doing.

Now, I cannot do as well as the other speakers have done so I will not repeat what they have said, but I do want to bring up one point and that is when CBO has made all of these huge projections of what the surpluses are going to be over the next 10 years, they will also tell us in their report that there is a 50 percent chance that they are going to be a hundred billion dollars wrong in the first 5 years. Most people do not realize that. Members of Congress I am sure do not realize that. If you do not take my word for it, go to the Web site. It is www.cbo.gov.

Mr. Speaker, the other projection they talk about is in the following 5 to 10 years there is a 50 percent chance that they will be off at least $250 billion. So we are talking about at least, at a very minimum, of a $350 billion potential swing in these projected budget surpluses. That is why the Blue Dogs have never come up with numbers, they have always come up with percentages. The idea of paying 50 percent of these surpluses down on paying the debt is a realistic approach to this budgetary process that does not lock us in and jeopardize our future in terms of going back to the old days of deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point that there is a huge room for error in these projected surpluses, that we need to be cautious. The most important thing that we can do is pay down the debt in a way that is fiscally responsible and do tax cuts in a way that is fiscally responsible.

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Blue Dogs Coalition, but I would like to be an honorary one today because I think this organization truly is the voice of fiscal responsibility in this institution, and I am so happy that my colleagues are here today with this message.

I have three points. Point one has to do with a story from this weekend. I was talking to a colleague who went to a meeting this past weekend, and he started to talk about the surplus. An older gentleman came up and poked his fingers in my colleague's chest and said, what do you mean by the surplus, you man, and my colleague started to explain it. He said, no, no, no, hold it right there.

□ 1445

As long as we have got a big debt, we have not got a big surplus. And this was not Alan Greenspan talking, but this was a fellow who I think was in touch with the heartland of this country, who understands that with a $5 trillion debt we ought to take care of the deficit first. That gentleman understands that 14 percent of all of his taxes, $14 of every $100 of income taxes he paid last year were wasted, down the black hole. They did not get a teacher, they did not get a soldier or a sailor, but went to pay interest on the Federal debt. That gentleman understood we have to pay a commitment to the public debt.

Second point. All of the numbers, which are essentially a fiscal hallucination about this alleged surplus, talk about this 10-year window of opportunity. But it is real interesting, because guess what happens the day after that 10-year opportunity? We baby boomers start to retire. The baby boom generation, which is going to drive us into a fiscal ditch, starts to retire in year 11, year 12 and year 13. And we know what will happen then: we will go right back down into deficit spending if we do not eliminate this debt first.

It is time for the baby boom generation, which I am a member of, to grow up. It is time for our generation to be fiscally responsible. And I appreciate the Blue Dogs and their request of the new administration. I hope they are serious about bipartisanship. This will be the real test to see whether they engage us, the Blue Dogs, and everybody else in a discussion of what this tax cut ought to be.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for joining with us here on the floor, and we certainly do want to make him an honorary Blue Dog.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to summarize.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to help clarify some other rhetoric that we will be hearing from this floor regarding spending.

I have served in the House of Representatives since 1979. When we look at discretionary spending by the Congress, it has declined by 36 percent from 1978 until the year 2000 as a percent of our gross domestic product. Entitlement spending has gone up 3 percent during that same period. Revenues have gone up 14 percent since that period. Interest rates have gone up 43 percent.

That is why we are emphasizing paying down the debt. Monies spent on interest are the least productive number of dollars that we can spend in this Congress. Money spent on defense, on veterans, on military retirees, on health care, on education, on agriculture are the most productive dollars that we can spend. So long as they are spent prudently and with policies that we can agree to in a bipartisan way, they are the most efficient and the best way to deal with our Nation's problems.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and, in summary, I want to read from the CBO's report that just came out, the summary. It will just take a few seconds here.

The summary starts out this way, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: ''In the absence of significant legislative changes and assuming that the economy follows the path described in this report, the CBO projects that the total surplus will reach $281 billion in 2001. Such surpluses are projected to rise in the future approaching $889 billion in 2011 and accumulating to a $5.6 trillion figure.'' We know over half of that is Social Security. Here is an interesting sentence, Mr. Speaker: ''That total is about $1 trillion higher than the cumulative surplus projected for the 10-year period in CBO's 2000 report, July 2000.''

In 6 months, Mr. Speaker, the projected surplus changed by CBO's own estimates over $1 trillion. And I want to read one more sentence that goes on later in the summary report, Mr. Speaker, and this really should give pause to many of our American citizens:

''Over the long-term, however, budgetary pressures linked to the aging and retirement of the baby boom generation threaten to produce record deficits and unsustainable levels of Federal debt.'' Mr. Speaker, I want to say that again. ''Budgetary pressures linked to the aging and retirement of the baby boom generation threaten to produce record deficits and unsustainable levels of Federal debt.''

I am reading directly from the summary of the CBO report which came out last month.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the indulgence of the House and for the Speaker's courtesy today, as well as my colleagues who came and assisted today.

TAX FAIRNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House today, and I wanted to take a few minutes to talk about not only the accomplishments of this Congress, but also to talk about a major issue of fairness, a fundamental issue of fairness in the Tax Code.

I represent the south side of Chicago. I represent the south suburbs and Cook and Will, Grundy and Kankakee and La Salle Counties. This is a very, very diverse district of city and suburbs and country. The message that I have heard time and time again since I was a candidate for Congress in 1994 the first time, was that folks back home want us to look for solutions to the challenges that we face.

I remember when I was first elected in 1994, we wanted to do some pretty radical things. We wanted to balance the budget, we wanted to reform the welfare system, we wanted to pay off the national debt, we wanted to stop the raid on Social Security and Medicare. We were called radical for having those kind of ideas and that kind of agenda.

I am proud to say in the 6 past years that this Republican Congress has accomplished those very goals. Not only have we balanced the budget 4 years in a row, but we have paid down almost $600 billion of the national debt. And according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, we are projected to see a surplus of extra tax revenue, a tax surplus of almost $5.6 trillion over the next 10 years.

Think about that. Our Federal budget this year is $1.9 trillion, but over the next 10 years we are expected to collect $5.6 trillion in more tax revenue than we are projected to spend. A huge surplus.

I am also proud to say that we did something that our grandparents, many seniors and those who aspire to be seniors have complained about over the years, and that is we stopped the raid on Social Security. Three years ago, this Republican Congress took the initiative and passed legislation which locked away 100 percent of Social Security for Social Security. This past year we did the same for Medicare. And yesterday we did it again for the coming budget year. We passed the Social Security and Medicare lockbox, setting aside 100 percent of the Social Security and Medicare trust fund surpluses for Social Security and Medicare to use those dollars not only to run our current program of Social Security and Medicare, but to set them aside as we modernize those programs to assure that Social Security and Medicare are there for future generations.

When it comes to welfare reform, I am proud to say that we reformed welfare. I remember when I was first elected we had more children living in poverty than ever before in our Nation's history and the highest rates of teenage illegitimacy. Clearly, our Nation's welfare system was failing. We passed welfare reform. Took us three times before we were able to convince the President to sign it into law, but he finally signed it into law in 1996. And since then we have seen our Nation's welfare rolls drop. In fact, in States like Illinois they have been cut in half, with almost 6 million former welfare recipients now on the tax rolls as working taxpayers. Clearly fundamental changes.

Think about it. We have balanced the budget, we have stopped the raid on Social Security, we have stopped the raid on Medicare, we have paid on the national debt $600 billion, and we are on track to eliminate our Nation's debt by the year 2009, and we also reformed and made fundamental changes to our Nation's welfare system.

One of our other priorities, of course, has been the issue of bringing fairness to the Tax Code. Now, I was proud that as a key part of the Contract With America we enacted the child tax credit. In States like Illinois, that meant an extra $3 billion in tax relief that stayed in the pocketbooks of Illinois taxpayers rather than going to Washington to be spent by Washington from that $500-per-child tax credit alone.

But there are other issues in the Tax Code that we need to address that are important to families. I thought Valentine's Day was an appropriate day to raise this issue. It is an issue of fundamental fairness. Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples, husband and wife both in the workforce, pay on average $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married? It just does not seem right, it does not seem fair that if a man and a woman who are both in the workforce decide to get married that they have to pay higher taxes if they make that choice.

The only way today to avoid the marriage tax penalty, if you are still single, is to not get married. And if you are married, the only form you can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is to file for divorce. Well, that is wrong that under our Tax Code married working couples pay higher taxes than identical couples who live together outside of marriage. That is just wrong.

I am proud to say that this Republican Congress has made elimination of the marriage tax penalty a priority, and it is only appropriate that on this

day, on Valentine's Day, that we deliver a valentine to the 25 million married working couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty and let them know that we want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is wrong that married couples should have to pay higher taxes.

I am proud to say that our current President, President Bush, agrees that elimination of the marriage tax penalty needs to be addressed. Unfortunately, the previous President vetoed our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, because last year we sent the Marriage Tax Elimination Act to President Clinton. He vetoed the bill. And of course that means 25 million couples still suffer that penalty.

During the campaign last fall, then-candidate Bush said had he received the bill, had he been President, he would have signed it into law. So we have an opportunity with our new President to work towards our goal of eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Let me explain how the marriage tax penalty works. The marriage tax penalty occurs when a man and a woman, husband and wife, both are in the workforce. When they marry, they file their taxes jointly, which means they combine their incomes, and that usually pushes them into a higher tax bracket.

Let me give an example of a married couple from the district I represent in the south suburbs of Chicago. This is Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. They actually live in a little town called Manhattan, but they are public school teachers in the Joliet area. They have a combined income of about $65,000. They now have a little boy named Ben. When they file their taxes, with their combined income, and after they do the personal exemptions and all the other provisions they have, they pay an average marriage tax penalty of almost $1,400.

And as Shad and Michelle have pointed out to me, for Shad and Michelle Hallihan and for the average married working couple, $1,400 is real money to the folks back home in Illinois. Here in Washington, $1,400 out of a $1.9 trillion budget, it is a drop in the bucket. But for real people and real communities in places like Illinois, $1,400 is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, it is 3 months of day care for the Hallihan family for their little child while they are teaching at school, it is 4,000 diapers for their infant. It is real money for real people.

And people like Shad and Michelle Hallihan and 25 million other married working couples suffer the marriage tax penalty, and unfortunately they continue to suffer the marriage tax penalty because our previous President vetoed our legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I am proud to say today that we announced our plans to reintroduce the Marriage Tax Elimination Act for this Congress, legislation that as of today has over 230 bipartisan cosponsors. Now, I would point out that we need 218 votes to pass a bill; a majority of the House is 218. So a bipartisan majority of the House is cosponsoring our legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

□ 1500

For couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, we would help them by eliminating that marriage tax penalty with the Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

We note that our proposal does a number of things. Number one is, in the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, we essentially wipe out the overwhelming majority of the marriage tax penalty by, number one, broadening the brackets. There are five tax brackets, and we broaden each of them so that married couples, joint filers, can earn twice as much as a single filer in that same tax bracket and stay within each bracket paying the same rate.

That helps those that itemize their tax, couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, that happen to be homeowners.

Second, we double the standard deduction for joint filers twice that for singles. That will help married couples who do not itemize their taxes, usually middle class families, if you own a home, you itemize your taxes, but if you do not itemize your taxes, you use a standard deduction. So we help them, those who could not itemize by doubling the standard deduction.

We recognize the alternative minimum tax has a consequence when you adjust the rate brackets and we make a fix in our legislation that ensures that, even though we are adjusting for the marriage tax penalty, families like Shad and Michelle can continue to qualify for the child tax credit.

And last, for low-income working families who qualify for that earned income tax credit, we adjust the marriage tax penalty there, as well.

In fact, by adjusting the income threshold for married couples by $2,000, we provide for the average family of four eligible for the earned income credit about an extra $400 a year in extra income that they can use by eliminating the marriage tax penalty in the earned income credit, as well.

The bottom line is we wanted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We feel it is fundamentally wrong that you should pay higher taxes just because you are married.

Now, President Bush has stepped forward because he recognizes, and we are very thankful that we have a President who agrees, we need to address the marriage tax penalty. And President Bush has a very balanced approach to cutting taxes. He says, out of a $5.6 trillion surplus that we should take about a fourth of that, $1.6 trillion, and use that to lower taxes, stimulate the economy, and bring fairness to the Tax Code.

The centerpiece of his tax cut, of course, is changing the rates and going from our current five rates to four rates. And of course, in addition to that rate reduction, which he feels is very important, and I agree with him, to stimulate this economy, he also attaches to it a proposal which will help reduce the marriage tax penalty, a second-earner deduction.

Now, that is an important step forward. But I would note that the President's plan provides only about $700 in marriage tax relief; and, of course, the marriage tax penalty on average is $1,400. So his proposal only does about one-half of what we need to do if we really want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

So our hope is that, over the next few weeks, next few months, as we work to move the President's tax proposal through the Congress, particularly as we work to stimulate and revitalize our economy, that we can address the need to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, as well.

I and several members of the Committee on Ways and Means have met with the President. We have also met with the Treasury Secretary, Secretary O'Neill, and other representatives in the administration to talk about the need to do more to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

We believe that really the way we can do more is when we adopt the President's rate reduction plan, which simplifies the Tax Code and lowers taxes for all Americans, that we also adjust the brackets in the President's plan so that we eliminate the marriage tax penalty. And that can be phased in.

In the same way that the President proposes with his rate reduction, we can make the adjustments for the marriage tax penalty, and we believe it should be done at the same time. It only makes sense when you adjust the rates to deal with marriage penalty at the same time.

So, my colleagues, I want to share with you that we feel this should be a bipartisan priority. And I am proud to say that 230 Members of this House are now cosponsors of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

I particularly want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), who is the lead Democratic cosponsor of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act. He and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Ms. CAPITO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS) have taken the lead in working together with us to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We want it to be a bipartisan effort.

There is no reason that Republicans and Democrats cannot work together with the Bush Administration to eliminate the most unfair consequence of our complicated Tax Code, and that is the marriage tax penalty.

My colleagues, we need fast action on the President's tax cut. And here is why I believe it is important that we need fast action.

I have watched the nightly news, just like my neighbors have, over the last

several weeks in the Chicago area. We have seen tens of thousands of our neighbors losing their jobs because of the weak economy that President Bush inherited from his predecessor.

Unfortunately, companies like Montgomery Ward are going out of business. LTV Steel has declared bankruptcy. Lucent and Motorola and Outboard Marine and other companies in the Chicago area are announcing massive layoffs. And those individuals are telling me they are having a hard time finding a new job.

Well, if we want to stimulate the economy, Congress needs to set politics aside and move quickly, move quickly. We need fast action to cut taxes, to put more money in people's pockets, to help families pay their high home heating bills, to help families pay off their credit card bills, to put confidence back in the minds of the decision-makers in business as well as consumers about their future of our economy.

I believe, as we move quickly, not only should we lower taxes for all, but we need to address the need to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I am proud of the way that the President has balanced his tax plan. Because if you look at the President's tax plan, you will note that under his proposal that the biggest beneficiaries are moderate and middle class taxpayers, because they see the greatest proportion of their income returned in tax relief, meaning that moderate, middle income, taxpaying families will have the biggest portion of their income back essentially as a pay raise, an extra few weeks' pay, an extra end-of-the-year bonus that they can use to meet their needs.

I am proud to say he is doing that. And for a family making $50,000 a year, President Bush's proposal would provide an extra $2,000 in higher take-home pay. That is an extra three weeks' pay under the President's plan.

Now, if they are making $40,000 a year, it is about $1,600 more in higher take-home pay because of lower taxes. So that is pretty meaningful if you think about it. And at the end of the day, when his plan is done, higher income Americans will pay a higher proportion of the income tax burden.

So if you are concerned about who gets what and who pays more, low, moderate, middle income families will see a greater proportion of their income back in tax relief and, at the end of the day, wealthier Americans will pay a higher proportion of the overall tax burden. So if that is important for you, it is something to think about.

But for a family making $50,000 a year, a married couple with two kids, they will see an extra $1,600 to $2,000 in higher take-home pay under the President's plan. At the same time we reduce rates for all Americans, we believe that we should eliminate the marriage tax penalty, as well.

We want to help couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers who work hard every day, to ensure that the children of the Joliet-Will County area have a bright future.

We also want families like Shad and Michelle Hallihan to have a bright future as well by ensuring that Shad and Michelle Hallihan get to keep what is theirs. It is wrong that when they chose to get married that they had to pay higher taxes. That is just wrong.

We believe, by adoption of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, we can eliminate the marriage tax penalty, and we want to work with President Bush and Democrats and Republicans, both in the House and the Senate to get the job done this time.

I was so proud last year when we passed the Marriage Tax Elimination Act out of this House and the Senate. It broke the hearts of 25 million married working couples when President Clinton vetoed the bill. But it is a new day. It is a new time of opportunity. We now have a chance to do the right thing, and that is, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

It is important to say that, here on Valentine's Day, what better valentine can we give 25 million married working couples than to eliminate the marriage tax penalty?

Let us work together. We have 230 cosponsors today. Hopefully, we will have more tomorrow.

NEED FOR GOOD MANAGEMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS LONG OVERDUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, with a new administration, it is time that we face up to the lack of management in the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create an Office of Management within the executive office of the President, H.R. 616.

The language of the bill is below and will be part of the RECORD.

The proposal that complements and extends the efforts of recent congresses to focus on one of the greatest challenges facing the Federal Government is seen best this way: finding an effective way to manage the complex collection of Government cabinet departments, independent agencies, and laws and regulations that exist to serve the public and provide for our national security.

Some might argue that this proposal is unnecessary or unimportant. Those arguments are profoundly misguided. The challenge of effectively managing our Government is, in fact, one of the most vital issues before us.

If we hope to solve the long-term problems that threaten Social Security and Medicare, and if we hope to strengthen our social safety net for children and other vulnerable members of our society and if we want to reduce the tax burden on American families, then we must start with a well-managed Federal Government.

As most Members of Congress know, each year we receive reports from the comptroller general of the United States, those excellent reports that billions of tax dollars are lost to waste, fraud, and abuse.

A January 2001 report by the General Accounting Office, which works for the comptroller general, stated the following: ''We have identified inordinate program management risks in major program and mission areas. These range from large benefit payment programs that sustain substantial losses to the earned income tax credit that experiences a high rate of noncompliance.''

In addition to these two programs, the General Accounting Office stated that poor management policies place vital programs such as Medicare, supplemental security income, student financial aid, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's single family mortgage insurance and rental housing assistance at the high risk of waste, fraud, and misuse of the taxpayers' money.

The new GAO report lists 21 programs that remain at high risk of waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement, in addition to the emerging government-wide problem of managing its strategic human capital.

Among the most significant problems, the report cited the Department of Defense's poor financial management. Despite the GAO's recognition of this serious accounting problem, which dates back to 1995, little has changed.

In May of last year, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, which I chaired, found that the Department of Defense still cannot produce auditable financial statements. We started on that on a bipartisan basis back in 1993 and most of us said they will never make it. We were right.

In fact, the Department's Inspector General reported that, in 1999, the Department of Defense had to make bookkeeping adjustments that totaled $7.6 trillion, not million, not billion, we are talking about trillions, $7.6 trillion in order to reconcile its books with the United States Treasury and other sources of financial records.

The GAO's examination of the comptroller general of those adjustments found that at least $2.3 trillion of the adjustments were not supported by documentation, reliable information, or audit trails.

The Department of Defense is not the only agency with such problems. It is just the biggest. The subcommittee's examination of the 1999 financial audit of the Health Care Financing Administration found that the Agency had erroneously paid out an estimated $13.5 billion in its Medicare fee-for-service program. That is roughly 8 percent of the program's $170 billion budget.

As the General Accounting Office testified at a subcommittee hearing on

this subject last year, accounting procedures were so inadequate that no one could even estimate how much of this money was lost to fraud.

These are just two examples of the enormous cost of the Government's poor management, outmoded business practices, and insufficient financial controls.

□ 1515

At another subcommittee hearing on the governmentwide consolidated financial statements last year, the Comptroller General of the United States, David Walker, testified that serious financial management weaknesses also exist at the Internal Revenue Service, the Forest Service, and the Federal Aviation Administration. We have excellent people there as directors, and they are turning a lot of this around.

Commissioner Rossotti at the Internal Revenue Service is an outstanding executive. He came from the private sector, and he has applied some of those theories to one of the largest bureaucracies in the United States.

The same with the forester of the Forest Service; the same with the Federal Aviation Administration. They are working very hard to move those agencies ahead. These weaknesses, said the Comptroller General, place billions of taxpayer dollars at high risk of being lost to waste, fraud, and misuse. There is only one way to find these abuses, and that is to ferret out each wasted dollar, agency by agency, program by program, line by line.

