

And, although donated blood can be stored for up to six weeks, it usually is used within ten days because the demand is so great.

Every one of us knows someone—a family member, a friend, a loved one—who has needed, and received a blood transfusion at some point. But there are so many more who are in danger of not receiving the help they need.

This is why it is so vital that we make people aware of the importance of donating blood. I take this responsibility very seriously and give blood on a regular basis. Yet, I am only one person. We need to find ways to encourage more. Today, we can pass a resolution, which expresses the sense of the House that we establish a summer emergency blood donor season to encourage eligible donors.

I strongly support this resolution. We must ensure that everyone who is able to give blood does so. It is perhaps the most important gift we can give.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 202, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the establishment of a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2510) to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2510

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 "Defense Production Act Amendments of 2001".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended by striking "September 30, 2001" and inserting "September 30, 2004".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 711(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161(b)) is amended by striking "1996 through 2001" and inserting "2002 through 2004".

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 301(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(a)(1)), by striking "714(a)(1) of this Act" and inserting "702(16)".

(2) In subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 301(e)(1) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(1)), by striking "industrial resource shortfall" each place such term appears and inserting "industrial resource or critical technology item shortfall".

(3) In sections 301(e)(1)(D)(ii) and 303(a)(7)(B) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(1)(D)(ii), 2093(a)(7)(B)), by inserting "item" after "critical technology".

(4) In section 304(b)(1), (50 U.S.C. App. 2094(b)(1)), by striking "711(c)" and inserting "711(b)".

(5) In sections 301(e)(2)(B) and 309(a)(1), (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(2)(B), 2099(a)(1)), by striking "Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives" and inserting "Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2510, the Defense Production Act Amendments of 2001. As I am sure my colleagues know, the DPA is an essential element of our national security package. The DPA uses economic tools to provide uninterrupted supplies of industrial resources in times of both military crisis and civil emergency.

We are here today because the President's authority under the DPA expires at the end of the fiscal year. This bill introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) who chairs the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and his ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), is a straightforward, 3-year reauthorization with a handful of purely technical amendments.

Those amendments amount to little more than housekeeping. For example, one of those changes updates the statute to reflect the creation of the Committee on Financial Services at the beginning of this Congress. Others fix errors in section numbering or harmonize language within the statute.

Madam Speaker, I have with me the administration's statement in support of this bill along with a letter from Defense Principal Deputy Undersecretary Michael W. Wynne endorsing this legislation.

□ 1515

Madam Speaker, I will include these for the RECORD at this point.

PRINCIPAL DEPUTY
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2001.

Hon. MICHAEL OXLEY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is to express my strong supporter of the enactment of H.R. 2510, 107th Congress, an Act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950. The legislation gives the Department the ability to use the authorities of the Act for items and industrial resources that are essential for national security needs. The District Production Act authorities remain important elements in our national defense program.

H.R. 2510 extends and reauthorizes the Defense Production Act by three years from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2004.

This legislation provides a number of critical authorities needed to ensure a strong industrial base capable of meeting national defense requirements in peacetime as well as in times of national emergency. Title I of the DPA provides for priority performance on contracts and orders to meet approved national defense and emergency preparedness program requirements. Title I is indispensable in expediting production to meet the critical needs of US forces engaged in military operations. Title I authorities were used to ensure priority production and shipment of numerous items urgently needed by the coalition forces during Desert Shield/Storm and more recently Bosnia and Kosovo.

The Title III authorities enable us to establish assured and affordable production capacity for items essential for national defense. Title III is an extremely valuable tool that enables the Department to field technologically superior systems, upgrade the capabilities of older systems, and reduce operations and sustainment costs. A recent Title III project for Discontinuous Reinforced Aluminum (DRA) resulted in the insertion of components made of DRA in the F-16 fighter that are dramatically reducing life-cycle costs and improved flight safety.

This legislation does not call for additional spending by the Government or Department of Defense. A similar letter has been sent to the Ranking Member, Congressman John LaFalce.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL W. WYNNE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 5, 2001.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 2510—DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001 (REP. KING (R) NEW YORK AND REP. MALONEY (D) NEW YORK)

The Administration supports H.R. 2510, which would extend the expiration date and authorization of appropriations for the Defense Production Act through FY 2004.

The expiration of the Defense Production Act could have a severe impact on the Nation's ability to respond to national security threats, both at home and abroad. Thus, passage of H.R. 2510 would ensure the President's continued ability to provide for the Nation's security by providing authority to: (1) establish, expand, or maintain essential domestic industrial capacity; (2) direct priority performance of contracts and orders to meet approved national security requirements; and (3) suspend or prohibit a foreign acquisition of a U.S. firm when that acquisition would present a threat to the Nation's security.