To accomplish this goal, we must make management a clear and unequivocal priority across the entire Federal Government. The General Accounting Office report came to the same conclusion, stating that ''effectively addressing the underlying causes of program management weaknesses offers tremendous opportunities to reduce government costs and improve services.'' Congress must create a corps of management experts who not only have the ability and skill to address wasteful administration and program failures but who also have the power and mandate to force action and produce results.

The Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President was created by President Nixon in 1970 for the various purposes I have outlined. At that time, I supported the creation of that office and adding the ''M'' there and presumably then having a management component with the overworked budget side.

I thought at the time there is a real possibility to use the budget process to get the attention of Cabinet officers and strengthen their interest in management practices. I was absolutely wrong. Every one of my colleagues in the government and the senior service, senior civil service, all of them saw nothing happening. And when I got back here 6 years ago, that is exactly what had happened. For years, management experts whom I respect, inside and outside the government, have said that the ''M'' in OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, does not stand for management. It stands for mirage.

The unpleasant reality is that tying management to the power of the budget process was an excellent theory but one that never worked. The pressures and dynamics of the annual budget process have simply overwhelmed nearly every initiative aimed at improving management. In effect, the fledgling management trees could not survive among the tangled and gnarled limbs of the bureaucratic budgetary forest.

Since serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology for the last 6 years, it has become very clear to me that we can no longer continue on our present course of muddling along, then papering over our fundamental management deficiencies with more tax dollars. This course has left us vulnerable to monetary waste and threatens to disrupt vital government programs that serve millions of Americans.

This very real problem seized my attention in April of 1996, some of my colleagues will remember, on the 2000 date change. Unless corrected, the year 2000 problem, called Y2K, threatened to disrupt government computers when their internal clocks moved from December 31, 1999 to January 1, 2000. The bulky computers of the sixties and seventies had little memory and to save that memory they said, Let us just call it 67, not 1967. At that time no one thought these systems would still be operating by the turn of the century.

As time went on, the concern grew that these computers would misinterpret the year 2000 as the year 1900; and there were some rather humorous but serious matters. In one case, a 104-year-old woman received a school district notice telling her to register for kindergarten and little things like that. But it was a serious problem.

It was grappled with not by OMB, it was grappled with when the President of the United States picked a person that had retired from OMB, brought that person in as assistant to the President. He did a very good job, and we can thank him for getting to it. But it took him a long time, 4 years, to get into this. They should have done it earlier. We would have saved billions of dollars if they had. But they did not. They did not take it seriously.

When I did a survey of the Cabinet back in 1996, there were two that had never heard of it, did not know a thing about it. We had some that did know something about it. But the one agency that was on top of all this was the Social Security Administration. They have long been a very well-run organization. In the sixties when I was on the Senate staff, we saw that every day. It is the type of thing that we should commend and we did.

The other thing was the Federal Highway Administration. They had a first-rate programmer tell them all about it back in 1987, and they just laughed. They said, ''Oh, that isn't possible.'' You would think that would go up the line to the Secretary of Transportation at the time, but the fact was, it did not.

And the Federal Aviation Administration, therefore, did not really have to face up to the problem, and so they had to play catch-up in order to overcome what could have been done beginning in the 1980s. The President procrastinated until February 1998 even though the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the ranking Democrat on my committee, and I had sent him a letter urging him to appoint someone.

Well, he did, 2 years after the letter. But that also lost us time. The President appointed John Koskinen as an assistant to the President and he did pull it together, but it was running right to the last wire to be passed and the last hurdle. Mr. Koskinen served the President as deputy director of OMB for management. You would think something would have happened there. He was there from 1993 until he retired. He is a very good man, but in the OMB nest, it was not the way to run the program. And he knew that. And when you are an assistant to the President, you can get things done. The Cabinet officers start listening to you. Yet Mr. Koskinen's able leadership at OMB frankly did not do anything to solve the problem until he took retirement, the President called him back in, and then he went to work and focused on it.

The year 2000 crisis provides powerful evidence of the need for an Office of Management. The executive branch of our government must have one office that is focused solely on finding, deciphering and solving this type of problem before it occurs, not afterwards. We need one group of management-oriented professionals who are available to monitor and help find solutions to management problems before they become costly burdens to the taxpayers.

Looking back, Franklin Roosevelt had a small group of professionals who were capable of sorting out problems and their long-range implications. They had the ear of the President in that era of the budget. President Harry Truman had such a group, as did President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It went downhill on management after President Eisenhower left office, and more and more it was politicized. Instead of professional civil servants that knew what they were doing, neither Democrats nor Republicans knew what they were doing, and that is not good enough. What we need are professionals that work for the President, and that is the way that agency used to work. Had the year 2000 problem been taken seriously a decade ago, its solution might easily have been integrated into the routine maintenance and modernization of Federal computer systems. Unfortunately, that did not happen; and

we lost probably a few billion. But they do not seem to care about that down there.

In recent years, five major Federal agencies have launched computer modernization efforts that sunk from lofty goals to abject failures. These efforts by the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Defense, the National Weather Service, the Medicare program can be summed up as an ongoing series of repetitive disasters that at the highest possible cost failed to produce useful computer systems needed to serve the public. The Internal Revenue Service finally realized that its project had failed at the $4 billion mark. The FAA, Federal Aviation Administration, had a similar disaster that cost more than $3 billion before they canceled it and realized they were not going in the right direction. Both were costly examples of abysmal management. Another word for it is stupidity.

The American taxpayer deserves a lot more from the executive branch than it has received. The new Bush administration can solve a lot of those management problems which have been very well swept under the rug. We need to get it out from under the rug and deal with it. Three years ago, the General Accounting Office reported that ''these efforts are having serious trouble meeting cost, schedule and/or performance goals. Such problems are all too common in Federal automation projects.''

In short, good management could have saved taxpayers billions of dollars and given the government and its citizens modern, efficient, productive and effective technology. Yes, we need to strengthen the President's staff in the area of information technology, but we have an even greater need to have an integrated approach to management improvement.

The desperate need to improve the government's financial management systems which I have already referred to can be pursued meaningfully only in concert with information technology. In addition, however, many of the failures in upgrading these computer systems can be traced to inadequacies in the procurement process. At present, these three specialized areas of management reside in three independent offices within the Office of Management and Budget. We must remove all of them from the shackles of the budget process and insist that they work together to eliminate further loss of billions of dollars in wasteful and unsuccessful systems development.

Many other management challenges lie ahead. We need an organized and comprehensive governmentwide plan to protect government computers from cyber attacks such as the Melissa and I-Love-You viruses. Over the next few years, the Federal workforce will suffer massive attrition as a large number of workers become eligible to retire. We need an executive branch agencywide strategy to train new workers and retain veteran employees. An Office of Management would produce enormous dividends in these areas simply by early identification of problems such as these and pointing the way toward the most effective solutions.

Mr. Speaker, there are other vital areas that need the same kind of scrutiny and guidance that I believe would flow from an Office of Management. Beginning with the Debt Collection Improvement Act which became law in 1996, Congress has attempted to provide Federal departments and agencies with the tools they need to collect the billions of dollars in debts that these agencies are owed. Yet so far their collection efforts have been sluggish and ineffective. Good financial management practices and systems should be in place throughout the Federal Government. However, recent subcommittee hearings have again shown that too many agencies have neither.

We will have quite a number of hearings this year taking the Comptroller General's little reports on each of these agencies. We would obviously like the appropriations subcommittee to do the same thing and the authorizing committee, but we as the oversight will make sure what the Comptroller General has brought up should be read by every Member of this Chamber, and then we can face up to these problems and do something about it. But Congress cannot do it day to day. That is where the executive branch and the Executive Office of the President is important to have this type of an entity added to it, which is simply moving it around but getting a focus in it, and that is the Office of Management.

Regardless of party, most White House staffers are interested in policy development, not managing policy implementation. Policy involves hope, excitement and media coverage. Management, on the other hand, appears dull and dreary, whether it is program management or financial management. Yet good policies that are not translated by management into action have very little value. Removing the management problems from the current Office of Management and Budget would provide the President with a rational division of labor that would place a new and necessary emphasis on managing what is now unmanageable.

□ 1530

Those who are engaged in budget analysis have different skills and fulfill different roles than those who work in financial and program management.

Since 1993, on a bipartisan basis, this Congress has authorized chief financial officers and chief information officers for each cabinet department and each independent agency. Both management and budget staffs could and should participate in annual budget reviews of the executive branch departments and agencies. Of course they should do that. But they also have to focus to be very effective, and you cannot be diverted, just going to meetings.

We do not need to create a new bureaucracy or require a major reorganization of the executive office of the President. We do, however, need to create a separate office of management, whose director has clear and direct access to the President or the President's Chief of Staff, similar to the President's relationship with the separate Director of Budget, who sits in his cabinet.

If we are to create government-wide accountability, then an office of management is essential. It is long-overdue reform that taxpayers deserve and good government demands. An office of management could work with departments and agencies in measuring the value of program effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, which is the subcommittee I now chair, will have a large agenda this year. We will follow up on all of the reports of the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General of the United States.

We have had hearings on what the States are doing. We have had hearings on what other countries are doing. If Oregon can do it, why cannot the executive branch of the United States do it? If New Zealand can do it, why cannot the executive branch of the United States do it? If Australia can do it, why cannot the executive branch of the United States do it? It just gets down to a question of doing it.

My most famous and fun commencement address that I learned as a university president was when Winston Churchill, the great leader of the free world, was sitting there puffing on his cigar watching the graduates and what they were doing. He got up to the podium and he said, ''Do it,'' and sat down. If commencement speeches were that long, two words, we would have better inspiration for most of the young people of America.

In August of 1910, Theodore Roosevelt spoke to this very issue. He said no matter how honest and decent we are in our private lives, if we do not have the right kind of law and the right kind of administration of the law, we cannot go forward as a Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to go forward. If we are to create government-wide accountability, an office of management is essential. It is a long-overdue reform that taxpayers deserve and good government demands. The office of management could work with departments and agencies in measuring the value of program effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, which I chair, will have a large agenda this year. We will follow it up on just these various points: What Oregon, Australia and New Zealand are doing, why are we not doing? So let us try it.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES of Ohio) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, once again on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus we rise to celebrate Black History Month. As we said yesterday, this is a continuation of presentations from yesterday. Black History Month is an excellent time for reflection, assessment, and planning. A full understanding of our history is a necessary and crucial part of comprehending our present circumstances and crafting our future.

I want to recognize, if she chooses to be recognized once again, the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), let me thank you for leading this celebration series of speeches today. It is important that we at least once a year give notice to the history of the African Americans in this country.

We especially think it is important this year, because we just had a very, very emotional, difficult experience with the past election, and the reason why we are so concerned about that is because we have had several turbulent periods in our history on our voting rights.

As you know, we got them very early; then Reconstruction, we lost a number of people. We have fought and died for our voting rights, and, as I indicated before, as Santayana once said: ''Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.'' We do not want to repeat the history we have had in this country, trying to gain equal respect and equal opportunity for casting votes as citizens in the United States.

So it is indeed important that we bring attention to this issue and plead and pray for a solution. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding to me, and particularly do I thank her for her initiative and leadership in organizing this Black Caucus commemorative on and during Black History Month.

I want to congratulate the good gentlewoman from Ohio for the way in which she has hit the ground running. No grass grows under her feet. Her predecessor, the esteemed gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Stokes, left. We did not know whose feet would be big enough to fill his shoes. I am looking at her feet right now. They may not be big enough, but they certainly are filling them. They are not big enough because she is a lady, and that is not how a lady's feet operate. But this is only one indication of how the gentlewoman from Ohio operates.

Mr. Speaker, it is an important occasion this year, because each year we, of course, come forward, we who are African Americans, and others, to commemorate Black History Month. It may be that we were in danger of having Black History Month become like George Washington's birthday. You do it every year, you know you are doing it because something great and important is being commemorated.

But I must say, this year, all of us I believe have looked at Black History Month as a giant wake-up call for what it truly can mean and must mean in these times. This is no commemoration for African Americans or for America; this is a time for reflection and for action.

I could go down a list of reasons why the country does not need to be in repose on its oldest issue, born as a matter of original sin, race and racism in our country. That ought to be clear, although I fear it is not. Rather, in the limited time I necessarily have, I would like to focus on three reasons why a wake-up call comes this Black History Month: one has to do with how long it has taken us to honor the Father of Black History; second has to do with Florida and its aftermath; third has to do with the most pressing voting rights challenge in our time.

Dr. Carter G. Woodson, only the second black to get a Ph.D. from Harvard, a self-educated man until he went to the University of Chicago and got his masters, started the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

This man, this brilliant and great American historian, almost single-handedly uncovered suppressed African American history and started the process of challenging racist stereotypes throughout American historiography. Yet his house on 9th Street, the house where the association that he started and where he lived, has been boarded up for decades.

I come to the House today to thank the House for passing my bill during Black History Month last year, finally passed by the Senate, which allows the Park Service to do a feasibility study, now under way, to determine whether or not Dr. Carter G. Woodson's house will become a national historic site.

Carter G. Woodson started Negro History Week, which I always celebrated as a child in the segregated schools of the District of Columbia. It has evolved into Black History Month, now commemorated through the history and the world. It is time that we focused in on the man who began it all, began the process of correcting the history that we celebrate this month, the history, through its correction, that led finally to the historic civil rights acts themselves.

Second, the wake-up call comes in no small part because of Florida and its aftermath. We, especially those of us who come out of the civil rights movement, thought that, at least with respect to the great civil rights bills, our work could be said to be, if not done, well on its way. We certainly did not think there were major voting rights problems remaining in this country. We knew there were pockets; we knew of problems.

What we now know is that nationwide there have been systematic violations of people's voting rights forever in this country, and if there had not been a close election, we never would have known it. The results in Florida were beneath the standards of American democracy. The great shame is the court to which we move to the side on political matters decided an election for the first time in American history. That alone must never happen again.

Florida shows us that what African Americans struggled for in the 1965 Voting Rights Act is no longer simply a black problem. There were many more people than blacks who were disenfranchised in Florida. We cannot go back to Florida, but what we can do is not make this year go by without putting in motion the apparatus and the funds to correct the voting rights mechanisms or the election mechanisms in the United States of America. We do need a commission, we do need to study some of the long-range effects, but we need to begin the process of correction before the next election is held.

Finally, let me address what I said was the third great wake-up call, and that is the most pressing voting rights challenge in America today. That, of course, is the absence of congressional voting rights for almost 600,000 American citizens who live in the District of Columbia who have no voting representation on the floor of the House or the floor of the Senate, but on April 15th are expected to pay their Federal income taxes like everybody else.

This is a situation that cannot go on much longer, as we hold our heads high as we preach democracy around the world. Residents of the District of Columbia are not going to let it go on much longer. It has gotten to the point of civil disobedience. I myself testified at a trial yesterday regarding some civil disobedience that occurred here during the last appropriations period.

D.C. residents have been very patient. They do not seek to correct this by civil disobedience, the way we did in the civil rights movement. They seek to use the processes of this House in order to get the voting rights to which they are entitled as American citizens who pay their Federal income taxes every year.

So, for those for whom this month of commemoration has become just that, a commemoration, let me leave you with a notion that the way to commemorate this month is to think of

what is still outstanding on the American agenda that most affects African Americans.

□ 1545

I believe that a small but important matter is making sure that Carter G. Woodson's home becomes a National Historic Site, and I believe that is under way. I come this afternoon to thank the House for what the House has done and what the Senate has done to make that possible.

There is Florida and its aftermath, which I think is only beginning. We will know if we have gotten anywhere by whether or not this year's budget and specific legislation has moved this issue forward this year, not this session but this year.

Finally, on that agenda must be the outstanding issue of taxpaying residents being left without voting rights in the Congress of the United States, and those taxpaying residents do not live in some far-off corner of our country. Those taxpaying residents live right under the nose of the Congress.

In their name, in this month of black history, particularly since the majority of them are African-Americans, I ask that the Congress move forward to grant voting rights in the Congress of the United States to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

For the record, I support voting rights for the District of Columbia, as many of us do, and we are going to continue to work this year in this Congress to see that each of the residents of the District of Columbia have a vote and a voice.

Mr. Speaker, let me just read a quote from the last black to leave Congress back in 1901, George Henry White, from North Carolina. He stood up on this very floor and declared, ''You have excluded us. You have taken away the right to vote, and so I am the last one to leave. This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negro's temporary farewell to the American Congress. But let me say, phoenix-like, he will rise up some day and come again. These parting words are on behalf of an outraged, heartbroken, bruised and bleeding but God-fearing people, a faithful, industrious, loyal people, rising people, full of potential force.''

With that quote, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RUSH). Just like the phoenix rising, he represents one of 37 African-American Members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for her leadership and her outstanding work on behalf of the entire Congressional Black Caucus, and also on behalf of American citizens who are minorities, who are dark-skinned citizens, all across this Nation, as she led the charge on this day and on yesterday to bring before the Congress of the United States the celebration of Black History Month.

Mr. Speaker, for as long as I can remember, Black History Month was a time of joyous celebration as the Nation took note of the accomplishments and achievements of black Americans throughout the history of this Nation, acknowledging their contributions, not only to the upliftment of this Nation, the progress of this Nation, but indeed, to acknowledge their accomplishments and achievements on behalf of nations throughout the world.

Indeed, the world is a better place because of the contributions of black Americans, and we honor and celebrate them during the month of February.

However, Mr. Speaker, this month of February is a month that the celebration is somewhat hollow. We are celebrating with less enthusiasm than we have celebrated past Black History Months. The reason for this is singularly the fact that just a few months ago there was an election for President of the United States, and, Mr. Speaker, that election, in the opinions of a significant number of American citizens, and I would say, indeed, the majority of black American citizens, that election was stolen from the rightful winner.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about a stolen Presidential election and the disenfranchisement of African-American voters during this last election.

As we speak on the floor today, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, on which I serve, is holding a hearing on the television network's coverage of last November's Presidential election. That is a hearing that I also have mixed feelings about because, whereas I understand and appreciate and am also concerned about the fact that the coverage, the network coverage of last November's election, left a lot to be desired, I feel as though that hearing is just tinkering along the edges. It is not really getting to the essence of the issue.

I and the voters of the First Congressional District, along with millions of American voters across the Nation, heard the results of Florida's Presidential balloting announced, then revised, then reversed, then rescinded by the networks.

The impact of those faulty projections and the havoc which they wreaked is still being felt today, not only by the individual who was defeated, Vice President Gore, but also by tens of thousands of American voters who believed then and believe now that their votes in Florida and in many States, like my State, the State of Illinois, were not counted.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent many, many years, and I have spent most of my adult life, fighting to ensure that African-Americans have the right to vote and that their vote be counted. I spent most of my political career fighting a dastard machine in the city of Chicago that moved with adroitness and skill on every election to suppress the African-American vote within the city of Chicago, within the State of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, on election night in Chicago, and also in Cook County, I want to bring it to the attention of the American people that antiquated voting machines in Chicago and Cook County resulted in thousands of African-American voters' ballots being disqualified. Yet, in the rich suburban, Republican collar counties surrounding Cook County, where the population is not primarily minority, there were state-of-the-art voting machines in place which allowed for the smooth disposition of defective ballots, and for citizens to be recorded accurately right then and there.

Can Members believe it, in my State, in the State of Illinois, in Cook County, where a majority of minority citizens are, we had old, antiquated machines, that if in fact a ballot was put or entered into that machine, it was kicked out and that person lost their vote? But just a few miles away, in the Republican part of the State of Illinois, in the collar counties surrounding Cook County, they had up-to-date machines where once the card was entered in that machine, if in fact there was a mistake by the voter, it was immediately rejected and the voter right then and there, at the same time, could correct their mistake and enter that card once again into that machine and their vote would be counted.

So 125,000 African-American and minority voters in the County of Cook were denied their right to vote as a result of this duality of this double standard, of these two different machines, one antiquated, being utilized inside Cook County, and one up-to-date state of the art, being utilized outside of Cook County.

More than 200 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, African-American voters are still today being denied their rights, particularly their right to vote. It is incumbent upon us as Members of Congress to safeguard the rights of African-Americans and all voters, no matter what their race, color, or creed. There are lingering questions, many lingering questions, about this last Presidential election that need to be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon Members of this Congress, Members of the 107th Congress, I call upon the leadership of this Congress, to get to the bottom of why, why did African-Americans and other minorities, why were they denied their right to vote? Why were their votes not counted? Why was there intimidation and harassment, and indeed, in some instances, faulty arrests of African-Americans on their way to the polls?

Why, Mr. Speaker, in the County of Cook, were there two different types of machines, one with faulty equipment, antiquated equipment, and the other

one state-of-the-art equipment? Why were those two different types of machines used in the State of Illinois in a Presidential election?

The American people deserve the right to know that, to know the answer to those questions. African-Americans deserve the right to know the answer to those questions. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we all deserve the right to know the answer to those questions.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much, and I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. Moreover, I thank the gentlewoman for her outstanding leadership in this special order commemorating Black History Month. She has done a marvelous job over these two days, and we certainly appreciate her efforts.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt the gentleman, due to the large amount of people we have coming, I am going to ask my colleagues to try to restrict their comments to 3 to 5 minutes, please, and I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WYNN. Yes, I will be happy to do that. But as I say, the gentlewoman from Ohio has done a magnificent job, and we all appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on the occasion of Black History Month to speak about electoral reform. There was a saying that those who do not learn the lessons of history are destined to repeat them. I want to comment for a few moments about a relatively ugly episode in American history, the disenfranchisement of African-Americans.

Return first to the era known as Jim Crow, an era in which African-Americans were legally and systematically denied the right to vote. They were, in essence, denied democracy. They were denied full citizenship. They were denied the very things that make us proud to be Americans.

Techniques such as poll taxes, literacy tests, requiring African-Americans to recite the Constitution, physical harassment, the denial of jobs for those people who chose or decided they wanted to vote, all of these were mechanisms that were used to systematically disenfranchise African-Americans during this period of our history known as Jim Crow.

In the sixties, and as a result of the civil rights movement, we saw a major mobilization as people of good will of all colors, races, and creeds came together to mobilize against this disenfranchisement and begin the movement known as the voting rights effort.

Unfortunately, in 1964, three such individuals, Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman were killed while working in Mississippi to protect that fundamental aspect of American democracy, the right to vote.

But even more recently, a decade ago in New Jersey, under the thinly-veiled notion of ballot security, a program was instituted to actively discourage African-Americans from voting with physical intimidation and the presence of off-duty law enforcement officers designed to discourage people from voting.

This brings us to the present day and what I would like to call ''the fiasco in Florida.'' Now, there are a lot of people who say to the African-American community, ''You need to get over it. The election is over.'' Let me emphasize that this is not about the Gore campaign. This is not about who won that election, although that is certainly important.

What this is about for the African-American community is that the incidents we saw occurring in Florida recalled the incidents of the Jim Crow era; recalled the incidents surrounding the deaths of Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman; recalled the so-called ballot security programs. So this is not just a matter of who won or who lost, this is a matter of a threat to what we believe are our fundamental rights.

What did we see in Florida? The use of identification requirements to discourage voters, requests for photo identification, which is not required in the law. Suddenly police checkpoints sprung up in African-American communities, discouraging people who might be on their way to vote and then to work.

We found voters turned away, being told they were not in fact registered when in fact they were. College students, eager, enthusiastic about voting for the first time, were turned away. There were allegations that the motor-voter program did not effectively register people. People who in fact had their voter registration card in hand were turned away by election officials.

□ 1600

Of course, as you heard from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), my colleague, faulty detective voting machines were disproportionately located in African American communities. All of these incidents bring to mind a very, very ugly episode in our history, and we are determined not to relive the mistakes of the past. We are determined to, in fact, learn the lessons of history.

To that end, I would say we need to do three things. First, we need to have a full Justice Department investigation of voting rights violations in Florida. That would give the administration an opportunity to truly prove that they want to extend the knowledge base and ensure that everyone has fair access to the voting process.

Second, we need legislation, legislation that would provide money to States so that they can buy modern voting machines and we can have uniform voting technology.

We also need to protect disputed ballots so people who believe they are registered could vote on a temporary basis and have that vote preserved until the legitimacy of their voting status could be determined.

Let me take a brief moment to mention another item that ought to be corrected by this Congress. Individuals who are convicted of crimes, served their sentence and served their parole, ought to have their voting rights restored. They have paid their debt to society.

Our prison system has said they have been rehabilitated, they ought not be denied that fundamental rights to vote.

Mr. Speaker, when I began I said that those who do not learn the lessons of history are destined to repeat them. I think the final lesson we need to learn on the occasion of Black History Month is that continued vigilance is necessary to protect our right to vote. We cannot take it for granted.

We need to register more voters. We need to educate voters as to their rights, and we need to protect the voters who come out and want to vote. We need to protect voting rights. I believe we have learned the lessons of history.

We have been reminded by virtue of what happened in Florida, and I hope as we reflect on the meaning and the history of African American History Month, that we will take to heart these ideas and ensure that never again in America will our citizens of any color be denied the right to vote.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), because it was through his work that we were able to secure the hours to be able to have this Black History Month special order.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for her outstanding work and for yielding to me.

I rise, joining my colleagues, on this day during Black History Month to discuss two critical issues that impact every American citizen, voting rights and the need for reform.

Mr. Speaker, it is one of the great historic truisms that our right to vote, the ultimate expression of the empowerment of the people and the bedrock of our democracy, is also perhaps the most hard-won right accruing to Americans.

The battle to extend the right to vote to every citizen, especially women and African Americans, has shaped much of our Nation's history, and along with the battle to protect the vote has, and continues to, shape and reshape our notions of democracy.

Events in Florida this past November remind us that this is no mere intellectual exercise. Unfortunately, events in Florida during the election reflect the fact that we leave the 20th century facing an assault with great parallels to the events which ushered in the century.

After the Civil War, our Nation witnessed great movement towards democracy. Swept along by a powerful movement for African American equality, Congress passed the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

The movement for equality rapidly grew into a movement to claim a fair share of political representation. Some two dozen African Americans were elected to the Congress, and some 700 African Americans to State legislatures in the South.

The response was a wave of terrorism and oppression followed by a storm of political and legal repression.

One of the most horrific and shameful symbols of that wave of terror came in the summer of 1908, when in the town of Springfield, Illinois, my home State, home to President Abraham Lincoln, America learned of a race riot of mass terror against African Americans which lasted for days and which killed and wounded scores of African Americans and which drove thousands from the city.

Those riots led directly to the founding of the NAACP by W.E.B. DuBois and other brave and far-sighted individuals and to the unfolding of a century of struggle for political and voting rights.

The landmark cases, Smith versus Allwright giving African Americans the right to vote in primary elections in Texas, Thornburgh versus Gingles ruling that redistricting to dilute the voting strength of minorities is illegal, Chisom versus Roemer ruling that the Voting Rights Act applies to the election of Judges, were driven by the unrelenting determination of mass struggles and marches, boycotts, sit-ins and voter registration drives, and by the great political victories including, in the first place, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Second only to the 13th, 14th, 15th, 19th and 24th amendments to the Constitution, no tool has been more powerful in breaking the bonds which denied political representation to African Americans and other minorities, and especially even to women.

The NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the ACLU and a host of peoples' organizations wielded this tool with great effectiveness.

As a result, our democracy was expanded and enriched, our political institutions regained credibility, our government's effectiveness was redoubled.

However, those that thought full equality would come on its own had not fully appreciated the words of Frederick Douglass, when he said that power concedes nothing without struggle.

The 20th Century ended with the beating of Rodney King, the dragging death of James Byrd, the assassination of Ricky Byrdsong, and the 20th Century ended with renewed Supreme Court attacks on affirmative action and voting rights. With cases such as City of Mobile versus Bolden and Shaw versus Reno, the Supreme Court reflecting the political events of the last quarter of the century, began do dismantle generations of hard-won gains in the battle for equality and justice.

Gone were the days of overt racism. In its place was a new paradigm, one which shed crocodile tears for fairness and democracy, all the while ruthlessly ripping at African American voting rights.

It was not long ago that America responded to the demands of protests, wrapped her strong arms around the impervious suffrage movement led by African American leaders and other leaders and relieved trepidation of an abused who longed to take an active role in shaping our democracy.

On August 6, 1965, our Nation matured and took a giant leap forward towards equality. On that day, America witnessed the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This historic act enforced the right that no voting qualification or prerequisites to voting or standard practice or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

This landmark event, among other historical moments in American history, unified our country and together we began building a bond of comradeship and brotherhood. By voting, thousands of citizens began to speak a common language, democracy.

Ironically, this great achievement has been overshadowed by recent developments. According to the NAACP, despite a record level voter turnout among African Americans during the November 7 general election, black voters were confronted with a multitude of nonuniform election practices which impeded their ability to vote.

So when a private company, ChoicePoint, gave Florida officials a list with the names of 8,000 ex-felons to scrub from their voting lists, and it turned out that none on the list were felons, that is a new and deadly threat to democracy.

It makes no difference that the source of the list was the State of Texas. It makes no difference that Florida officials made an attempt to restore some of those purged. It makes no difference that the company dismissed the error as a minor glitch, less than 1/10 of 1 percent of the electorate.

The fact is that 8,000 votes is some 15 times the margin of victory in Florida, a margin which determined the Presidency of the United States. The fact is that in Hillsborough County, Florida, the number of African Americans on the list of felons was 54 percent while African Americans make up only 11.6 percent of Hillsborough's voting population.

The fact is that ChoicePoint is only a small part of a system which denies African Americans the right to vote and to have their vote counted in Florida, a system which includes, according to suit filed by the NAACP, arbitrary and racially disparate adverse impact on the electoral systems, racial disparity in election administration, wrongful purging of eligibility voters, failure to timely and correctly process voter registrations, improper procedures for change of residence and unequal access to the inactive list.

And so you see, Mr. Speaker, what happened in Florida is a mirror of what is happening all over America. Now is the time for America to say, not only will we renew the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but we will be serious in our efforts to make sure that each and every American, no matter where they live, no matter what their race, creed, ethnic origin, background, income status, they will have the right to participate effectively in the making of decisions in this great democracy, anything less than that makes a mockery of our understanding of what democracy really is.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from the State of North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman (Mrs. JONES) for yielding to me, and I thank her for the leadership and making time available so that members of the Congressional Black Caucus can have this opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, and it is also very appropriate during Black History Month, for us to reflect upon and recall the struggles this Nation has experienced in our continuing quest to ensure that all our citizens are able to freely exercise their fundamental act of citizenship, voting.

In 1776, our Nation's founders made a remarkable beginning of a struggle to establish a more perfect union, a union which the government derived its power from the consent of the government. Our founders correctly, albeit, with some elitism, established voting as a foundation of our democratic republic. Voting was a process by which the will of the people would be expressed.

At first, the only people that mattered, those who enjoyed the privilege of voting, were white men who owned property. Through painful, sometimes bloody, often deadly struggles and sacrifices of many American heroes, the shackles of racial and gender discrimination have been shaken off. It is fitting that we take time to pause and to recall and to honor those great Americans and their contributions to our Nation, a Nation that shines like a beacon to other people around the world who also yearn to be free.

Mr. Speaker, after the Civil War, the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation and passage of series of amendments to the United States Constitution, the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments, African Americans, former

slaves and sons of former slaves no longer were excluded from the great American experiment of self government. As a result, black men were elected to public office, especially in the South, in large numbers.

Women continued to be excluded from voting until the passage years later of the 19th amendment. In South Carolina, the State legislature had a black majority; in North Carolina, at least four Afro-Americans served in Congress before the turn of the century, including Mr. John Hyman, Mr. James O'Hara, Henry Cheatham and George H. White.

Then, the forces of hate, nullification and bigotry surged and our Nation entered the awful period called Jim Crowism, a period in which some whites, with the tacit or overt support of others, exerted power through a combination of terrorism, economic oppression and legalized separation of the races.

The terrorism included bombings of homes and churches, jailing of black men for minor, often presumed violence violations of law, beatings and lynchings. For years, African Americans were beaten and jailed for trying to register and to vote.

□ 1615

Foreign visitors commented about the strange fruit seen in the trees in many southern communities, the barriers imposed to black voter participation were widespread and severe. The barriers also included poll taxes and literacy tests, often given by white people who, themselves, could not read.

The struggle to overcome this horrible chapter of American history brought us to the modern civil rights effort of Thurgood Marshall, the architect of the litigation strategies of the NAACP; and Dr. Martin Luther King, who directed SCLC which, along with young John Lewis, now a Member of Congress; and many other individuals in the organization led protests and demonstrations to end racial discrimination that excluded African Americans from getting service at hotels and restaurants, from attending public schools with white children, from living in certain neighborhoods, from being considered for employment and college admissions, and most fundamentally, from registering to vote.

In 1957, Congress passed a Civil Rights Act that made it a Federal crime to interfere with a citizen's right to vote, and created the Civil Rights Commission to investigate violations of the law.

White politicians and white supremist groups intensified their resolve to prevent blacks from voting. Black applicants seeking to register to vote were made to wait for hours, voter registration places were open for very limited times and often suddenly closed when blacks tried to register, and their applications were lost or discarded.

Before the Voting Rights Act was passed 35 years ago, there were five African Americans in Congress. Today, there are 40. The important role of Federal enforcement of voting rights is clear. The recent voting irregularities in Florida and other States serve as a painful reminder of the need for a Federal presence and effective enforcement remedies as a safeguard against unfair, discriminatory State action.

We cannot go back, Mr. Speaker, to the period of disenfranchisement of segments of our population. This Nation paid a dear price for that, in broken lives and deferred dreams of generations of African Americans. We paid in the form of loss of national credibility and moral standing in the eyes of the world. We paid in the form of lost opportunities to achieve our national quest for a more perfect union, one nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

We must learn from the lessons of history and take seriously the challenges presented by the recent Florida elections disaster. We must move forward to heal the Nation and to fix the problems in our voting procedures and machinery.

Congressman George White from North Carolina spoke from the floor in 1900. He knew he could not be reelected because of unfair voting practices taking place all across the country, including North Carolina. He was the last African-American Member of Congress during the Reconstruction era. Like a voice from the wilderness, he called on the Congress to pass legislation that would prohibit lynching. Congress refused to act. Congressman White told his colleagues that he was leaving the Congress but that African Americans, like a phoenix, would rise again and return to the Halls of Congress. Years passed before Mr. Oscar DePriest, from Illinois, was elected in 1928. Nearly a century passed before the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and I, in 1992, were elected to succeed George White from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are those who cannot appreciate the depth and pain of the deprivation suffered by many of our citizens for so many years, they must recognize the contradiction between our ideals, that all of our citizens' votes count in a democracy, and our tarnished history, years of unjust, legalized exclusion from voting of certain segments of our population.

We must work together, both Democrats and Republicans, black and white, Hispanic, Asian and Native Americans, to protect and promote voting and to ensure that all votes are indeed counted. Our government must be elected by the people for the people.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the spirit of the many great men and women we honor each year during black history month, I rise today to join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in calling for meaningful election reform that will ensure the voting rights of all Americans.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for her leadership on this matter and for scheduling this special order at this time.

We as Americans cannot afford to allow a repeat of what transpired during the last Presidential election. Although our Constitution guarantees every citizen the right to vote, what we witnessed last November was an electoral system so flawed and outdated that it caused the disenfranchisement of thousands, if not millions of eligible voters across our country.

The essence of our constitutional freedom itself is founded on the inalienable right of every eligible American citizen to cast his or her vote without obstruction or intimidation.

When this right is denied, whether by design or simple neglect, democracy itself suffers. Like Florida, in my own district in St. Louis, Missouri, thousands of citizens were turned away from the polls and denied their right to vote. The result of a failing system that was ill prepared to deal with the large voter turnout.

Such a situation cannot and must not be tolerated. That is why it is incumbent on those of us in Congress to work together to ensure that every eligible citizen in our country be afforded the unobstructed right to vote. And just as important, every vote cast also must be counted.

To do this, we must modernize our Nation's failing electoral system by creating one that is accurate, efficient, and tamper proof. To do any less, we risk forfeiting the rights and protections guaranteed to all Americans by law.

We must not allow partisan differences to prevent us from resolving the critical problem, and the public demands that we do not. Because if the people do not have confidence in the electoral process, how can we expect them to have faith in our government?

I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) very much for this opportunity to participate in the special order.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I might welcome the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNUM), it is a delight.

I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her kindness, and I am gratified that we have been allowed this time in our Nation's history to be able to recount the many contributions of Americans.

And I stand before you today to emphasize the word ''Americans'' in America, for I might think that there may be those who may be listening who may have some consternation or some difficulty with Members of the United States Congress rising to the floor, to be able to emphasize both our

difference and our commonality. The common core that joins us together is that we are Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I salute in this month the many heroes and leaders and activists and spokespersons and quiet people who, in their own way, have offered to contribute to the fundamental right of the right to vote. February happens to be the month we commemorate the contributions of African Americans to this great Nation, but it also gives us a time in 2001 to be able to reflect upon a journey that none of us thought that we would travel and that is a time that sunshine shown very brightly on a Democratic system frankly that is broken.

So I rise today to recount for those whose memories may have faded, Birmingham and Selma and Montgomery, North Carolina and South Carolina, Georgia and Mississippi and Texas and names like Martin King and Rosa Parks and Josiah Williams and Andy Young; but yes, those names that are yet not recorded, names of thousands upon thousands of young college students from all walks of life, all religions and races and creeds, that walked in the sixties to be able to reestablish the fundamental right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was important, and I want to thank the Congresswoman from Ohio and the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, that you hear us emphasize the need for refocusing on the right to vote. For you to understand that it was not easily secured, either by women, either by those who were without property, or either by those who look first and came first to this Nation in the bottom of the belly of a slave boat.

The real focus of the right to vote sort of jelled in the late 1950s and early 1960s as one began to expand this whole concept of civil rights. We all know about Rosa Parks. We pay tribute to her; and the concept of her movement was about accommodation and riding on buses and being able to eat in restaurants and hotels. It was the simple dignity of being able to use your money as any other American citizen.

But as we moved into the 1960s and as Martin King laid out the agenda for us in his 1963 ''I Have a Dream,'' he began to realize that the political empowerment of a people was crucial to take one's role and one's right. And so we began to move after 1963 to emphasize over and over the right to vote. That right to vote bore fruit in 1964 in the Civil Rights Act and in the 1965 Voter Rights Act that said no one should be discriminated against in the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, yet after signing that legislation, constantly throughout the decade of the 1960s and 1970s and 1980s and 1990s, we have found instances where: One, there has been voter intimidation. Two, votes have been thrown out. Three, minorities have lost elections for a variety of infractions that never rose to the level of national concern.

And yet in this election in 2001, although we recognize that it is finished, I believe the ultimate fact that a decision had to be made at the Supreme Court level of the United States, that people felt that they were turned away from the polls, that young college students who were dutifully registered to vote whose names were not on the polling list and who were then instructed to be turned away because there was not enough knowledge to know that you could affirm and testify to the fact that you had registered, there is need for electoral reform.

We should not let the tragedies of Montgomery, of Selma, and all that went before go on any further without solving the problem of allowing one vote, one person. The history of this Nation is embedded in the fact that each voice should be counted, but all too often people do not vote. People are disenfranchised, frightened, or turned away or their votes are not counted.

So in tribute to African American History Month, I believe the tribute should be forthright and forward-going. It should be a recommitment that, in fact, we will allow no intimidating force to ever keep us away from voting. We will answer the question of racial profiling. We will answer the question of blockades at polls. We will answer the question of antiquated voting equipment in certain areas of our community. We will lift up the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which reinforces the opportunity for people to be represented by people who will represent them in the best way.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that our Declaration of Independence says it all. We all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In the pursuit of such liberty, it is imperative that our vote is counted. As we proceed to improve on the voting system, let it be in tribute to all of those who marched, who sung, who spoke, who lost their lives, all Americans with particular emphasis and tribute on African Americans who did not have the ultimate right to vote in the 1960s.

Mr. Speaker, let this African American History Month be a tribute of going forward, never to repeat again the days of Florida and the days of this last election where anyone, no matter who you are, new citizen or not, failed to vote because someone closed the door in your face.

□ 1630

There is much that I could say, and as my colleague well knows, when we are moved to speak on these issues, we are moved to speak. But I would only say that the Constitution charges us with the importance of ensuring that everyone has a right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm and appreciation that I join my colleagues of the House in recognition of Black History Month.

It is ironic that we are celebrating the first Black History Month of the new millennium, yet we must make so much more progress, my friends. The disenfranchisement of thousands of African American voters, along with countless others who's votes were not counted, opened many wounds in the recent election.

After the heated battles of the Civil Rights movement and the sacrifices of Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, as well as countless others, including the four little girls who were killed at the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama, I believed that we had indeed made progress. Today, African Americans know that we have not yet overcome the weight of not being treated as full citizens of this great nation.

The seminal catalyst for voting rights was reflected by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. when he began a peaceful and historic march for black voting rights from Selma, Alabama on March 7, 1965.

When the peaceful marchers attempted to leave Selma they were beaten by law enforcement officers as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Two weeks later, under the protection of the Alabama National Guard, Dr. King was able to lead the march successfully, and in August of that same year President Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This was a civil rights victory because African Americans understood all too well the barriers to suffrage.

Today, I must say that history does and can repeat itself, if we are not vigilant. We have not been vigilant enough in keeping the spirit of the United States Constitution alive. We have not been vigilant in ensuring that every American has the right to freely exercise their franchise. We have not been vigilant in keeping a watchful eye on those who administer elections at the local, state, and national level.

We know that the hands of justice for black people in this country moves slowly all too often. After all, it was only last summer that men were indicted to face trial in the nearly forty year-old murders of African American girls who were killed one Sunday morning by a bomb while they participated in services at the 16th Street Baptist Church. This terrible act galvanized the civil rights movement and began a call for justice, which may at last be answered in a court of law as two Ku Klux Klansmen in Alabama's Jefferson County are finally being brought to justice for the 1963 bombing.