Madam Speaker, over the past 3 years, the DPA has been reauthorized

on a year-to-year basis due to accidents in the legislative calendar. This authority is far too important to allow uncertainty over the future of the DPA to continue. We do not want to repeat the mistakes of 1990, when the DPA expired in the middle of the buildup of Operation Desert Storm.

While the DPA may need to be tweaked in the future, we should ensure that those important authorities continue uninterrupted and use the next 3 years to carefully examine proposed improvements to the act.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) deserve great credit for their bipartisan work on this bill. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the 3-year reauthorization of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This is bipartisan legislation that was reported by the Committee on Financial Services by voice vote.

First enacted during the Korean War, the DPA has proven a useful tool in ensuring the delivery of goods and services needed for the defense of the Nation during times of war and peace. The act was used in Operation Desert Storm to assist in the massive deployment of forces to the Gulf.

Most recently it was used by the Clinton and Bush administrations to maintain the supply of natural gas to California. Without this action, the administration contended that defense installations in northern and central California could have faced interrupted natural gas service.

The DPA has played an important role in dealing with recent natural disasters. Should the country face a major domestic terrorist attack, the DPA could be valuable in ensuring that emergency supplies are delivered to those who need them and in a timely manner.

As the representative of a city that has been the target of terrorist attacks and many terrorist threats, I can attest that, unfortunately, such a potential use of the DPA is not a mere theoretical possibility.

Given the DPA's relevance to natural disasters, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, FEMA, has taken the lead in reviewing the act and requesting its reauthorization, which is set to expire October 12 of this year.

The Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, Technology and Economic Growth held a hearing on June 13 of this year, a meeting at which Members were able to raise concerns and have them answered by FEMA and other agencies. It is after careful review of the act and following this hearing that I chose to cosponsor the reauthorization.

Finally, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY), the gentleman from New York (Chairman KING), and

the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), for moving quickly on this legislation. In the past, Congress has often rushed to renew the DPA under the gun of its pending expiration. I appreciate the fact that we have followed committee process, culminating with today's vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the coauthor of this legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2510 and to associate myself with the remarks of the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY). I also want to thank the chairman for allowing this important reauthorization bill to move quickly through the committee as we push up against its expiration date. I also want to thank my subcommittee ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for her bipartisan cosponsorship of this bill. Madam Speaker, this bill has enjoyed broad support, allowing us to proceed in a genuinely bipartisan manner.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and I introduced this DPA reauthorization bill after receiving testimony on June 13 of this year from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Energy and FEMA, the agency responsible for the act's coordinating efforts. By request of the administration, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and I have worked together to put forth a clean 3-year reauthorization bill, recognizing the importance that this act holds for the ability of any administration to address defense and civil preparedness issues. As reflected in the committee testimony and debate, a multiyear extension makes the most sense.

As the chairman stated, and I want to emphasize this, the changes that are contemplated in DPA are extremely technical in nature. Also, in closing, let me say that I realize that if used inappropriately, DPA has the potential to adversely affect our domestic marketplace. Fortunately, throughout the almost 50 years that it has been in existence, there has been no such adverse impact.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking members, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); and I look forward to the swift non-controversial adoption of this measure.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, although our effort in the House of Representatives today to extend the Defense Production Act is commendable, the House has missed a prime opportunity to make this Act more effective in ensuring our national security and helping American workers.

The Defense Production Act, first enacted in 1950, ensures that products, materials, and

services essential to our national security are available to defense related agencies at all times—but especially in times of conflict. One material that is especially critical to our defense needs is steel. Our armed forces would not be able to respond to a national emergency without an adequate supply of domestically produced steel.

But at this very moment, the American steel industry is in dire straits. In recent months a number of steel companies have been driven into bankruptcy, and others are on the brink. Thousands of jobs are at risk, as another wave of low-cost steel imports has battered the domestic industry. In my home district, LTV Steel, which employs thousands of Cleveland residents, is undergoing bankruptcy proceedings and has had to idle one of its plants.

A bill I introduced, the Steel and National Security Act, would have amended the Defense Production Act to enable the President to step in and aid critical defense industries such as steel. In its findings, the Steel and National Security Act identifies domestic steel capacity as an essential part of what a key executive order has called the "foundation for national defense preparedness": our domestic industrial and technological base.

To revive and secure the health of the American steel industry and thereby ensure adequate domestic capacity, the Steel and National Security Act would reauthorize the Defense Production Act's Title III, with a specific allocation of \$1 billion in each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004 for Department of Defense loans, grants and purchase commitments. Fifty percent of each year's allocated funds would be reserved for purchase commitments, to ensure that ailing industries are given a sharp boost.