I am here to say that we as a nation cannot wait forty years to get our election system right. We are on a clock and it is fast approaching the mid-term elections in 2002 and the next Presidential Election Day in 2004. We must learn from the mistakes made and empower African Americans so every vote counts.

It is our nation's credo that all men, the human species both male and female, are equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. We as a nation was founded on the premise that to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, which is expressed by our nation's founders in the Constitution of the United States. Thomas Paine's work titled the ''Rights of Man,'' ably wrote ''[T]hat men mean distinct and separate things when they speak of constitutions and of governments . . . A constitution is not the act of a government, but of a

people constituting a government without a constitution, is power without a right.''

The people of this nation at its inception said, ''We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.''

It is understood that the preamble to the Constitution of the United States is not a source of power for any department of the Federal Government, however, the Supreme Court has often referred to it as evidence of the origin, scope, and purpose of the Constitution. In Jacobson v. Massachusetts (1905), Justice Harlan wrote ''Although that preamble indicates the general purposes for which the people ordained and established the Constitution, it has never been regarded as the source of any substantive power conferred on the government of the United States, or on any of its departments. Such powers embrace only those expressly granted in the body of the Constitution, and such as may be implied from those so granted.''

Our Constitution, like all constitutions, is the property of a nation, and not of those who exercise the government. It is our belief, as Americans, that this democracy was and continues under the direct authority of the people of this nation.

All power exercised over a nation, must have some beginning. In America, the beginning of power is found in the Constitution, but in the history of mankind power has found two sources where it may either be delegated or assumed. There are no other sources of power other than the consent of the governed. All delegated power is trust, and all assumed power is usurpation. Time does not alter the truth or veracity of this statement. It only makes its truth clearer to those who can see and to those who learn the enlightened history of this great nation.

Our Constitution grants separately the power to legislate, to execute, and to adjudicate, and it provides throughout the document the means to accomplish those ends in a manner that would allow each of the branches of government to avoid ''blandishments and incursions of the others.'' The beauty of this document is its goal, which was to frame a system of federal government by conferring sufficient power to govern while withholding the ability to abridge the liberties of the governed. To this reason, I share Henry David Thoreau's view that ''Government does not keep the country free.'' Mr. Speaker, we as citizens must do our part in preserving the fundamental freedoms of our country.

The longstanding theory of elaborated and implemented constitutional power is grounded on several principles chief of which are: the conception that each branch performs unique and identifiable functions that are appropriate to each; and the limitation of the personnel of each branch to that branch, so that no one person or group should be able to serve in more than one branch simultaneously.

Thomas Paine argued that Government is not a trade which any man or body of men has a right to set up and exercise for his own emolument, but is altogether a trust, in right of those by whom that trust is delegated, and by who it is always resumable.

Unfortunately, evidence from the resolution of the election reveals that a breach of trust has occurred. The United States Supreme Court, sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, did not act as one might have expected. I share the disappointment of millions of Americans with the Court handling of Bush v. Gore. The unfortunate aspect of politics was meshed with the law in a way that erodes the public's confidence in our judicial system. Now, the Court must repair any institutional damage done.

The Supreme Court has more cases presented than it can possibly review and for this reason has over time applied two rules to judge the appropriateness of review the Standing Doctrine and the Ripeness Doctrine.

Standing is composed of both constitutional and prudential restraints on the power of the federal courts to render decisions. In Valley Forge Christian College v. Americans United (1982), Justice Rehnquist wrote that ''The exercise of judicial power under Art. III is restricted to litigants who can show ''injury in fact'' resulting from the action that they seek to have the court adjudicate. The Doctrine of ''standing'' has a core constitutional component that a plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief. The concepts of standing present questions that must be answered by reference to the Art. III notion that federal courts may exercise power only in the last resort and as a necessity, and only when adjudication is consistent with a system of separated powers and the dispute is one traditionally thought to be capable of resolution through the judicial process.

The case brought before the Court in Bush v. Gore did not establish the fine points of standing because no injury had been incurred by then Governor Bush. It was only the presumption of impending injury that prompted the court's action. The Court's decision had the real impact of stopping the counting of votes in the State of Florida, a decision that had a direct effect on the outcome of the election.

Just as the question of standing has importance in the life of judicial review, so does the Ripeness Doctrine, which defines when a case may be brought before the Supreme Court for review. In the case of United Public Workers v. Mitchell, the Court declared that it could not rule in the matter because the plaintiffs ''were not threatened with actual interference with their interest,'' there was only a potential threat of interference of their interest. The Court viewed the threat hypothetical and not ripe for review by a court of law.

In a dissenting view in Bush v. Gore by Justice Stevens joined by Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer argued that the ripeness issue presented to the Court had already been assigned to the States by the Constitution. Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution defines that each state shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled for the purpose of choosing the President and Vice President of the United States.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny that all voters do not use the same method of voting. The condition of the Florida election was the fruit of this disparity in that the variations in the methods voting lead to different methods of tallying votes and different success or failure rates in the accuracy of those tallies. The more modern pencil mark to fill an oval on a paper ballot that is feed into a computer to tally votes was found to only hold a three percent error rate while the punch card method of tallying votes had a fifteen percent error rate.

It is clear that the injured party in this matter are the voters of Florida who had to suffer through the biased actions of a Secretary of State who campaigned for then Governor Bush. The voters struggled to be heard in the face of repeated challenges and disruptions designed to end an orderly process of discerning voter intent when the machine failed in that determination. Let us remember today that a constitution is the property of a nation, and not of those who exercise the government. All the constitutions of America are declared to be established on behalf of the authority of the people.

For this reason I introduced H.R. 60, the Secure Democracy for All Americans Act, which would create a commission to address all of the problems associated with last year's election. We can do better Mr. Speaker.

The result of this infamous decision is that African Americans were shunned by the country where we were enslaved and died for our nation on the battlefields. I do remember the cries from Republicans and Democrats after it was learned that military service men and women votes cast by absentee ballot were under threat of not being counted, because I joined them in that outrage. The cry that we should not disenfranchise these Americans was shared by all who appreciate their dedication and service to our nation. My pain was at the lack of concern that those who were veterans of past conflicts were not given the same level of concern that their votes not go uncounted because they resided in Palm Beach County, and Miami County Florida.

We can and will do better if we adopt electoral reform that enable all Americans to have their vote counted. We can accomplish that in a bipartisan way, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas.

I now call on my colleague, the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for her leadership and for bringing us all together to celebrate Black History Month over the last couple of days.

As we celebrate Black History Month, we are reminded that the struggle continues in our country for equality and justice for all. The recent Presidential election reminded us that voting rights, the very essence of our democracy, must be protected and enforced. Many African Americans discovered that equality and justice did not apply to them. America has unfortunately repeated a very sad chapter in our history, and we must never repeat it again.

African Americans had to wait almost 100 years after the formal birth of our country to receive the right to vote. One of the major turning points came after the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. Less than 3 years later,

the 13th amendment was ratified ending slavery. In 1870, the 15th amendment was ratified stating that the right to vote could not be denied in this country based on race, color or previous conditions of servitude. Many blacks were elected to Congress, two to the Senate from Mississippi, Hiram Revels and Blanche Bruce, and 20 Congressmen.

Just as the black community began to enjoy some newfound political freedoms in the post-Civil War era, most of their legal rights diminished after the Presidential election of 1876. The Democratic candidate, Samuel Tilden, won the popular vote and only needed one additional electoral vote to win the Presidency. However, his opponent, Rutherford Hayes, made a deal with the Democratic Party and the white-controlled South to remove Union troops from the South, which meant the end of enforcement of black rights in that part of the country, including the right to vote.

Hayes won the election and millions of blacks lost the new rights that they barely had time to appreciate as the South ushered in the period of Jim Crow. 120 years later, in the 2000 Presidential election, one candidate won the popular vote and another won the electoral vote. Many African Americans reported numerous problems trying to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

Just as in the 1876 election, Florida was one of the States at the center of the voting controversy. In a county in Florida a police check was set up which intimidated voters. Others reported that they were told that they were purged from the voting polls, even though they were indeed registered to vote and had their voting cards with them. Still others were told they could not vote because they were felons, when in fact they were not. Voting irregularities occurred outside of Florida as well, and so the 2000 elections showed us that the need to still be vigilant about this very important right remains.

Many men and women died for the right to vote. This is part of black history, it is a part of American history. We will not take the hard-fought right to vote for granted. African Americans had to wait almost 200 years for the full legal and enforced right to vote in this Nation. We will not see those rights taken away.

In closing, let me just say to my colleagues and to all here today that we want to remember and to thank the Congressional Black Caucus for this Special Order because it is so important that we focus on Black History Month and remember the long hard battles many African Americans and other Americans have fought for basic civil rights in our country. We should learn from our history so that we are not doomed to repeat some of the major miscarriages of justice.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on and to include therein extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to take my last minute to wrap up.

This has been a great pleasure for the past 2 days to have an opportunity to host a Special Order for Black History Month. We decided this year to focus specifically on the whole issue of voter reform and the history of voter disenfranchisement that has occurred in this country.

If I have 30 seconds left, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much. I would like to share with her how appreciative I am for the time that she has taken to organize this Special Order for the Congressional Black Caucus and others who wanted to participate.

We did focus on election reform. It is extremely important. We have a very rich history in this country of making sure we correct the wrongs and we open up this country to participation by all of those who would wish to participate in this democracy. When we see a problem, we move to correct it. This focus today on election reform is about that.

We will be working to make sure we correct the problems in the system.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, not only during Black History Month but appropriately, as we continue to celebrate Black History Month for 2001, the Congressional Black Caucus is using this time and the voice that is afforded to us as members of this body to come before the country and its leaders to re-issue our call to reform the election system.

The Presidential election of 2000 will be remembered by many of our citizens for not living up to the promise of ''Democracy for all''. It is therefore clear that our election system must be fixed as it relates to the election of the President—but equally important, to ensure that all Americans are afforded their right to use.

Last November, many Americans, especially African-Americans, either saw their legally cast votes not counted or encountered a mired of obstacles that prevented them from being able to vote.

What occurred in the state of Florida last November, as well as in many other places in our country and which has occurred in election after election—must never be allowed to occur again.

According to the NAACP, irregularities ranging from the ridiculous—such as calls being made to primarily Black and Hispanic communities suggesting that the NAACP was calling to urge people to vote for President Bush—to specific complaints, from the time the polls were opened until they were closed, about police stops, actual polling places being moved, or the young and old being told that they weren't registered to vote when clearly they were.

We in the CBC will live up to our reputation as the ''conscious of the Congress'' and ''the fairness cops'' of the nation.

Tomorrow, Democrats will announce the creation of a Special Committee on Election Reform to investigate all the flaws plaguing our system and take swift action by submitting recommendations to Congress on how to fix the election process. In this vein we must: modernize the machinery of voting and provide better training for poll workers and voter education; enforce the National Voter Registration Act and the Voting Rights Act to ensure that more Americans have greater access to democracy; explore structural reforms like expanded time for voting, uniform poll closing times and easier access to voter registration; and provide models of election systems that work and promote these best practices.

We pledge to do all that we can to move forward swiftly and pass the best and most relevant recommendations into law soon.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, as we focus on the election reform we must not lose sight of the fact that equal justice includes struggling for voting rights. To this end, the lack of voting rights for my constituents and those of my colleagues from the other U.S. Territories and Commonwealths must also be addressed. The fact we are not allowed to directly participate in the choice of who will be our Commander-in-Chief is fundamentally undemocratic. The people who live in the Territories are Americans in every respect except, that by virtue of where they live, they don't get to vote for President or to have voting representation in the Congress.

We should be ashamed, that as the only remaining superpower in the world and the biggest promoter of democracy abroad, that we afford citizens in our territories less voting rights that Canada—our neighbor to the north—provides to their citizens in the Yukon Territory or than France does to the citizens in their remaining overseas territories.

And so, in the spirit and goal of Black History Month, I am committed to working with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to urge Congress as a whole, as well as President Bush, to expeditiously come-up with and put in place the critically needed election reforms that will be developed by the Special Committee on Election Reform of the Democratic Caucus and by this Caucus, including providing voting rights to the people of the Territories.

In closing, I want to commend my colleague, STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, for organizing this Special Order tonight.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, seventy-five years ago, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, a noted African American historian and scholar, founded Negro History Week. He wanted to create an occasion for African Americans to remember, honor and celebrate the accomplishments and achievements of their ancestry.

As I stand before you on this diamond anniversary, all that I can say is—what a great tradition this has become.

African American Heritage month is important because it provides an opportunity for all American families and communities to come together and reflect upon the contributions African Americans have made to this great country.

Earlier this week, I invited one of my colleagues and close friends—Congressman

HAROLD FORD, Jr. of Tennessee to join me at my 2nd annual African American Heritage Month Celebration.

This year's celebration was dedicated to African American Economic Development and empowerment in the New Millennium.

Everyone who attended the event that evening had a good time. Each year, I enjoy celebrating this great tradition and look forward to it.

African Americans have such a rich heritage and culture. Neither my district, the Seventh Congressional District of New York nor this country would be what it is today without the rich contributions of African American heritage and culture. I am proud to say that I represent the district that both Louis Armstrong and Malcolm X lived until the very last days of their lives.

In the aftermath of the 2000 Presidential election, many African Americans throughout this country find themselves engaged in another struggle.

While the civil right's movement ended some time ago the struggle for equal justice and equality still continues.

After this past election, too many people of color felt that the votes they casted were not counted.

Some even felt that there was an organized effort to disenfranchise their votes and keep them from the polls.

The problems of this past election are far too reminiscent of the problems African Americans had to face prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965.

So while we celebrate, we must remember that the fight for equal rights, justice and equality must continue.

I believe that all leaders, regardless of their party affiliation, race, religion or creed must do all that they can to ensure all Americans are protected under the laws of this great nation.

As I stand before you here this afternoon, I pledge to do all that I can to ensure that these rights are protected for African Americans and all Americans regardless of their race, religion or creed.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, especially Representative TUBBS JONES for allowing me this time this afternoon.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Black History Month with my colleagues. As we approach the 45th Anniversary of the arrests in which many of Montgomery's African American leaders, including the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., were indicted, tried, and convicted under an old law prohibiting boycotts, it is important for us to remember that the quest for civil rights is an ongoing journey.

The Montgomery Bus Boycott officially began on December 1, 1955, when Rosa Parks, a seamstress and civil rights activist, was arrested for disobeying a city law that required blacks to give up their seats when white people wished to sit in those seats or in the same row. After this arrest, a chain of events unfolded that had an undeniable impact on American society.

African-American community leaders quickly urged all blacks to stay off the city buses on the day that Parks' case was due in court. Dr. King later wrote, ''a miracle had taken place'' when all the buses in Montgomery were empty the following morning.

Capitalizing on the boycott's initial success, local ministers and civil rights leaders met to organize themselves as the Montgomery Improvement Association. As important as the founding of the organization itself, the group elected King as president, and the group quickly moved on a unanimous vote to continue the boycott indefinitely.

Bus boycotts had been held before for short periods of time in other Southern cities, so local authorities were not expecting the Montgomery boycott to last very long. However, the resolve shown by the community was extraordinary. The Montgomery Improvement Association even organized a ''private taxi'' plan, under which blacks who owned cars picked up and dropped off blacks who needed rides at various points throughout the city.

Maintaining the boycott was not easy. Local leaders had their homes bombed, and private taxi drivers were arrested on trumped up traffic charges. Each day that it continued, attempts were made to break the boycott, which had hurt downtown businesses considerably.

In court, black residents of Montgomery pushed hard for complete integration of the city's buses. Because the Brown versus Board of Education decision said that the ''separate but equal'' doctrine had no place in public education, Montgomery's residents argued that the doctrine had no place in any public facilities. On November 13, 1956, the United States Supreme Court declared bus segregation unconstitutional. Montgomery's black residents returned to the buses after the Supreme Court mandate had been enacted in December of that same year—a full 382 days after the protests began.

Trying to put the Montgomery boycott into perspective is not an easy task, but I would argue that there are three key points to be made when discussing its legacy. First, the ascension of Dr. Martin Luther King as a leader is of the utmost importance. The boycott gave Dr. King a leadership position within the national movement, and he quickly became an international symbol of tolerance who worked tirelessly for the advancement of civil rights.

It should also be noted that the work of the work of Dr. King was extraordinary because of his effectiveness at drawing support to the movement. He built a groundswell of support by recruiting like-mined people throughout the South across the normal barriers of race, age, and religion. A good example of this is the creation of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee in 1960, where King recruited both black and white college students to lead boycotts, sit-ins, and marches for the cause of civil rights.

Secondly, the Montgomery boycotts are an important aspect of America's history because they caught the attention of the entire nation. The massive scale and duration of this protest was widely reported, heightening public awareness to the lack of the civil rights of African-Americans.

As the first organized mass protest by blacks in Southern history, the Montgomery boycotts also set the tone for the rest of the movement. The boycott's effectiveness demonstrated the power of nonviolent direct action in the quest to end Southern segregation. Similar nonviolent protests and actions, including the important luncheon counter sit-ins that took place throughout the South at segregated stores and restaurants, can be traced to the Montgomery boycotts.

Lastly, honoring the history of the Montgomery boycott reinforces the fact that civil rights require our attention at all times. We must be vigilant at all times, to ensure that no person is every discriminated against on the basis of the color of his or her skin. It may not always be easy, but the path has been laid out clearly for us. Collectively, we must commit ourselves to the protection of each person's unalienable rights to ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.''

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES, for convening this critically important special order today. It is very appropriate that Members of the Congressional Black Caucus take this time to honor Black History Month, and more specifically, our nation's ongoing struggle to fulfill the promise of democracy.

When I first ran for Congress in 1964, I ran on a platform of ''Jobs, Justice and Peace.'' I never thought at that time that the fundamental plank of justice, the right to vote, would remain the primary issue before us 37 years later. I never would have thought then that there would be cases of voter intimidation, disenfranchisement and confusing ballots in the 21st century.

Like most Americans, I wanted to believe that our system of justice would do all that it could under current laws to ensure the right to vote, particularly the right of African Americans and other historically disenfranchised voters will be protected. Unfortunately this was not the case in the 2000 presidential election.

Therefore I have joined with several of my colleagues in the Congress to begin the painstaking task of looking at reform of our system of voting from the top down and from the bottom up.

So, as we celebrate the history of African-Americans, we should commit ourselves to fight harder for the future of all of America. This Congress and the current Administration, must make real, true election reform their top priority.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND CONGRESSIONAL SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Today, Democratic Leader GEPHARDT announced the formation of a Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, chaired by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, and Co-chaired by myself, STENY HOYER and a number of our colleagues who have committed themselves to this task. The Democratic Caucus is committed to working on solutions, not rehashing the past.

We are hopeful that Speaker HASTERT will appoint a Congressional Special Committee soon and look forward to working with him and all of our Republican colleagues on a nonpartisan basis.

NATIONAL ROUNDUP OF VOTER IRREGULARITIES

From reports that flawed felony voter ''purges'' may have erroneously disenfranchised thousands of African-American voters to allegations of voter irregularities across the nation, we agree that the razor-thin margin in the 2000 Presidential election illuminated serious flaws in our electoral system.

Here are just a few of the problems encountered by voters in the past election:

PROBLEMS IN FLORIDA

The Problems in Florida are well known. From butterfly ballots that no one could understand, to police roadblocks near polling

places, to overbroad felony voter purges, Florida showed the system is broken.

THE PROBLEM WAS NOT JUST IN FLORIDA—IT WAS NATIONWIDE

In Georgia, ''Lines too long'' was the single most commonly heard complaint from voters. Citizens in some communities waited at the polls for two hours or more, and some metro Atlanta voters did not cast ballots until after 11:00 p.m.—a more than four-hour wait. Contributing factors in some polling places were poor layout, a shortage of well-trained poll workers, and a shortage of poll locations.

In Louisiana, people who claimed that they were prevented from voting because their voter registration at local driver's license bureaus under the ''motor voter'' law never got processed. According to the Registrar of Voters, dozens of voters in Jefferson Parish alone found themselves with no designated precinct to go to. On the west bank of New Orleans, there were 75–100 calls from people who claimed to have changed their address, but were not in the Registrar's records. And in St. Tammany, Registrar of Voters M. Dwayne Wall said that approximately 100 people called because of apparent problems with the Department of Motor Vehicles registration process.

In Missouri, it was contended that many registered voters were inaccurately stricken from the rolls after a mail canvass. They also allege that procedures for re-registering those ''inactive'' voters were too cumbersome, and that many polling places were understaffed or had no telephone contact with the board's downtown headquarters.

And in my home state, voters complained that the polling places had undertrained administrators and long lines.

STORIES OF ELECTION DAY PROBLEMS

In New Orleans, voters were not allowed to vote because their voter registration at local driver's license bureaus under the state's motor voter law never got processed. Leslie Boudreaux moved from one precinct and registered. However, she was turned away at her polling place.

In Portland, Maine, it appears that as many as 15,000 voters were illegally purged from voting rolls and were forced to wait in long lines at City Hall to register again and vote. One voter forced to stand in line, Shirley Lewellyn, said she was ''mad as hell'' about having to stand in a long registration line when she wanted to be with her husband, who was undergoing minor eye surgery. ''I've voted for 20 years at [my precinct], and when I went there this morning, they told me I wasn't on the list.''

In Columbia, South Carolina, some registered voters said they were turned away from the polls, while others said they were intimidated by poll workers and NAACP poll watchers were asked to leave poll sites.

In Boston, Mass, a volunteer who was giving voters rides to the polls received a call from an amputee for a ride to the polls. The caller stated that he had attempted to vote at the polling place he had voted a year before and was turned away. The volunteer drove the man to four different poll sites and were turned away each time. Only at the last poll site were they told that the first poll site, the one the man had visited initially, was the correct one.

THERE ARE SOLUTIONS

Most importantly, we must address the instances of voter intimidation, such as police checkpoints near polling places, and the widespread problem of overbroad felony voter purges. The best voting machines in the world won't do any good if they don't let legal voters vote.

We should have more vigorous investigation and enforcement of civil rights laws and government aid to states should be contingent upon affirmative steps by states to comply with those laws.

The most obvious problem for states and localities has been an inability or unwilliness to fund 21st Century election technology. The federal government needs to step in and provide assistance to states to replace old voting machines.

But we need to help states do more than that. States need better trained poll workers and better educated voters.

We need to ensure that polling places accessible to persons with disabilities. More than that, it is unthinkable in the year 2001 that we have not implemented technology that allows a seeing impaired person to cast an independent secret ballot. The federal government can provide financial assistance and encouragement in this area as well.

We need to use federal dollars to encourage states to make democracy easier, by implementing same day registration procedures.

And there is a ''data gap.'' No unbiased entity is testing voting machines. There has been no rigorous study of whether other innovations, such as an election day holiday, are needed. We need to study these issues very carefully and very quickly.

In short, Congress needs to act and it needs to act soon before these incidents are repeated in the 2002 elections.

Together we have fought to end voting disenfranchisement and secure racial justice in the electoral arena. Today, the fight continues. The voice of each American must be allowed to be heard in our democracy.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for his kindness in allowing me this time, and I want to join others in commending the Congressional Black Caucus and our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), for her leadership in calling this Special Order today.

Nothing speaks to the contribution made by the African American community to our great country than the eloquence that we heard on this floor today from our Members and the fine record of achievement by the African American community and the members of the Congressional Black Caucus to Congress over time.

The focus today on this celebration of Black History Month has been election reform. My colleagues, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), talked about the history of voting rights in this country and how African Americans first got those rights and what the struggle has been. Now, as we look to the future, we must improve.

The issue of electronic voting, using technologies for the future, having a uniform standard, even if it is not a uniform manner of casting ballots and counting them, is essential. We must be very proactive in making sure that the people in all of our communities, including the African American community, know that when they vote, they will be counted, that indeed they do count.

We must be aware of the fact that some of the technology may increase the disparity that we have, so I caution us as we go forward to involve ourselves in those technologies which increase participation and which are more uniform in their standard rather than again advantaging those who have more resources with technology at home.

So while we have big challenges ahead, again we are blessed with the resources, the human resources of the Congressional Black Caucus in this Congress. And I want to point with pride to a newly elected member of our Board of Supervisors in San Francisco, Sophie Maxwell. She comes from a proud tradition. Her mother, Enola Maxwell, is very active in education and other social and economic justice issues in our community. Sophie is a member of the Democratic State Central Committee. She has been a leader on issues in our community. She has made us, and will make us, all very proud.

But back to the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to thank them for what they are doing. It is important to the black community and important to the Black Caucus, and it is important to our great country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, though I have so much more to say but only a little time, I wish to yield to a great leader, someone we are very, very proud of in California, she is a national leader on this and so many other subjects important to strengthening our country and making the future brighter for all of America's children, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for her generosity in sharing her very limited time with me so that I will have an opportunity to continue my remarks on this very important issue of elections and election reform.

I am very proud to announce that the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), today appointed me to serve as the chairperson for a Democratic Caucus special election reform committee. I am honored to accept that appointment and to work with the vice chairs of that committee to travel across this country holding town halls, workshops, and meetings where we will listen to the people. We will hear from the people the problems that they are experiencing in their States and in their jurisdictions as it relates to the elections process.

We were focused on the problems of the election system in Florida in this recent election, and we were amazed at the disenfranchisement that took place there in so many different ways. But we have come to understand that it is not simply Florida, but everywhere we look in this country we can point to problems. Those problems include dysfunctional voting machines, long lines where people are waiting to vote that cannot get in before the polls close. We saw the butterfly ballot, and we learned that that was kind of the decision of one person. We saw in Florida, for example, that one person in the elections office could determine that absentee ballots or requests or applications could be taken out from the office to be taken home to be worked on. We saw all kinds of things.

So we are going to go around the country, and we are going to hear more. We are going to hear about consolidations that eliminate the ability for people to participate. Again, we have a lot of work to do. We will be doing that, and we hope that everyone who would like to be involved can be involved in this.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer from Michigan, and I know that you are as well in your State of Florida.

Agriculture today and the plight of farmers is one of the serious issues before Congress. Another serious issue that is sort of the overriding consideration of where we go in the next several months is how high should taxes be in this country and how should government spend that tax money that comes down here to Washington as we decide on the priorities for spending.

This first chart is a pie chart that shows the different pieces of pie, or the percentage of spending this year that goes into several categories. Social Security takes 20 percent of all Federal spending. Social Security is the largest expenditure that we have in the Federal Government. Of course, the people at risk are the young people today that are going to be threatened with huge increases in taxes or reduced benefits in Social Security benefits.

Out of the approximately $2 trillion that we will be spending this year, 2001, 20 percent goes to Social Security. The next highest is 12 appropriation bills. Twelve of the appropriation bills all together, what we spend a half a year arguing on, spending for so-called discretionary spending, discretionary meaning what Congress has some discretion over, is 19 percent of the budget. The other 13th appropriation bill is defense, and that takes 17 percent.

But here is Social Security now taking much more than even defense spending, with Medicare at 11 percent. Medicare is even growing because we are talking now of how do we add some prescription drug coverage to Medicare. So we are looking at the challenge of the Federal Government's expenditure and the Federal Government getting bigger. That means more imposition on individual rights. It is giving more empowerment to Congress and the White House, and it is taking away authority and authorization and power from individuals.

□ 1645

So the first question it seems to me should be, how high should taxes be?

Mr. Speaker, I would ask our listening audience to give us a guess in their own mind of how many cents out of every dollar they earn goes for taxes at the local, State, and national level, what percentage of what you earn goes in taxes.

Well, if you are an average American taxpayer, a little over 41 percent goes in taxes, 41 cents out of every dollar you earn. When the seniors graduate next year or when they finish college or high school and go into the job market, on average they are going to be shelling out 41 cents of every dollar they earn in taxes, taking the first 4 months out of every year proportionately to pay taxes.

And, of course, everybody is now considering their Federal tax bill. They are looking at the taxes. If they have some investment in some mutual funds, they are getting notices on their 1099s that they have a capital gains tax to pay, even though the value of that mutual fund might have gone down in this past year.

So the question then becomes, how do we have tax fairness? It would be my suggestion that we make every possible effort to reduce taxes from that 41 percent down to at least 35 percent. That is what made this country great is the fact that you are going to get some reward for your efforts to save and invest to try to maybe get a second job or a second part-time job so you can take care of your family.

Well, we now have a tax system that says, look, not only are we going to tax you at the same rate if you get a second job, we are going to tax you at a higher rate if you start earning more money. I think there is a lot to do on tax fairness. I think there is a lot to do on tax simplification.

But I want to spend a little time talking about where we go on finances, and part of that question is how large should the Government debt be in this country.

Right now the debt today is $5.69 trillion, almost $5.7 trillion of debt. I am a farmer, as I mentioned, and our tradition on the farm has been to try to pay off some of that mortgage to leave your kids with a little better chance. But what we are doing in this country right now, in this body, and the Senate and the White House is borrowing all of this money and we are going to leave it up to our kids and our grandkids to pay back.

Without reform, Social Security leaves our kids a legacy of debt larger than we have today. Right now, of the $5.7 trillion, $3.4 trillion is so-called Treasury debt, Treasury bonds, Treasury paper. It is so-called the debt to the public, the public borrowing. The rest of the debt is debt that we borrow from the trust fund. Roughly $1.1 trillion comes from the Social Security trust fund that the Government has borrowed that extra money coming in from Social Security taxes and spent it on other programs.

Yesterday we passed a bill to make sure that we do not do that this year. And then there is $1.2 trillion that is from all of the other 119 trust funds. And so, most of what we are doing with the extra money coming in from the trust funds, we are writing out an IOU and we are using those dollars to pay down the public debt.

But when the baby-boomers start retiring around 2008, then we are looking at a situation where there is not going to be enough money coming in from Social Security taxes to pay benefits. So what do we do?

Well, what Washington has done in the past is increase taxes. I think it is important that we deal with Social Security now so that we do not rely on tax increases in the future.

And that is why we have this curve. As we pay down the debt held by the public, eventually we are going to have to start borrowing again to pay Social Security benefits and Medicare benefits, and that is going to leave our kids with that huge debt load.

The temporary debt reduction plan does little more than borrow the Social Security surplus to repay the debt held by the public; and when the baby-boomers retire. Social Security surpluses disappear and Federal debt again soars.

Again on the debt, for the whole load of hay, we see now that this is roughly the division of that $5.7 trillion of debt. But over time, if we keep borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund and Medicare trust fund and other trust funds and use that money to pay down the debt held by the public, then the debt held by the public continues to diminish, but the Social Security trust fund debt and the Medicare trust fund debt are still there. There is not enough money there to pay the benefits that are going to be required after the baby-boomers retire.

That is demonstrated in this chart. In the top left, we see a momentary surplus in Social Security taxes coming in. Right now your Social Security taxes are 12.4 percent of essentially everything you make. But when the baby-boomers retire and go out of the pay-in mode to recipients of Social Security, then the problem really hits us from twofold, a tremendous increase in the number of retirees that are going to be taking Social Security benefits and a reduced number of workers that

are paying in their taxes to cover the cost of that program and starting.

Starting around 2012, there is going to be an insufficient amount of Social Security taxes coming in, so we are going to have to come up with money from someplace else.

What we have done on several occasions that I think should make every American very concerned is that we have either increased taxes and/or reduced benefits. We did that in 1977. We did it again in 1983 when we revised the Social Security system.

This red, by the way, represents $9 trillion of unfunded liability. That is why I think it is so important and I have urged this administration and, of course, I encouraged for the last 8 years the previous administration to move ahead with some changes in Social Security that will keep Social Security solvent.

I mean, if we take a trillion dollars out of this total $5.6 trillion that we are now guessing is going to be there over the next 10 years and we use that trillion to start some real returns on some of that money, we can save Social Security and keep it solvent for the next 75 years.

If we put it off, that means that we are going to have to be even more drastic in the future to make these changes. In other words, the longer we put off the solution to Social Security, the more drastic those changes are going to have to be.

I mentioned $9 trillion in today's dollars. The unfunded liability means that we would have to put $9 trillion into a savings account today to earn enough money in interest to pay benefits to add to what is going to come in in Social Security taxes to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Social Security program over 6 decades ago, he wanted it to feature a private sector component to build retirement incomes. Social Security was supposed to be one leg of a three-legged stool.

I have some of those old brochures that I have looked up in the archives where it says, look, Social Security is one-third of what should be everybody's effort to have a secure retirement, one-third from Social Security, one-third from your individual savings and investment, and one-third from some kind of a pension plan that he encouraged everybody to partake in. But right now we have almost 22 percent of our Social Security recipients that depend on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their total retirement income.

So if there is one message in all of this talk about Social Security, if there is one message we can drive home: it is the importance of saving now for your retirement.

Let me tell you another reason. I chaired the Social Security Task Force here in Congress for the last couple of years in the Committee on the Budget, and the Social Security Task Force brought in futurist experts on health and on medicine, and their guess was that within 20 years, anybody that wanted to live to be 100 years old would have that option, and their estimate was that within 40 years anybody that wanted to live to be 120 years old would have that option.

I mean, what does that mean in all of our individual lives? What does that mean for our kids? What does that mean in terms of the importance of making the changes now to keep Social Security solvent in the future?

The personal retirement accounts that a lot of people have talked about and some people have said to me, well, now is not the time to talk about individually owned accounts because look what the stock market has done over the last 12 years.

The fact is that an average person retiring from Social Security 5 years from now is going to get a 1.1 percent return on the money that was paid in that they paid in and their employer paid in. Right now the average is 1.7 percent. But as taxes go up, the percentage and the likelihood that you are going to get that money back is going to diminish.

And so, the question is, can we do better than getting a 1.1 percent or even a 1.7 percent return on some of that money?

The other danger is, so, if we can put it into individual accounts where workers of America own that account and own that money so that when the problems in Washington make Members of Congress and the Senate and the President feel that other spending is more important, that we do not again cut Social Security benefits.

So there is some security in having this in individual accounts. And we can put it in safe investments. We brought in experts into our Social Security Task Force that said, look, we can guarantee a 4.2 percent return and guarantee that you will have at least a 4.2 percent return on the way we are going, we can invest your money.

Some other insurance companies have higher rates. Some others have lower rates. But the fact is that a CD at your bank, other investments that are secure, can do a lot better than that 1.1 to 1.7 percent return.

The fact is that the Supreme Court, on two decisions now, has said that there is no entitlement to Social Security. On two decisions the Supreme Court says Social Security taxes are simply another tax. Social Security benefits are simply another law that Congress has passed, and the President has signed to have a certain benefit structure and, therefore, there is no entitlement or no necessary connection between the two.

I think that should make us nervous, also.

Social Security is a system stretched to its limits. Seventy-eight million baby-boomers will begin to retire in 2008. Of course, the baby-boomers after World War II, the soldiers came home and there was a tremendous increase in birth rate and at that time, of course, we had that huge increase in population. We had problems in building our schools and building up our education system and the kind of services necessary to deal with that expanding population, and Social Security worked very well as an expanded workforce, paid in those taxes, and those taxes immediately go out to pay the benefits of existing retirees.

□ 1700

Social Security spending exceeds tax revenues starting technically in 2015, and that is when the problems really hit us. If there was a Social Security trust fund, then the Social Security trust fund would keep Social Security solvent until 2034 or 2035.

But let me spend just a couple of minutes on what the Social Security trust fund is. You pay in currently 12.4 percent of the first roughly $80,000 you earn in Social Security taxes. For the last almost 6 years now, there has been quite a huge surplus on the taxes coming in as opposed to what was needed to pay benefits.

Again it is a pay-as-you-go program. Taxes come in and by the end of the week, they are sent out in benefits almost. We are dealing with a situation where the government then writes an IOU, but you cannot cash in that IOU. It is nonnegotiable. They write the IOU, and say we are borrowing this money; and for the last 42 years, government has been spending any surplus that came in from Social Security on other government spending.

Starting last year, for the first time, and I introduced a bill in the spring of 1999 that said we would have a rescission or we would cut all spending if we started digging into the Social Security surplus, that ended up with the lockbox bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

We passed that again just yesterday, a lockbox bill that says we are not going to use the Social Security surplus for any spending. But now there are a bunch of IOUs in a steel file box down there that technically says the government has borrowed this money.

The question then becomes, when Social Security needs the money, how is it going to pay it back? It is going to do one of three things. To come up with that money to pay it back for benefits, it is either going to reduce the cost of Social Security, in other words, lower benefits so there is not so much to pay back or they are going to reduce other spending or they simply borrow more money.

You remember that earlier chart, how we are going to leave our kids this huge debt. That is because to pay Social Security benefits, we are going to have to borrow those huge amounts of dollars. By huge, I mean over the next 75 years, borrowing or somehow coming up with $120 trillion. Remember, our total budget this year is $2 trillion. Over the next 75 years, coming up with

$120 trillion in excess of what is coming in in Social Security taxes to pay the benefits that are currently promised.

You can see now it is a huge problem. Nobody knows quite how to solve this problem. So we keep putting it off. The danger of this legislative body, of course, is until a crisis is almost on us, we do not react in solving some of the tough problems. That is why it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that the American people understand how dramatic, how challenging the problem is of keeping Social Security solvent.

Insolvency is certain. We know how many people there are and when they are going to retire. It is not some kind of economic projection. The actuaries over in the Social Security Administration know absolutely how many people there are. Their estimate of how long people are going to live is very, very accurate; and we know how much they are going to pay in and how much they are going to take out in Social Security. Payroll taxes will not cover benefits starting in 2015, and the shortfalls will add up to $120 trillion between 2015 and 2075.

This other chart shows the paying-in problem. This is the demographics, the changing makeup of our population. Back in 1940, there were approximately 30 people working paying in their Social Security tax for every retiree. Today, there are just three people working paying in their Social Security tax for every one retiree. And over on your right, you see by 2025, the estimate is that at that time there are only going to be two people working for each retiree. Two people working for each retiree. A huge challenge, a huge potential to increase those taxes on those two workers. As you increase taxes, of course, you discourage economic development.

There is no Social Security with your name on it. As I give speeches around the country, a lot of people think that there is somehow an account that is in their name that entitles them to Social Security benefits. This is a quote from the Office of Management and Budget of the United States Government. They say: ''These trust fund balances are available to finance future benefit payments and other trust fund expenditures, but only in a bookkeeping sense. They are the claims on the Treasury that, when redeemed, will have to be financed by raising taxes, borrowing from the public or reducing benefits or other expenditures.''

I thought I would throw that quote in, Mr. Speaker, to reaffirm the point that I was just trying to make earlier, that having the Social Security trust fund and pretending that somehow that is the solution out there is fooling ourselves. It is fooling the American people.

The public debt versus Social Security shortfall. Some have suggested that if we paid back the debt held by the public, now $3.4 trillion, somehow that savings on interest is going to accommodate the $46.6 trillion shortfall between now and 2057, over the next 56 years. This chart is simply to represent that that $3.4 trillion debt and roughly the 5 percent interest on that debt is not going to accommodate the huge shortfall in Social Security.

Some people have suggested, look, if we can keep the economy going strong, that will help solve our Social Security problems. It helps solve the Social Security problems in the short run, but because there is a direct relationship in the Social Security benefits you receive to the wages that you pay in, in the long term it does not help the problem, because the more you earn and the more you pay in, eventually the higher the benefits you are going to be entitled to. And spelling this out, Social Security benefits are indexed to wage growth. When the economy grows, workers pay more in taxes but also will earn more in benefits when they retire. Growth makes the numbers look better now but leaves a larger hole to fill later. Any administration has got to realize that saying that we are going to pay down the public debt to save Social Security is not going to do the job.

Helping me is a page by the name of Martha Stebbins. Martha is from New Hampshire. I was up in New Hampshire, Martha, and bought some maple syrup last summer. It is very good, but we make maple syrup in Michigan, too, that is pretty good. In fact, we make some maple syrup on my farm.

Back to business. The biggest risk is doing nothing at all. Social Security has a total unfunded liability of over $9 trillion. The Social Security trust fund contains nothing but IOUs. To keep paying promised Social Security benefits, the payroll tax will have to be increased by nearly 50 percent or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent. Neither one should be an option of this Congress or the Senate or the President.

How about investing the money? How big a risk is it? The diminishing returns of your Social Security investment. Right now, this chart represents what you might get back in terms of Social Security benefits based on what you and your employer paid in, or if you are self-employed, what you paid in.

The real return of Social Security is less than 2 percent for most workers and shows a negative return for some compared to over 7 percent for the market on the average over the last 100 years. If you look at just the last 10 years, then we are looking at returns that exceed 14 percent. It is a negative return, by the way, for minorities.

So if a young black male today because they have a shorter life span, they spend their life paying into Social Security, but then die and might get a $200 death benefit, but they essentially lose all their money. If some of this money was in their own account, then it would go to their heirs and it would not be simply kept by the Federal Government saying, well, this helps balance out everything else. On average, as I mentioned, it is 1.7 percent with a market return of over 7 percent.

This is a chart, I thought to demonstrate this point, the fact that it is not a good investment, it is not a good idea, and again let me make sure that everybody understands, Mr. Speaker, that in all of the proposals to solve Social Security, none of those proposals touch the disability and survivor benefits. So that portion of the Social Security that goes for disability, if you get hurt on the job, then you get some benefits the rest of your life, or if you die and your spouse or your kids need help, none of the proposals nor the three bills that I have introduced over the last 8 years, none of the proposals dig into that survivor disability portion of the package.