The bill would also establish a National Defense Preparedness Domestic Industrial Base Board. The Board would be responsible, through one time en masse purchases and other means, for ensuring uninterrupted availability of defense-related materials. Together, these provisions would ensure enough demand so that domestic industries critical to our national security—like steel—can survive tough times.

But that is not all my bill would accomplish. The Steel and National Security Act would also reauthorize Defense Production Act's Title VII, with a specific directive ordering the Department of Defense to request a 45-day period of further investigation for all mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers involving a foreign steel company. This would ensure that domestic capacity to produce materials and goods essential to our national security always exists.

Mr. Speaker, though the House has acted correctly in extending the Defense Production Act to 2004, it has not acted decisively to aid those industries most vital to our national security.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2510.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

PROVIDING WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF TREATY TRADERS AND TREATY INVESTORS

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2277) to provide for work authorization for non-immigrant spouses of treaty traders and treaty investors.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2277

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

SECTION 1. WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR SPOUSES OF TREATY TRADERS AND TREATY INVESTORS.

Section 214(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) In the case of an alien spouse admitted under section 101(a)(15)(E), who is accompanying or following to join a principal alien admitted under such section, the Attorney General shall authorize the alien spouse to engage in employment in the United States and provide the spouse with an ‘employment authorized’ endorsement or other appropriate work permit.”.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam 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. 2277.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, today the House is likely to approve, for the fourth and fifth time this year, pro-family, pro-immigrant legislation that we have crafted in the Committee on the Judiciary. This body can be proud of the work it has done upholding the Nation's tradition of welcoming immigrants to our shores in a responsible manner.

This particular bill, H.R. 2277, would allow spouses of E visa recipients to work in the United States while accompanying the primary visa recipients.

E visas are available for treaty traders and investors. A visa is available to an alien who “is entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of com-

merce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national . . . solely to carry on substantial trade, including trade in services or trade in technology, principally between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national, or . . . solely to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which he has invested . . . a substantial amount of capital.”

Alien employees of a treaty trader or treaty investor may receive E visas if they are coming to the U.S. to engage in duties of an executive or supervisory character, or, if employed in the lesser capacity, if they have special qualifications that make the services to be rendered essential to the efficient operation of the enterprise. The alien employee would need to be of the same nationality as the treaty trader or investor.

For fiscal year 1998, 9,457 aliens, including dependents, were granted E visas as treaty traders; and 20,775 aliens, including dependents, were granted E visas as treaty investors.

While current law allows spouses and minor children to come to the U.S. with the E visa recipients, spouses are not allowed to work in the United States. Since working spouses are now becoming the rule rather than the exception in our society and in many foreign countries, multinational corporations are finding it increasingly difficult to persuade their employees abroad to relocate to the United States.

Spouses, often wives, hesitate to forego their own career ambitions or a second income to accommodate an overseas assignment. This factor places an impediment in the way of the use by employees from treaty countries of the E visa program and their contributing to trade with and invest in the United States.

There is no good reason why we should put an impediment in the way of the business's effort to attract talented people. There is no good reason why husbands and wives should have to ask their spouses to forego employment as a condition of joining them in America.

Thus H.R. 2277 would simply allow the spouses of E visa recipients to work in the United States while accompanying the primary visa recipient. Families will no longer have to chose between the advancement of either spouse's career in order to grasp an opportunity to come to America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2277. While current law allows spouses to come to the United States with E visa holders, spouses are not allowed to work in the United States. H.R. 2277 would allow these spouses

work authorization in the United States while accompanying the E visa holder.

It does not make any sense whatsoever to allow spouses to accompany their partners to the United States and then deny them the opportunity to be employed. Furthermore, this bill makes the time these families live in the United States financially easier since it allows for a second income.

Madam Speaker, I hope that this bill is the beginning of an understanding that we should allow spouses in other nonimmigrant classifications who accompany their husband or wife to the United States to be able to obtain work authorization.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2277.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

PROVIDING FOR WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2278) to provide work authorization for nonimmigrant spouses of intracompany transferees, and to reduce the period of time during which certain intracompany transferees have to be continuously employed before applying for admission to the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2278

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

SECTION 1. WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR SPOUSES OF INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES.

Section 214(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) In the case of an alien spouse admitted under section 101(a)(15)(L), who is accompanying or following to join a principal alien admitted under such section, the Attorney General shall authorize the alien spouse to engage in employment in the United States and provide the spouse with an ‘employment authorized’ endorsement or other appropriate work permit.”.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF REQUIRED PERIOD OF PRIOR CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(c)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“In the case of an alien seeking admission under section 101(a)(15)(L), the one-year period of continuous employment required