But to get back all of the money that you and your employer have paid in is going to take anybody that retires in the next several years, it is going to take 23 to 26 years that you are going to have to live after retirement to break even, to get back the money you and your employer put in. Because taxes have gone up so dramatically, that is why this graph has gone up and you are going to have to spend more time and live longer after you retire to break even. Of course, if you happened to retire in 1940, it took 2 months to get back everything you put in. In 1960, 2 years. Today it takes 23 years. You have got to live 23 years after you retire to break even and get the money back that you and your employer paid in in Social Security taxes.

This chart represents how we have increased taxes over the years. So people that say, well, you know, politicians that have to run for reelection would not dare to increase taxes again because already 75 percent of working Americans pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax. Seventy-five percent to 78 percent of Americans today pay more in Social Security tax, 78 percent if it is the total FICA tax, than they do in income tax.

And it is a very regressive way to tax. Yet this country has substantially increased that tax. In 1940, we had a 2 percent rate. That meant the employer paid 1 percent and the worker paid 1 percent on the first $3,000. The maximum for the year for both employee and employer were at $60 a year.

By 1960, we raised the rate to 6 percent, raised the base to $4,800; and the maximum was $288 a year. In 1980, we raised the rate to 10.16 percent on a base that was increased to $25,900. So the maximum went up to $2,630 a year.

Today we have a 12.4 percent tax, 6.2 for the employee and 6.2 for the employer on, since it is indexed is now up to $79,000, on the first $79,000, so the maximum total is about $10,000 a year.

This is our history of every time government has got into trouble where they needed more money than was provided by the revenues and the benefits that have been expanded, of course,

over the years, then we ended up increasing taxes. And twice, in 1977 and in 1984, we also reduced benefits.

This is what I was mentioning in the FICA tax. So the FICA tax, 12.4 is Social Security; and the rest of the 15-odd is Medicare. So a total of a little over 15 percent goes in your payroll tax.

Right now 78 percent of American working families pay more in the payroll deduction in the FICA tax than they do in income tax. What I am trying to do with that chart is shout that it would be very unfair to again raise those taxes. But if we do not deal with Social Security now and we say, look, we are just going to use the Social Security surplus to pay down the debt held by the public, that $3.4 trillion to accommodate the $50 or $60 trillion shortfall in Social Security and pretend that somehow that is going to fix Social Security, I think it is not fair to ourselves to say that and I think it is not fair to the American people to think that that is going to be a possibility.

These are the six principles of my Social Security bill that I have been introducing. I was chairman of the Senate finance committee in the State of Michigan before I came here, and there were a couple of considerations and concerns I had before I came to Congress, and that was the low savings rate in the United States. We have a lower savings rate than any of the other G–7 countries.

Our savings rate is about 5 percent of what we earn. In Japan, for example, it is about 19 percent. In Korea, it has been as high as 35 percent of what they earn. We used to in this country save about 15 percent. Back in the 1940s and 1950s we were saving almost 15 percent of what we earned.

□ 1715

But now our savings rate has tremendously gone down. Part of it maybe is the advertisements of ''Fly now, pay later.'' ''Come in and get a new car and get $200 immediate cash to buy Christmas presents,'' or something.

So we have encouraged debt. So there is a danger not only of the Federal Government mounting this kind of debt, but there is a problem with individual Americans relying more and more on those credit cards or other credit systems to borrow and borrow more money. That does a couple things. Number one, it disrupts economic expansion, because savings and investment mean that that investment is what companies use to do the research, to buy the kind of state-of-art equipment and machinery that can accommodate international competition.

It was important to me when I came to Congress that I try to do the kind of things to encourage savings, and one of those things was allowing some of this large Social Security tax to be invested and to be in the name of individuals. So that is when I started writing the bills.

So, number one, my Social Security proposals protect current and future beneficiaries, allow freedom of choice. In other words, if you do not want to go with any kind of a private investment plan that will be limited to safe investments by law and you want to stay in the current system, you can. It preserves the safety net, because we are not going to allow anybody to go without food or shelter in this country. It makes Americans better off, not worse off; and it creates a fully-funded system, and no tax increase.

Personal retirement accounts offer more retirement security.

If I have to take a drink of water, that probably means that I have talked almost long enough, and maybe the listening audience has listened long enough, so I am going to finish the last few slides.

Personal retirement accounts offer more retirement security. If John Doe makes an average of $36,000 a year, he can expect monthly payments in Social Security of $1,280, or from a personal retirement account he can expect $6,514.

When we passed the Social Security law back in 1934, we said that States and local governments could opt out of Social Security and develop their own pension retirement plan. Galveston, Texas, did just that. They decided not to go into Social Security, but to have their own retirement plan. Right now this chart compares what those individuals in Galveston County have as death and disability and retirement benefits as opposed to what they would have in Social Security.

On the death benefits, Social Security, $253; the Galveston plan, $75,000 in death benefits. Social Security, $1,280; the Galveston plan, with their own investments, $2,749. Monthly retirement payments, $1,280, compared to Galveston retirees getting $4,790.

San Diego did the same option. San Diego enjoys personal retirement accounts, PRAs, as well. A 30-year-old employee who earns a salary of $30,000 for 35 years and contributes 6 percent to his PRA would receive $3,000 per month in retirement. Under the current system he would contribute twice as much in Social Security, but only receive $1,077.

The difference between San Diego's system of PRAs and Social Security is more than the difference in a check. It is also the difference in ownership, in knowing that politicians are not going to take that away from you.

Even those who oppose PRAs agree they offer more retirement security. This is a letter from Senator BARBARA BOXER and DIANNE FEINSTEIN and TED KENNEDY to President Clinton. In their letter they said, ''Millions of our constituents will receive higher retirement benefits from their current public pensions than they would under Social Security.''

So the question is, how can we make this more available to everybody, to, in effect, guarantee they are going to be better off and they are going to have an ownership of some of that retirement account?

I represented the United States in describing our pension retirement system in an international forum in London a couple of years ago, and it is interesting the number of countries that are ahead of us in terms of allowing their workers to own personal retirement accounts.

In the 18 years since Chile offered the PRAs, 95 percent of Chilean workers have created accounts. Their average rate of return has been 11.3 percent per year. Among others, Australia, Britain, Switzerland, all offer worker-PRAs. The British workers chose PRAs with 10 percent returns, and two out of three British workers enrolled in the second-tier social security system. They are allowed to have half of their social security taxes go into these personal retirement accounts, and they have been getting 10 percent-a-year return. Again, that compares to our Social Security return, currently at 1.7 percent.

This is what has happened in equity investments over the last 100 years. It is a graph of the ups and downs of the returns on equities. Some bad years, in the early 1920s, during the Depression, 1929, a little depression. But, on average, if you leave your money in for over 12 years, in any time period, then you did not lose any money on equity investments. The average return over this time period was 6.7 percent.

Again, we are looking at a system, such as all Federal employees know about the Thrift Savings Plan, so it is limited to safe investments. It is limited to your choice of how much you want to put in equities versus government Treasury bills versus bonds for corporations, fixed income bonds or variable interest rate income bonds. So you balance that in terms of minimizing risk, and in all cases the experts suggest that it is going to be very, very easy to do much, much better than the 1.1 to 1.7 percent return you are going to get on Social Security.

Based on a family income of $58,475, the return on a personal retirement account is even better. We divided this into three different areas, if you invest 2 percent of your wages or 6 percent of your wages or 10 percent of your wages. If the average working life span is, what, if you go to work at 20, 25, and you retire at 65, 70, so on average I suspect we are working 40 years, paying in our Social Security taxes, so let me jump way over to the 40 years.

If you were to work 40 years and invest 2 percent of your money, then you would end up with just a little over a quarter of a million dollars. If you invested 10 percent of your money, you would have $1.4 million over the 40 year-period.

What we are looking at, if you just invested this money at 2 percent for the first 20 years, you would still have $55,000 after 20 years; or if you invested at 10 percent, you would have $274,000 over 10 years.

Again, the fact is that long-term investments, even with the fluctuations

for that 12-year or 15-year period, we have never had a 12- or 15-year period in the history of the stock market, of equities, where there has been a loss. Again, the average return on such an investment has been 6.7 percent.

Okay, let me finish up just briefly with the Social Security bill that I have introduced. I am rewriting that bill now to make a couple changes that I think are important.

The question is, some people argue, well, you cannot let individuals invest the money themselves. So what I have done in this legislation is I have limited the investment to safe investments, index stocks, index bonds, an index of mutual funds, or an index of some of the foreign stock investments funds. That is what we are doing in the Thrift Savings Plan also.

My legislation allows workers to invest a portion of their Social Security taxes in their own personal retirement savings accounts that start at 2.5 percent of wages and gradually increase. So 2.5 percent out of the 12.4 percent that is going in Social Security taxes you would be allowed to have in your own account and invest it in your selection of maybe four, maybe five, limited so-called safe investments, and then I would leave it up to the Secretary of Treasury to add to that any other investment potential that he thought was safe and reasonable to add to this selection.

My proposal does not increase taxes. It repeals the Social Security earnings test for everybody over 62 years old; it gives workers the choice to retire as early as 59.5 years old, and as late as 70. In my proposal, I made a suggestion that you could increase your benefits 8 percent a year for every year after 65 that you delayed taking those benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it gives workers the choice to retire at 59½. It gives each spouse equal share of the PRSAs. If you are a stay-at-home mom, you get half of what your husband makes; or if you are a stay-at-home dad, half of what your wife makes would go in your individual PRSA account. So it is always divided equally between the two spouses. If one spouse makes more than the other spouse, they are added together and divided by two to represent how much would go into each account.

It also increases widow and widower benefits up to 110 percent. That is partially to encourage retirees that might be a surviving widow or widower to live in the same home. You cannot do it now. One cannot live on half as much money as two. So this adds to the surviving spouse's benefit.

It reinforces the safety net for low-income and disabled workers. It passes the Social Security Administration's 75-year solvency test. In other words, the actuaries over at Social Security have scored this and said this will keep Social Security solvent for at least 75 years. Actually, it would keep Social Security solvent forever, the way it is written.

The bill takes a portion of on-budget surpluses over the next 10 years. That is what I would like to stress. This bill borrows $800 billion of surpluses other than the Social Security surpluses to make the transition. Since we are taking all the money essentially now that is coming in and paying out $400 billion a year in Social Security benefits, how do you come up with enough money to stop paying out? You are not going to stop paying out those benefits, so how do you make the transition?

So the transition is made from borrowing some money from the general fund. Now that we have this surplus coming in, now is the time to take that step. So if we can take $1 trillion now from the other surpluses to fix Social Security, then we are going to have Social Security solvent; and it is not going to haunt our kids and grandkids later.

It uses capital market investments to create Social Security's rate of return above the 1.7 percent workers are now receiving. Over time, PRSAs grow, and Social Security fixed benefits are reduced. It indexes future benefit increases to the cost-of-living increases instead of wage growth.

□ 1730

In other words, part of the problem now with Social Security is that benefits go up faster than the economy. Benefits increase based on wage inflation, which is higher than the CPI inflation. So one of the things my bill does is it changes the index of how much wages are increased to inflation. So it covers the increased cost of everything we buy, but it does not go up faster than everything we buy, as is currently structured under the current Social Security law.

Let me finish, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that I think we are in luck with this new President we have. He suggested that we leave some of the money that taxpayers are paying in, now at an all-time high. We are paying more taxes now, at the 41 cents out of every dollar, than we have ever paid in the history of America in peacetime. There was one year during World War II that it was higher than what it is today.

So the fact is that another way to say that we have a surplus is saying that we are overtaxing somebody, someplace, somehow. So let us make taxes more fair, but at the same time, this President has said it is important to continue to pay down the debt so our kids and our grandkids are not left with that huge mortgage on the way we have operated government.

Thirdly, he said that we have to fix Social Security. So I am encouraged. I think the challenge before this body is not sweeping this problem of Social Security and Medicare solvency under the rug, to leave it for future Congresses or as future problems for taxpayers that will be our kids and our grandkids.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–304, as amended by Public Law 99–7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the One Hundred Seventh Congress—

the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON);

the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK);

the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH); and

the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINVOICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–550, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the James Madison Commemoration Commission Advisory Committee—

Steven G. Calabresi, of Illinois; and

Forrest McDonald, of Alabama.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–398 and in consultation with the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore appoints the following individuals as members of the United States-China Security Review Commission:

Michael A. Ledeen, of Maryland.

Roger W. Robinson, Jr., of Maryland.

Arthur Waldron, of Pennsylvania.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE—107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, enclosed, please find a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Science of the U.S. House of Representatives. The Committee on Science adopted these rules by voice vote on February 14, 2001. We are submitting these rules to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for publication in compliance with rule XI, clause 2(a)(2).

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE RULES FOR THE 107TH CONGRESS

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

General Statement

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, as applicable, shall govern the Committee and its Subcommittees, except that a motion to recess from day to day and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in

full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondatable privileged motions in the Committee and its Subcommittees and shall be decided without debate. The rules of the Committee, as applicable, shall be the rules of its Subcommittees. The rules of germaneness shall be enforced by the Chairman [XI 1(a)]

Membership

(b) A majority of majority Members of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority Members of each Subcommittee and shall authorize the Chairman to negotiate that ratio with the minority party; Provided, however, that party representation on each Subcommittee (including any ex-officio Members) shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee. Provided, further, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee.

Power to Sit and Act; Subpoena Power

(c)(1) Notwithstanding subparagraph (2), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents as deemed necessary, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Chairman. [XI 2(m)]

(2) The Chairman of the Full Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, may authorize and issue such subpoenas as described in paragraph (1), during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period longer than 3 days. [XI 2(m)(3)(A)(i)]

(3) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than a meeting or a hearing of the Committee.

Sensitive or Confidential Information Received Pursuant to Subpoena

(d) Unless otherwise determined by the Committee or Subcommittee, certain information received by the Committee or Subcommittee pursuant to a subpoena not made part of the record at an open hearing shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session when the Chairman of the Full Committee, in his judgment and after consultation with Ranking Minority Member, deems that in view of all the circumstances, such as the sensitivity of the information or the confidential nature of the information, such action is appropriate.

National Security Information

(e) All national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping. The Chairman of the Full Committee may establish such regulations and procedures as in his judgment are necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any Member of the Committee, or any other Member of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

Oversight

(f) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the House of Representatives.

(g) The Chairman of the Full Committee, or of any Subcommittee, shall not undertake any investigation in the name of the Committee without formal approval by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee.

Order of Business

(h) The order of business and procedure of the Committee and the subjects of inquiries or investigations will be decided by the Chairman, subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

Suspended Proceedings

(i) During the consideration of any measure or matter, the Chairman of the Full Committee, or of any Subcommittee, or any Member acting as such, shall suspend further proceedings after a question has been put to the Committee at any time when there is a vote by electronic device occurring in the House of Representatives.

Other Procedures

(j) The Chairman of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

Use of Hearing Rooms

(k) In consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman of the full Committee shall establish guidelines for use of Committee hearing rooms.

RULE 2. COMMITTEE MEETINGS [AND PROCEDURES]

Quorum [XI 2(h)]

(a)(1) One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for all purposes except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this Rule.

(2) A majority of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum in order to: (A) report or table any legislation, measure, or matter; (B) close Committee meetings or hearings pursuant to Rules 2(c) and 2(d); and, (C) authorize the issuance of subpoenas pursuant to Rule 1(c).

(3) Two Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which, unless waived by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, shall include at least one Member from each of the majority and minority parties.

Time and Place

(b)(1) Unless dispensed with by the Chairman, the meetings of the Committee shall be held on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of each month the House is in session at 10:00 a.m. and at such other times and in such places as the Chairman may designate. [XI 2(b)]

(2) The Chairman of the Committee may convene as necessary additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business subject to such rules as the Committee may adopt. The Committee shall meet for such purpose under that call of the Chairman. [XI 2(c)]

(3) The Chairman shall make public announcement of the date, time, place and subject matter of any of its hearings, and to the extent practicable, a list of witnesses at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this Rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and promptly made available by electronic form including the Committee website. [XI 2(g)(3)]

Open Meetings [XI 2(g)]

(c) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House. Persons other than Members of the Committee and such non-Committee Members, Delegates, Resident Commissioner, congressional staff, or departmental representatives as the Committee may authorize, may not be present at a business or markup session that is held in executive session. This Rule does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by Rule 2(d).

(d)(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee shall be open to the public including radio, television, and still photography coverage except when the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate a law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, and Rule 2(q) a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony:

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information or would violate Rule XI 2(k)(5) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Rule XI 2(k)(5) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. No Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of any Committee or Subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize a particular Committee or Subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegate and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this Rule for closing hearings to the public: Provided, however, that the Committee or Subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of the hearing.

Audio and Visual Coverage [XI, clause 4]

(e)(A) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, these proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, except as provided in Rule XI 4(f)(2) of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall not be able to limit the number of television, or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(B)(1) Radio and television tapes, television film, and internet recordings of any Committee hearings or meetings that are open to the public may not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(2) It is, further, the intent of this rule that the general conduct of each meeting or hearing covered under authority of this rule by audio or visual means, and the personal behavior of the Committee Members and staff, other government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the meeting or hearing, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations, and may not be such as to:

(i) distort the object and purposes of the meeting or hearing or the activities of Committee Members in connection with that meeting or hearing or in connection with the general work of the Committee or of the House; or

(ii) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or bring the House, the Committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner into disrepute.

(3) The coverage of Committee meetings and hearings by audio and visual means shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this rule.

(f) The following shall apply to coverage of Committee meetings or hearings by audio or visual means:

(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a Committee or Subcommittee Chairman for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the Committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(9) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Special Meetings

(g) Rule XI 2(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference (Special Meetings).

Vice Chairman to Preside in Absence of Chairman

(h) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the Chairman's absence, by the member designated by the Chairman as the Vice Chairman of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chairman. [XI 2(d)]

Opening Statements; 5-Minute Rule

(i) Insofar as is practicable, the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall limit the total time of opening statements by Members to no more than 10 minutes, the time to be divided equally between the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. The time any one Member any address the Committee on any bill, motion or other matter under consideration by the Committee or the time allowed for the questioning of a witness at hearings before the Committee will be limited to five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be waived by the Chairman or acting. [XI 2(j)]

(j) Notwithstanding Rule 2(i), upon a motion the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may designate an equal number of members from each party to question a witness for a period not to exceed one hour in the aggregate or, upon a motion, may designate staff from each party to question a witness for equal specific periods that do not exceed on hour in the aggregate. [XI 2(j)]

Proxies

(k) No Member may authorize a vote by proxy with respect to any measure or matter before the Committee. [XI 2(f)]

Witnesses

(l)(1) Insofar as is practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file no later than twenty-four (24) hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and curriculum vitae. Each witness shall limit his or her presentation to a 5-minute summary, provided that additional time may be granted by the Chairman when appropriate. [XI 2(g)(4)]

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) which is relevant to the subject of his or her testimony and was received during the current fiscal year or either of the 2 preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. (XI 2(g)(4)]

(m) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority Members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon. [XI 2(j)(1)]

Hearing Procedures

(n) Rule XI 2(k) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference.

Bill and Subject Matter Consideration

(o) Bills and other substantive matters may be taken up for consideration only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, except those matters which are the subject of special-call meetings outlined in Rule 2(g). [XI 2(c)]

Private Bills

(p) No private bill will be reported by the Committee if there are two or more dissenting votes. Private bills so rejected by the Committee will not be reconsidered during the same Congress unless new evidence sufficient to justify a new hearing has been presented to the Committee.

Consideration of Measure or Matter

(q)(1) It shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any new or original measure of matter unless written notice of the date, place and subject matter of consideration and to the maximum extent practicable, a written copy of the measure or matter to be considered, and to the maximum extent practicable the original text for purposes of markup of the measure to be considered have been available to each Member of the Committee for at least 48 hours in advance of consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays. To the maximum extent practicable, amendments to the measure or matter to be considered, shall be submitted in writing to the Clerk of the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the consideration of the measure or matter. [XIII 4(a)]

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this rule, consideration of any legislative measure or matter by the Committee shall be in order by vote of two-thirds of the Members present, provided that a majority of the Committee is present.

Requests for Written Motions

(r) Any legislative or non-procedural motion made at a regular or special meeting of the Committee and which is entertained by the Chairman shall be presented in writing upon the demand of any Member present and a copy made available to each Member present.

Requests for Record Votes at Full Committee

(s) A record vote of the Members may be had at the request of three or more Members or in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

Report Language on Use of Federal Resources

(t) No legislative report filed by the Committee on any measure or matter reported by the Committee shall contain language which has the effect of specifying the use of federal resources more explicitly (inclusively or exclusively) than that specified in the measure or matter as ordered reported, unless such language has been approved by the Committee during a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members.

Committee Records

(u)(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting. [XI 2(e)]

(2) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written requires of my Member of the Committee. [XI 2(e)(3)]

(3) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form, including the Committee website. [XI 2(e)(4)]

(4)(A) Except as provided for in subdivision (B), all Committee hearings records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as its Chairman. Such records shall be the property of the House, and each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner, shall have access thereto.

(B) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, other than members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, may not have access to the records of the Committee respecting the conduct of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House without the specific prior permission of the Committee.

Publication of Committee Hearings and Markups

(v) The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Individuals, including Members of Congress, whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication. Any requests by those Members, staff or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript. Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee and shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chairman.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

Structure and Jurisdiction

(a) The Committee shall have the following standing Subcommittees with the jurisdiction indicated.

(1) Subcommittee on Energy

Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to energy research, development, and demonstration and projects therefor, and commercial application of energy technology including:

Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs;

Department of Energy laboratories;

Department of Energy science activities;

Energy supply activities;

Nuclear, solar and renewable energy, and other advanced energy technologies;

Uranium supply and enrichment, and Department of Energy waste management and environment, safety, and health activities as appropriate;

Fossil energy research and development;

Clean coal technology;

Energy conservation research and development;

Energy aspects of climate change; and energy standards.

(2) Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards

Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to competitiveness, technology, and environmental research, development, and demonstration including:

Technical standards and standardization of measurement;

The National Institute of Standards and Technology;

The National Technical Information Service;

Competitiveness, including small business competitiveness;

Tax antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental policies as they related to technological development and commercialization;

Technology transfer;

Patent and intellectual property policy;

International technology trade;

Research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation;

Surface and water transportation research, development, and demonstration programs;

Environmental Protection Agency research and development programs;

Biotechnology policy;

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including all activities related to weather, weather services, climate, and the atmosphere, and marine fisheries, and oceanic research;

Risk assessment activities; and

Scientific issues related to environmental policy, including climate change.

(3) Subcommittee on Research

Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to science policy including:

Office of Science and Technology Policy;

All scientific research, and scientific and engineering resources (including human resources), math, science and engineering education;

Intergovernmental mechanisms for research, development, and demonstration and cross-cutting programs;

International scientific cooperation;

National Science Foundation;

University research policy, including infrastructure and overhead;

University research partnerships, including those with industry;

Science scholarships;

Issues relating to computers, communications, and information technology;

Earthquake and fire research programs;

Research and development relating to health, biomedical, and nutritional programs;

To the extent appropriate, agricultural, geological, biological and life sciences research; and;

Materials research, development, and demonstration and policy.

(4) Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics

Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to astronautical and aeronautical research and development including:

National space policy, including access to space;

Sub-orbital access and applications;

National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractor and government-operated laboratories;

Space commercialization including the commercial space activities relating to the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce;

Exploration and use of outer space;

International space cooperation;

National Space Council;

Space applications, space communications and related matters;

Earth remote sensing policy;

Civil aviation research, development, and demonstration;

Research, development, and demonstration programs of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

Space law.

Referral of Legislation

(b) The Chairman shall refer all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee to the Subcommittee or Subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks, unless the Chairman deems consideration is to be by the Full Committee. Subcommittee Chairmen may make requests for referral of specific matters to their Subcommittee within the two week period if they believe Subcommittee jurisdictions so warrant.

Ex-Officio Members

(c) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex-officio Members of all Subcommittees and shall have the right to vote and be counted as part of the quorum and ratios on all matters before the Subcommittee.

Procedures

(d) No Subcommittee shall meet for markup or approval when any other Subcommittee of the Committee or the Full Committee is meeting to consider any measure or matter for markup or approval.

(e) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. For matters within its jurisdiction, each Subcommittee is authorized to conduct legislative, investigative, forecasting, and general oversight hearings; to conduct inquiries into the future; and to undertake budget impact studies. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee Chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(f) Any Member of the Committee may have the privilege of sitting with any Subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such Subcommittee, except as provided in Rule 3(c).

(g) During any Subcommittee proceeding for markup or approval, a record vote may be had at the request of one or more Members of that Subcommittee.

RULE 4. REPORTS

Substance of Legislative Reports

(a) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall include the following, to be provided by the Committee:

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to Rule X 2(b)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, separately set out and identified [XIII, 3(c)];

(2) the statement required by section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures as specified in [XIII, 3(c)(2)];

(3) With respect to reports on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, a ''Constitutional Authority Statement'' citing the specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution pursuant to which the bill or joint resolution is proposed to be enacted.

(4) with respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for an against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter;

(5) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Committee under Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, unless the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepared under subparagraph 2 of this Rule has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report [XIII, 3(d)(3)(D)];

(6) in the case of a bill or joint resolution which repeals or amends any statute or part thereof, the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed, and a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended [Rule XIII, clause 3]; and

(7) a transcript of the markup of the measure or matter unless waived under Rule 2(v).

(8) a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding. [XIII, 3(c)]

(b) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall further include the following, to be provided by sources other than the Committee:

(1) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office required under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified, whenever the Director (if timely, and submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison of the Committee [XIII, clauses 2–4];

(2) if the Committee has not received prior to the filing of the report the material required under paragraph (1) of this Rule, then it shall include a statement to that effect in the report on the measure.

Minority and Additional Views [XI 2(l)]

(c) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than two subsequent calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member, with the clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more Members of the Committee shall be include within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the Committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views, which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under Rule 4(b)(1)) are included as part of the report. However, this rule does not preclude (1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely requested for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this Rule or (2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that Committee upon that measure or matter.

(d) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall advise Members of the day and hour when the time for submitting views relative to any given report elapses. No supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be accepted for inclusion in the report if submitted after the announced time has elapsed unless the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, decides to extend the time for submission of views the 2 subsequent calendar days after the day of notice, in which case he shall communicate such fact to Members, including the revised day and hour for submissions to be received, without delay.

Consideration of Subcommittee Reports

(e) Reports and recommendations of a Subcommittee shall not be considered by the Full Committee until after the intervention of 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays, from the time the report is submitted and made available to full Committee membership and printed hearings thereon shall be made available, if feasible, to the Members, except that this rule may be waived at the discretion of the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

Timing and Filing of Committee Reports [XIII]

(f) It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.). To the maximum extent practicable, the written report of the Committee on such measures shall be made available to the Committee membership for review at least 24 hours in advance of filing.

(g) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by the majority of the Members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the Committee notice of the filing of that request.

(h)(1) Any document published by the Committee as a House Report, other than a report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee, shall be approved by the Committee at a meeting, and Members shall have the same opportunity to submit views as provided for in Rule 4(c).

(2) Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the Chairman may approve the publication of any document as a Committee print which in his discretion he determines to be useful for the information of the Committee.

(3) Any document to be published as a Committee print which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees must be approved by the Full Committee or its Subcommittees, as applicable, in a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members, and such Members shall have the right to submit supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the print within at least 48 hours after such approval.

(4) Any document to be published as a Committee print other than a document described in paragraph (3) of this Rule: (A) shall include on its cover the following statement: ''This document has been printed for informational purposes only and does not represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee;'' and (B) shall not be published following the sine die adjournment of a Congress, unless approved by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee.

(i) A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by this Committee and one or more other Committee(s) may be filed jointly, provided that each of the Committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

(j) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that members shall be entitled to not less than 7 calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(k) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, the Chairman may file the Committee's Activity Report for that Congress under clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House with the Clerk of the House at anytime and without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least 7 calendar days and that the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee. [XI 1(d), XI 1(d)(4)]

Oversight Reports

(l) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day). [XI 1(b)(2)]

LEGISLATIVE AND OVERSIGHT JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Rule X. Organization of Committees.

Committees and their legislative jurisdictions.

1. There shall be in the House the following standing Committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned to it by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4. All bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of the standing Committees listed in

this clause shall be referred to those Committees, in accordance with clause 2 of rule XII, as follows:

* * * * *

(n) Committee on Science.

(1) All energy research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor, and all federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratories.

(2) Astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

(3) Civil aviation research and development.

(4) Environmental research and development.

(5) Marine research.

(6) Commercial application of energy technology.

(7) National Institute of Standards and Technology, standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

(8) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(9) National Space Council.

(10) National Science Foundation.

(11) National Weather Service.

(12) Outer space, including exploration and control thereof.

(13) Science Scholarships.

(14) Scientific research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor.

* * * * *

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT FUNCTIONS

3. (j) The Committee on Science shall review and study on a continuing basis laws, programs, and Government activities relating to nonmilitary research and development.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. CAPITO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

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. MORAN of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CULBERSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 32 of the 107th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, February 26, 2001.

Thereupon, (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 32, the House adjourned until Monday, February 26, 2001, at 2 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Reprsentatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 107th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ALABAMA

1. Sonny Callahan
2. Terry Everett
3. Bob Riley
4. Robert B. Aderholt
5. Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.
6. Spencer Bachus
7. Earl F. Hilliard

ALASKA

At Large

Don Young

ARIZONA

1. Jeff Flake
2. Ed Pastor
3. Bob Stump
4. John B. Shadegg
5. Jim Kolbe
6. J.D. Hayworth

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry
2. Vic Snyder
3. Asa Hutchinson
4. Mike Ross

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson
2. Wally Herger
3. Doug Ose
4. John T. Doolittle
5. Robert T. Matsui
6. Lynn C. Woolsey
7. George Miller
8. Nancy Pelosi
9. Barbara Lee
10. Ellen O. Tauscher
11. Richard W. Pombo
12. Tom Lantos
13. Fortney Pete Stark
14. Anna G. Eshoo
15. Michael M. Honda
16. Zoe Lofgren
17. Sam Farr
18. Gary A. Condit
19. George Radanovich
20. Calvin M. Dooley
21. William M. Thomas
22. Lois Capps
23. Elton Gallegly
24. Brad Sherman
25. Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon
26. Howard L. Berman
27. Adam B. Schiff
28. David Dreier
29. Henry A. Waxman
30. Xavier Becerra
31. Hilda L. Solis
33. Lucille Roybal-Allard
34. Grace F. Napolitano
35. Maxine Waters
36. Jane Harman
37. Juanita Millender-McDonald
38. Stephen Horn
39. Edward R. Royce
40. Jerry Lewis
41. Gary G. Miller
42. Joe Baca
43. Ken Calvert
44. Mary Bono
45. Dana Rohrabacher
46. Loretta Sanchez
47. Christopher Cox
48. Darrell E. Issa
49. Susan A. Davis
50. Bob Filner
51. Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham
52. Duncan Hunter

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette
2. Mark Udall
3. Scott McInnis
4. Bob Schaffer
5. Joel Hefley
6. Thomas G. Tancredo

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson
2. Rob Simmons
3. Rosa L. DeLauro
4. Christopher Shays
5. James H. Maloney
6. Nancy L. Johnson

DELAWARE

At Large

Michael N. Castle

FLORIDA

1. Joe Scarborough
2. Allen Boyd
3. Corrine Brown
4. Ander Crenshaw
5. Karen L. Thurman
6. Cliff Stearns
7. John L. Mica
8. Ric Keller
9. Michael Bilirakis
10. C.W. Bill Young
11. Jim Davis
12. Adam H. Putnam

13. Dan Miller
14. Porter J. Goss
15. Dave Weldon
16. Mark Foley
17. Carrie P. Meek
18. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
19. Robert Wexler
20. Peter Deutsch
21. Lincoln Diaz-Balart
22. E. Clay Shaw, Jr.
23. Alcee L. Hastings

GEORGIA

1. Jack Kingston
2. Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.
3. Mac Collins
4. Cynthia A. McKinney
5. John Lewis
6. Johnny Isakson
7. Bob Barr
8. Saxby Chambliss
9. Nathan Deal
10. Charlie Norwood
11. John Linder

HAWAII

1. Neil Abercrombie
2. Patsy T. Mink

IDAHO

1. C.L. ''Butch'' Otter
2. Michael K. Simpson

ILLINOIS

1. Bobby L. Rush
2. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.
3. William O. Lipinski
4. Luis V. Gutierrez
5. Rod R. Blagojevich
6. Henry J. Hyde
7. Danny K. Davis
8. Philip M. Crane
9. Janice D. Schakowsky
10. Mark Steven Kirk
11. Jerry Weller
12. Jerry F. Costello
13. Judy Biggert
14. J. Dennis Hastert
15. Timothy V. Johnson
16. Donald A. Manzullo
17. Lane Evans
18. Ray LaHood
19. David D. Phelps
20. John Shimkus

INDIANA

1. Peter J. Visclosky
2. Mike Pence
3. Tim Roemer
4. Mark E. Souder
5. Steve Buyer
6. Dan Burton
7. Brian D. Kerns
8. John N. Hostettler
9. Baron P. Hill
10. Julia Carson

IOWA

1. James A. Leach
2. Jim Nussle
3. Leonard L. Boswell
4. Greg Ganske
5. Tom Latham

KANSAS

1. Jerry Moran
2. Jim Ryun
3. Dennis Moore
4. Todd Tiahrt

KENTUCKY

1. Ed Whitfield
2. Ron Lewis
3. Anne M. Northup
4. Ken Lucas
5. Harold Rogers
6. Ernie Fletcher

LOUISIANA

1. David Vitter
2. William J. Jefferson
3. W.J. (Billy) Tauzin
4. Jim McCrery
5. John Cooksey
6. Richard H. Baker
7. Christopher John

MAINE

1. Thomas H. Allen
2. John Elias Baldacci

MARYLAND

1. Wayne T. Gilchrest
2. Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
3. Benjamin L. Cardin
4. Albert Russell Wynn
5. Steny H. Hoyer
6. Roscoe G. Bartlett
7. Elijah E. Cummings
8. Constance A. Morella

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Olver
2. Richard E. Neal
3. James P. McGovern
4. Barney Frank
5. Martin T. Meehan
6. John F. Tierney
7. Edward J. Markey
8. Michael E. Capuano
9. John Joseph Moakley
10. William D. Delahunt

MICHIGAN

1. Bart Stupak
2. Peter Hoekstra
3. Vernon J. Ehlers
4. Dave Camp
5. James A. Barcia
6. Fred Upton
7. Nick Smith
8. Mike Rogers
9. Dale E. Kildee
10. David E. Bonior
11. Joe Knollenberg
12. Sander M. Levin
13. Lynn N. Rivers
14. John Conyers, Jr.
15. Carolyn C. Kilpatrick
16. John D. Dingell

MINNESOTA

1. Gil Gutknecht
2. Mark R. Kennedy
3. Jim Ramstad
4. Betty McCollum
5. Martin Olav Sabo
6. Bill Luther
7. Collin C. Peterson
8. James L. Oberstar

MISSISSIPPI

1. Roger F. Wicker
2. Bennie G. Thompson
3. Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering
4. Ronnie Shows
5. Gene Taylor

MISSOURI

1. Wm. Lacy Clay
2. W. Todd Akin
3. Richard A. Gephardt
4. Ike Skelton
5. Karen McCarthy
6. Sam Graves
7. Roy Blunt
8. Jo Ann Emerson
9. Kenny C. Hulshof

MONTANA

At Large

Dennis R. Rehberg

NEBRASKA

1. Doug Bereuter
2. Lee Terry
3. Tom Osborne

NEVADA

1. Shelley Berkley
2. Jim Gibbons

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. John E. Sununu
2. Charles F. Bass

NEW JERSEY

1. Robert E. Andrews
2. Frank A. LoBiondo
3. Jim Saxton
4. Christopher H. Smith
5. Marge Roukema
6. Frank Pallone, Jr.
7. Mike Ferguson
8. Bill Pascrell, Jr.
9. Steven R. Rothman
10. Donald M. Payne
11. Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
12. Rush D. Holt
13. Robert Menendez

NEW MEXICO

1. Heather Wilson
2. Joe Skeen
3. Tom Udall

NEW YORK

1. Felix J. Grucci, Jr.
2. Steve Israel
3. Peter T. King
4. Carolyn McCarthy
5. Gary L. Ackerman
6. Gregory W. Meeks
7. Joseph Crowley
8. Jerrold Nadler
9. Anthony D. Weiner
10. Edolphus Towns
11. Major R. Owens
12. Nydia M. Velázquez
13. Vito Fossella
14. Carolyn B. Maloney
15. Charles B. Rangel
16. José E. Serrano
17. Eliot L. Engel
18. Nita M. Lowey
19. Sue W. Kelly
20. Benjamin A. Gilman
21. Michael R. McNulty
22. John E. Sweeney
23. Sherwood L. Boehlert
24. John M. McHugh
25. James T. Walsh
26. Maurice D. Hinchey
27. Thomas M. Reynolds
28. Louise McIntosh Slaughter
29. John J. LaFalce
30. Jack Quinn
31. Amo Houghton

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Eva M. Clayton
2. Bob Etheridge
3. Walter B. Jones
4. David E. Price
5. Richard Burr
6. Howard Coble
7. Mike McIntyre
8. Robin Hayes
9. Sue Wilkins Myrick
10. Cass Ballenger
11. Charles H. Taylor
12. Melvin L. Watt

NORTH DAKOTA

At Large

Earl Pomeroy

OHIO

1. Steve Chabot
2. Rob Portman
3. Tony P. Hall
4. Michael G. Oxley
5. Paul E. Gillmor
6. Ted Strickland
7. David L. Hobson
8. John A. Boehner
9. Marcy Kaptur
10. Dennis J. Kucinich
11. Stephanie Tubbs Jones
12. Patrick J. Tiberi
13. Sherrod Brown
14. Tom Sawyer
15. Deborah Pryce
16. Ralph Regula
17. James A. Traficant, Jr.
18. Robert W. Ney

19. Steven C. LaTourette

OKLAHOMA

1. Steve Largent
2. Brad Carson
3. Wes Watkins
4. J.C. Watts, Jr.
5. Ernest J. Istook, Jr.
6. Frank D. Lucas

OREGON

1. David Wu
2. Greg Walden
3. Earl Blumenauer
4. Peter A. DeFazio
5. Darlene Hooley

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Robert A. Brady
2. Chaka Fattah
3. Robert A. Borski
4. Melissa A. Hart
5. John E. Peterson
6. Tim Holden
7. Curt Weldon
8. James C. Greenwood
9. Bud Shuster
10. Don Sherwood
11. Paul E. Kanjorski
12. John P. Murtha
13. Joseph M. Hoeffel
14. William J. Coyne
15. Patrick J. Toomey
16. Joseph R. Pitts
17. George W. Gekas
18. Michael F. Doyle
19. Todd Russell Platts
20. Frank Mascara
21. Phil English

RHODE ISLAND

1. Patrick J. Kennedy
2. James R. Langevin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Henry E. Brown, Jr.
2. Floyd Spence
3. Lindsey O. Graham
4. Jim DeMint
5. John M. Spratt, Jr.
6. James E. Clyburn

SOUTH DAKOTA

At Large

John R. Thune

TENNESSEE

1. William L. Jenkins
2. John J. Duncan, Jr.
3. Zach Wamp
4. Van Hilleary
5. Bob Clement
6. Bart Gordon
7. Ed Bryant
8. John S. Tanner
9. Harold E. Ford, Jr.

TEXAS

1. Max Sandlin
2. Jim Turner
3. Sam Johnson
4. Ralph M. Hall
5. Pete Sessions
6. Joe Barton
7. John Abney Culberson
8. Kevin Brady
9. Nick Lampson
10. Lloyd Doggett
11. Chet Edwards
12. Kay Granger
13. Mac Thornberry
14. Ron Paul
15. Rubén Hinojosa
16. Silvestre Reyes
17. Charles W. Stenholm
18. Sheila Jackson-Lee
19. Larry Combest
20. Charles A. Gonzalez
21. Lamar S. Smith
22. Tom DeLay
23. Henry Bonilla
24. Martin Frost
25. Ken Bentsen
26. Richard K. Armey
27. Solomon P. Ortiz
28. Ciro D. Rodriguez
29. Gene Green
30. Eddie Bernice Johnson

UTAH

1. James V. Hansen
2. Jim Matheson
3. Chris Cannon

VERMONT

At Large

Bernard Sanders

VIRGINIA

1. Jo Ann Davis
2. Edward L. Schrock
3. Robert C. Scott
4. Norman Sisisky
5. Virgil H. Goode, Jr.
6. Bob Goodlatte
7. Eric Cantor
8. James P. Moran
9. Rick Boucher
10. Frank R. Wolf
11. Thomas M. Davis

WASHINGTON

1. Jay Inslee
2. Rick Larsen
3. Brian Baird
4. Doc Hastings
5. George R. Nethercutt, Jr.
6. Norman D. Dicks
7. Jim McDermott
8. Jennifer Dunn
9. Adam Smith

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Alan B. Mollohan
2. Shelley Moore Capito
3. Nick J. Rahall II

WISCONSIN

1. Paul Ryan
2. Tammy Baldwin
3. Ron Kind
4. Gerald D. Kleczka
5. Thomas M. Barrett
6. Thomas E. Petri
7. David R. Obey
8. Mark Green
9. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.

WYOMING

At Large

Barbara Cubin

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá

AMERICAN SAMOA

Delegate

Eni F. H. Faleomavaega

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Delegate

Eleanor Holmes Norton

GUAM

Delegate

Robert A. Underwood

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Delegate

Donna M. Christensen

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Robert E. Andrews, Richard K. Armey, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, John Elias E. Baldacci, Tammy Baldwin, Cass Ballenger, Bob Barr, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Ken Bentsen, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Judy Biggert, Michael Bilirakis, Rod R. Blagojevich, Roy Blunt, Sherwood L. Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, David E. Bonior, Robert A. Borski, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ed Bryant, Richard Burr, Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Sonny Callahan, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brad Carson, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Saxby Chambliss, Wm. Lacy Clay, Eva M. Clayton, Howard Coble, Mac Collins, Larry Combest, Gary A. Condit, Christopher Cox, William J. Coyne, Philip P. Crane, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, John Abney Culberson, Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham, Danny K. Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Thomas M. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Jim DeMint, Peter Deutsch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Calvin M. Dooley, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Sam Farr, Mike Ferguson, Jeff Flake, Ernie Fletcher, Mark Foley, Vito Fossella, Barney Frank, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Martin Frost, Elton Gallegly, Greg Ganske, George W. Gekas, Richard A. Gephardt, Jim Gibbons, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Paul E. Gillmor, Benjamin A. Gilman, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Porter J. Goss, Lindsey O. Graham, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Gene Green, Mark Green, James C. Greenwood, Felix J. Grucci, Jr., Gil Gutknecht, Tony P. Hall, James V. Hansen, Jane Harman, Melissa A. Hart, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, J. D. Hayworth, Joel Hefley, Wally Herger, Van Hilleary, Earl F. Hilliard, Maurice D. Hinchey, David L. Hobson, Joseph M. Hoeffel, Peter Hoekstra, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Stephen Horn, John N. Hostettler, Amo Houghton, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Asa Hutchinson, Henry J. Hyde, Jay Inslee, Johnny Isakson, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Ernest J. Istook, Jr., Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, William L. Jenkins, Christopher John, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Nancy L. Johnson, Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Sue W. Kelly, Mark R. Kennedy, Patrick J. Kennedy, Brian D. Kerns, Dale E. Kildee, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Gerald D. Kleczka, Joe Knollenberg, Jim Kolbe, Dennis J. Kucinich, Ray LaHood, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Steve Largent, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, James A. Leach, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, William O. Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Ken Lucas, Bill Luther, Carolyn B. Maloney, James H. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Edward J. Markey, Frank Mascara, Robert T. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Jim McCrery, John McHugh, Scott McInnis, Howard P. McKeon, Michael R. McNulty, Martin T. Meehan, Carrie P. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, John L. Mica, Dan Miller, Gary G. Miller, Patsy T. Mink, John Joseph Moakley, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Constance A. Morella, John P. Murtha, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, George R.

Nethercutt, Jr., Robert W. Ney, Anne M. Northup, Charlie Norwood, Jim Nussle, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Tom Osborne, Doug Ose, C. L. Otter, Michael G. Oxley, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, David D. Phelps, Charles W. Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Richard W. Pombo, Rob Portman, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, Jack Quinn, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall, II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Bob Riley, Lynn N. Rivers, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Tim Roemer, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Steven R. Rothman, Marge Roukema, Edward R. Royce, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Jim Ryun, Martin Olav Sabo, Loretta Sanchez, Bernard Sanders, Max Sandlin, Tom Sawyer, Jim Saxton, Joe Scarborough, Bob Schaffer, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Edward L. Schrock, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, John B. Shadegg, E. Clay Shaw, Jr., Christopher Shays, Brad Sherman, Don Sherwood, John Shimkus, Ronnie Shows, Rob Simmons, Michael K. Simpson, Joe Skeen, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar S. Smith, Nick Smith, Vic Snyder, Mark E. Souder, Floyd Spence, John N. Spratt, Jr., Cliff Stearns, Charles W. Stenholm, Bob Stump, Bart Stupak, John E. Sununu, John E. Sweeney, Thomas G. Tancredo, Ellen O. Tauscher, W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Charles H. Taylor, Lee Terry, William M. Thomas, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, John R. Thune, Karen L. Thurman, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Patrick J. Toomey, James A. Traficant, Jr., Mark Udall, Robert A. Underwood, Fred Upton, Peter J. Visclosky, David Vitter, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Zach Wamp, Maxine Waters, Wes Watkins, J.C. Watts, Jr., Henry A. Waxman, Curt Weldon, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Heather Wilson, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, Albert Russell Wynn, C.W. Bill Young, Don Young,

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

823. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Flutolanil, N-(3-(1-methylethoxy) phenyl)-2-(trifuoromethyl)benzamide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301094; FRL–6761–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

824. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clomazone; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301101; FRL–6764–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

825. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Carboxin; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301100; FRL–6762–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

826. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Security and Emergency Operations; Security Requirements for Protected Disclosures Under Section 3164 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 [Docket No. SO-RM–00–3164] (RIN: 1992–AA26) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

827. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Guidelines for Safeguarding Member Information—received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

828. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule— Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance (RIN: 1901–AA87) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

829. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting clarification of Presidential Determiniation 2000–30 that was issued on September 19, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

830. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nuclear Safety Management (RIN: 1901–AA34) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

831. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Contractor Legal Management Requirements; Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (RIN: 1990–AA27) received February 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

832. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicaid Program; Medicaid Managed Care [HCFA–2001–FC] (RIN: 0938–AI70) received February 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

833. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia; Post 1996 Rate-of-Progress Plans, One-Hour Ozone Attainment Demonstrations and Attainment Date Extension for the Metropolitan Washington D.C. Ozone Nonattainment Area; Correction [DC–2025, MD–3064, VA–5052; FRL–6943–9] received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

834. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification to terminate the identification of Serbia as a particularly severe violator of religious freedom; to the Committee on International Relations.

835. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a notification to Authorize the Furnishing of Emergency Military Assistance to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), Countries Participating in UNAMSIL, and Other Countries Involved in Peacekeeping Efforts or Affiliated Coalition Operations With Respect to Sierra Leone; to the Committee on International Relations.

836. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received February 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

837. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Suitability (RIN: 3206–AC19) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

838. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2001 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surf Clams, Ocean Quahogs, and Maine Mahogany Ocean Quahogs [Docket No. 991228355–0370–04; I.D. 101200F] (RIN: 0648–AM50) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

839. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives Stemme GmbH & Co. KG Models S10 and S10–V Sailplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–81–AD; Amendment 39–12068; AD 2000–26–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

840. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109E Helicopters [Docket No. 2000–SW–07–AD; Amendment 39–12044; AD 2000–25–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

841. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Model EC135 P1 and EC135 T1 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000–SW–23–AD; Amendment 39–12062; AD 2000–26–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

842. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G–1159A(G-III) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–144–AD; Amendment 39–12070; AD 2000–26–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

843. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA-Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–82–AD; Amendment 39–12069; AD 2000–26–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

844. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FMCSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations; Definition of Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV); Requirements for Operators of Small Passenger-Carrying CMVs; Delay of Effective Date [Docket Nos. FMCSA–97–2858 and FMCSA–99–5710] (RINs: 2126–AA51 and 2126–A44 [formerly RINs: 2125–E22 and 2125–AE60]) received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

845. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final

rule—Further Revisions to the Clean Water Act Regulatory Definition of ''Discharge of Dredged Material'': Delay of Effective Date [FRL–6945–3] received February 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

846. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of New Markets Venture Capital, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—New Markets Venture Capital Program—received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

847. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Custom Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Duty-Free Treatment For Certain Beverages Made With Caribbean Rum [T.D. 01–17] (RIN: 1515–AC78) received February 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

848. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration and the Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for WTO and Multilateral Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report entitled, ''Subsidies Enforcement Annual Report To The Congress''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

849. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Construction Management Contracts—received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

850. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Advance Payments From Construction Service Contracts (Revised)—received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

851. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Claim Revenue Under A Long-Term Contract—received February 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

852. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Disclosure of Return Information to the Bureau of the Census [TD 8943] (RIN: 1545–AY51) received February 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

853. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting the annual report on the use of the Office by covered employees for calendar year 2000; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GANSKE (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. LEACH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. UPTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 608. A bill to amend section 211 of the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of MTBE, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the Environmental Protection Agency's Reformulated Gasoline Program, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 609. A bill 10, United States Code, to provide limited authority for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation in the case of certain disabled military retirees who are over the age of 65; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit for a portion of the amount paid for natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 611. A bill to amend part F of the title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and refocus civic education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 612. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the standards for compensation for Persian Gulf veterans suffering from certain undiagnosed illnesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 613. A bill to provide a grant to develop initiatives and disseminate information about character education, and a grant to research character education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 614. A bill to make technical corrections in copyright law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 615. A bill to make technical corrections in patent, copyright, and trademark laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 616. A bill to establish an Office of Management in the Executive Office of the President, and to redesignate the Office of Management and Budget as the Office of the Federal Budget; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 617. A bill to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States' relationship with Native Hawaiians, to provide a process for the reorganization of a Native Hawaiian government and the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 618. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase to 5 years the period during which former Members of Congress may not engage in certain lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WU, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HORN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 619. A bill to allow certain individuals of Japanese ancestry who were brought forcibly to the United States from countries in Latin America during World War II and were interned in the United States to be provided restitution under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 620. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish the model school dropout prevention grant program and the national school dropout prevention grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BACA):

H.R. 621. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 6230 Van Nuys Boulevard in Van Nuys, California, as the ''James C. Corman Federal Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KING, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COX, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. THOMAS M. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GORDON,

Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KERNS, Mr. KIND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RILEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BACA, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mr. OSE, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 623. A bill to provide funds to assist homeless children and youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. EHRLICH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 624. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote organ donation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH:

H.R. 625. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize grants to States for the construction, repair, renovation, and modernization of public school facilities, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tax incentives for such undertakings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 626. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to nonprofit organizations to finance the construction, refurbishing, and servicing of individually-owned household water well systems in rural areas for individuals with low or moderate incomes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 627. A bill to provide tax and regulatory relief for farmers and to improve the competitiveness of American agricultural commodities and products in global markets; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Rules, and Government Reform, 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 Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 628. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando, Florida, as the ''Arthur 'Pappy' KENNEDY Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 629. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1601–1 Main Street in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Eddie Mae Steward Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 630. A bill to provide grants for cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training in public schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COOKSEY (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 631. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Project Apollo; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HORN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 632. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Men's Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 633. A bill to reduce health care costs and promote improved health by providing supplemental grants for additional preventive health services for women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. WELLER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 634. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to include additional information in Social Security account statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself and Mr. COYNE):

H.R. 635. A bill to establish the Steel Industry National Historic Park in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit private educational institutions to maintain qualified tuition programs which are comparable to qualified State tuition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 637. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to eliminate the funding limitation applicable to grants for special alternative instructional programs under subpart 1 of part A of title VII of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 638. A bill to provide benefits to domestic partners of Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KING, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FRANK, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a comprehensive

program for testing and treatment of veterans for the Hepatitis C virus; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 640. A bill to adjust the boundaries of Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 641. A bill to protect amateur athletics and combat illegal sports gambling; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 642. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 643. A bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 644. A bill to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the Government of the Republic of Estonia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H.R. 645. A bill to reauthorize the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. STEARNS, and Mrs. WILSON):

H.R. 646. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Structure and Reauthorization of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself and Mr. PHELPS):

H.R. 647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate any portion of a refund for use by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in providing catastrophic health coverage to individuals who do not otherwise have health coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 648. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt licensed funeral directors and licensed embalmers from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H.R. 649. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to lease land at the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake project, South Carolina, to the South Carolina Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 650. A bill to expand loan forgiveness for teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 651. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide increased authority for school personnel to discipline children with disabilities who engage in certain dangerous behavior; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 652. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require the arbitration of initial contract negotiation disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 653. A bill 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a combat artillery medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 654. A bill to reduce fraud in connection with the provision of legal advice and other services to individuals applying for immigration benefits or otherwise involved in immigration proceedings by requiring paid immigration consultants to be licensed and otherwise provide services in a satisfactory manner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 655. A bill to establish a commission to study the culture and glorification of violence in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of allow use of cash accounting method for certain small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the depreciation benefits available to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that income averaging for farmers not increase a farmer's liability for the alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 659. A bill to authorize appropriations for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to achieve full funding for part B of that Act by 2006; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 660. A bill to ensure that exports of Alaskan North Slope crude oil are prohibited; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provision taxing policyholder dividends of mutual life insurance companies and to repeal the policyholders surplus account provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 662. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 663. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Center for Social Work Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. HART, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETRI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REYES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr.

SAXTON, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 664. 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 the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds $1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONIOR (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FROST, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 665. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply the look-thru rules for purposes of the foreign tax credit limitation to dividends from foreign corporations not controlled by a domestic corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 667. A bill to authorize certain States to prohibit the importation of solid waste from other States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 669. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 127 Social Street in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, as the ''Alphonse F. Auclair Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 670. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7 Commercial Street in Newport, Rhode Island, as the ''Bruce F. Cotta Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 671. A bill to expand the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Secretary to include firearm products and nonpowder firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty in the standard deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for charitable contributions to fight poverty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 674. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide for 1 percent downpayments for FHA mortgage loans for teachers and public safety officers to buy homes within the jurisdictions of their employing agencies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WU, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 675. A bill to provide assistance to East Timor to facilitate the transition of East Timor to an independent nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. EHRLICH, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. HART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H.R. 676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the maximum amount allowable as an annual contributions to education individual retirement accounts from $500 to $2,000, phased in over 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 677. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to inspection of commercial motor vehicles entering the United States along the United States-Mexico border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PAUL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 678. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the student loan interest deduction and to allow more taxpayers to claim that deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 679. A bill to prohibit mining on a certain tract of Federal land in Los Angeles County, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 680. A bill to provide funds for the planning of a special census of Americans residing abroad; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 681. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that the term of office of the Director of the Census shall be 5 years, to require that such Director report directly to the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 682. A bill to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to require the Attorney General to acquire data about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on gender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 683. A bill to increase the authorization of appropriations for low-income energy assistance, weatherization, and State energy conservation grant programs, to expand the use of energy savings performance contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD:

H.R. 684. A bill to authorize assistance for mother-to-child HIV/AIDS transmission prevention efforts; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 685. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize certain projects in California for the use or reuse of reclaimed water and for the design and construction of demonstration and permanent facilities for that purpose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 60-month limitation period on the allowance of a deduction of interest on loans for higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Ms. McKINNEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 687. A bill to expand the teacher loan forgiveness programs under the Federal Family Education Loan and Federal Direct Loan programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. McKINNEY):

H.R. 688. A bill to amend the Poison Prevention Packaging Act to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to require child-proof caps for portable gasoline containers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 689. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that coverage of bone mass measurements is provided under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 690. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a mechanism for United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to sponsor their permanent partners for residence in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 691. A bill to extend the authorization of funding for child passenger protection education grants through fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OSBORNE (for himself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. THUNE):

H.R. 692. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part J of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to make improvements to the rural education achievement program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 693. A bill to ban the manufacture of handguns that cannot be personalized, to provide for a report to the Congress on the commercial feasibility of personalizing firearms, and to provide for grants to improve firearm safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit elections to decertify representation by a labor organization; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MASCARA, Ms. HART, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 695. A bill to establish the Oil Region National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 696. A bill to permit expungement of records of certain nonviolent criminal offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to eliminate certain mandatory minimum penalties relating to crack cocaine offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the importation of certain prescription drugs by pharmacists and wholesalers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 699. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the effective date for paid-up coverage under the military Survivor Benefit Plan from October 1, 2008, to October 1, 2002; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 700. A bill to reauthorize the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JOHN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 701. A bill to use royalties from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas production to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 702. A bill to encourage the safe and responsible use of personal watercraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. SCOTT:

H.R. 703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to public elementary and secondary school teachers by providing a tax credit for teaching expenses, professional development expenses, and student education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 704. A bill to permit the States in the Pacific time zone to temporarily adjust the standard time in response to the energy crisis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. OTTER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 705. A bill to subject the United States to imposition of fees and costs in proceedings relating to State water rights adjudications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 706. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain properties in the vicinity of the Elephant Butte Reservoir and the Caballo Reservoir, New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 707. A bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act

to provide to certain nationals of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti an opportunity to apply for adjustment of status under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 708. A bill to establish a congressional commemorative medal for organ donors and their families; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. STUPAK:

H.R. 709. A bill to provide that a grantee may not receive the full amount of a block grant under the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program unless that grantee adopts a health standard establishing a legal presumption that heart, lung, and respiratory disease are occupational diseases for public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNUNU (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BASS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 710. A bill to amend the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 to provide for consistent treatment of survivor benefits for public safety officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. SCHAFFER):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify that State attorney generals may enforce State consumer protection laws with respect to air transportation and the advertisement and sale of air transportation services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BACA, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STARK, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 712. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Sciences to determine the causes of recent increases in the price of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 713. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a report regarding the safety and monitoring of genetically engineered foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 714. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide that certain funds treated as local funds under that Act shall be used to provide additional funding for programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 715. A bill to require a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to develop a methodology for measuring the cost of living in each State, and to require a study by the General Accounting Office to determine how Federal benefits would be increased in each State if the determination of such benefits were based on such methodology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial 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. WELDON of Florida (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 716. A bill to provide for a study of anesthesia services furnished under the Medicare Program, and to expand arrangements under which certified registered nurse anesthetists may furnish such services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. WICKER (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FORD, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. KING, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. KERNS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 717. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and services with respect to Duchenne muscular dystrophy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HORN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FRANK, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KING, Mr. BAKER, Ms. HART, Mr. PITTS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. REYES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 718. A bill to protect individuals, families, and Internet service providers from unsolicited and unwanted electronic mail; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. WU (for himself and Mr. FLETCHER):

H.R. 719. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that senior citizens are given an opportunity to serve as mentors, tutors, and volunteers for certain programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 720. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide temporary protected status to certain unaccompanied alien children, to provide for the adjustment of status of aliens unlawfully present in the United States who are under 18 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DICKS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FORD, Mr. STARK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BACA, Mr.

HALL of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 721. A bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. TERRY):

H.J. Res. 20. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. HAYES):

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution recognizing the Boy Scouts of America for the public service it performs through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's boys and young men; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Ava Gardner; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the upcoming trip of President George W. Bush to Mexico to meet with newly elected President Vicente Fox, and with respect to future cooperative efforts between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. REYES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. QUINN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GANSKE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BACA, Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. LAFALCE):

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution urging increased Federal funding for juvenile (Type 1) diabetes research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. HART, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. SIMMONS):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to promoting coverage of individuals under long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FROST, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued honoring Martha Matilda Harper, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H. Res. 40. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 41. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H. Res. 42. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H. Res. 43. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H. Res. 44. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Resources in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 45. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COMBEST:

H. Res. 46. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BARRETT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 47. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a postage stamp should be issued honorng American farm women; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FRANK):

H. Res. 48. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to post on the official public Internet site of the House of Representatives all lobbying registrations and reports filed with the Clerk under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ISAKSON, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H. Res. 49. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to Dr. Benjamin Elijah Mays in honor of his distinguished career as an educator, civil and human rights leader, and public theologian; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 50. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to Marcus Garvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Res. 51. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Argentina should provide an immediate and final resolution to the Buenos Aires Yoga School case; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. RILEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 52. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the grave danger of domestic terrorism and the need for improved organization in the executive branch and Congress to deter, prevent, prepare for, and respond to the impending threat of domestic terrorism; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WU:

H. Res. 53. A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the maximum Pell Grant should be increased to $4,350; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. TOWNS introduced a bill (H.R. 722) for the relief of Desmond J. Burke; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 36: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCINNIS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HILL, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 50: Mr. EVANS, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 65: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 122: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KING, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 123: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 131: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 138: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 139: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 145: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 148: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 154: Mr. ISSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 159: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 162: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 179: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 183: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 187: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 218: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 220: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 221: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 236: Mr. OTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 238: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 241: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 245: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 259: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 265: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 267: Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BACA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 275: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 286: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 287: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 303: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VITTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 310: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 311: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 325: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 336: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 345: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 367: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 368: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 369: Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 370: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 373: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 397: Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 419: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 429: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 456: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 475: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 478: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 482: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 489: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 490: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 491: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 493: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 494: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 498: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BACA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BERRY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANDANOVICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RODRIQUEZ, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BOYD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. THOMAS M. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GRAHAM, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 499: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 505: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 510: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. TURNER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 511: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. GANSKE.

H.R. 518: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 525: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 526: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 527: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 533: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 536: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 557: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 559: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 560: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 579: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WALSH, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H. Res. 13: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H. Res. 14: Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 17: Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 26: Mr. MCNULTY.