

vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 336 and "yea" on rollcall No. 337.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1983

Mr. SCHROCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1983.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2269

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 2269.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DR.
JAMES FORD

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a former Minnesotan who devoted his life to ministering to others and who made a huge difference in the lives of the people in this very House for over 2 decades. For 21 years, the House of Representatives was very well served by our dedicated and beloved chaplain, the Reverend Dr. James Ford. Seven days a week, year after year, Jim Ford was here for us and our families in times of deepest need. Jim was always here to encourage, console, humor, and inspire us. That is why all of us were terribly shocked and saddened to hear of his death on August 27. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family: his wife, Marcy; son, Peter; daughters, Julie, Marie, Molly and Sarah; sister, Janet; 9 grandchildren; and countless friends all over the world.

So many memories come flooding back at a time like this. Jim Ford leaves a legacy of love and service for his family, friends, and Nation which will be remembered always. His elo-

quent well-chosen words and ever-present wit helped keep our focus on what was truly important: working together to serve people.

□ 1845

Also Jim Ford taught us to take our job seriously, but not ourselves. Which Norwegian or Swede among us will ever forget Jim's endless litany of Ole and Sven stories.

Madam Speaker, we all remember the countless tributes that were directed at Jim Ford as he marked his well-deserved retirement 2 years ago. Jim's many distinguished years of service to the United States Military Academy, 19 to be exact, and his earlier years at Ivanhoe Lutheran Church at Ivanhoe, Minnesota, are well known and well documented.

What is not so well known are Jim Ford's very early years in Minnesota and his legendary escapades as a young ski jumper at Theodore Wirth Park in Minneapolis. Let the record reflect that our former beloved Chaplain, Dr. Jim Ford, still holds the record jump at the famous Theodore Wirth Ski jump, backward.

That is right, when he was a young student at Edison High School in northeast Minneapolis, Jim Ford defied the laws of gravity and common sense and survived a backward jump on this notoriously steep ski slope and lived to tell about it.

We now know backward ski jumping was just the beginning of Jim Ford's high-risk hobbies. From his beloved Harley to his ultralight aircraft, Jim lived life with a special zeal. Whether it was his frequent racquetball games in the House gym or a cross-country ride on his Harley, Jim Ford went for all the gusto.

Madam Speaker, they still talk proudly about their prominent alumnus, Jim Ford, at Edison High School in northeast Minneapolis and Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota, where Jim starred in the classroom and also on the athletic field.

"You can take Jim Ford from Minnesota, but you cannot take Minnesota from Jim Ford," was how his Gustavus classmate, the Reverend Bill Albertson, put it. Some of us remember my good friend and former minister, Bill Albertson, served as our guest chaplain here several years ago. Jim and Bill had a great time reminiscing that day. I will never forget our time together.

On behalf of all Minnesotans, Madam Speaker, we salute the memory of the Reverend Dr. Jim Ford and his many accomplishments. He was always there for us in good times, in hard times, in times of joy, in times of sorrow. We thank the Lord for his prayers, his counsel, great wit, compassion, and service.

We also thank God for the way Reverend Ford cared so deeply about our families, our friends, our constituents, our House of Representatives, and our beloved country. Madam Speaker, we will always be grateful for Reverend

Jim Ford's work and for the way he brought Democrats, Republicans, and Independents together for the good of our great Nation.

Jim Ford, I know you are in heaven right now, probably telling Ole and Sven jokes. May God bless you always, just as your work here in the House of Representatives blessed all of us. May your great legacy of service continue to inspire all of us who are lucky enough to be your friends.

Chaplain Jim Ford might be gone, but his spirit will live forever.

A SUSPENSION VOTE TOMORROW
ON THE 245(i) AMNESTY PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on H.R. 1885, which extends the 245 amnesty program. I am surprised that this vote is actually coming up under suspension. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to this legislation and to this vote.

What we are voting on tomorrow extends the date for illegal aliens to qualify for a 245(i) amnesty to August 15, 2001, and it extends the date for illegal aliens to apply for that 245(i) amnesty program for a full year, until April 30, 2002.

For those who have a little trouble understanding what that all means, let me explain it this way, that what we have are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of illegal aliens who are in this country; and we are now step by step trying to find ways in which we can make them legal, as the President has suggested. Perhaps the word is "regularize," or whatever word one wants to use.

But what we are really talking about when we offer a step-by-step process of whittling away this number of illegal immigrants, what we are talking about is an amnesty program, a step-by-step amnesty program, rather than just one large amnesty.

The American people understand what amnesty is all about, and they will be watching and they will be looking at the record when they find out what Congress has been moving. Rather than being forthright in dealing with the amnesty issue, instead, it has tried to exercise its authority in a way that was a little less discernible to the public by granting amnesty to various groups within society.

In this case, we would be granting amnesty in an interesting way, that is, anyone who is in this country illegally who applies, and now we are giving them until April 2002 to apply, can try to regularize their status in the United States. We have several categories of people who are here illegally to be able to do that.

Guess what, that is an amnesty program. We are giving amnesty to several

hundred thousand people who are in this country illegally.

Yes, there are some heart-tearing cases here. Yes, some people who are in this country end up marrying American citizens, and the American citizens find that their loved one is going to have to go back to their home country in order to be here legally, because they have married an illegal alien. I am sorry, if someone is here illegally and they are going to have to go back, then they should go back to their home country to regularize their status.

Tomorrow, on H.R. 1885, we are, for hundreds of thousands of people, going to be basically granting them the right to amnesty without going to their home country to legalize their status. This does nothing but encourage the millions, and we are talking about tens of millions, of people who are standing in line throughout the world waiting to come into this country legally so they can become citizens; but we have done nothing but encourage them to come here illegally, to reward the law-breakers, and to punish those people who are following the law.

This is ridiculous. Our colleagues should consider this and vote against the suspension tomorrow on the bill, H.R. 1885.

By the way, let me note that there has been a recent poll by Mr. Zogby, who is one of America's most respected pollsters, which has found out some interesting things about America's attitude toward amnesty.

Most Americans think amnesty is a terrible idea. In fact, 55 percent of all Democrats think it is a bad idea; 56 percent of Republicans; 60 percent of union households; 45 percent of people who call themselves liberals; 59 percent of people who call themselves moderates; 61 percent of people who call themselves conservatives. And here is the real hook, here is the real bell-ringer: 51 percent of all Hispanics in the United States believe that amnesty for illegal immigrants is a bad idea.

We have been lied to over and over again, and so much so that the Republican party has not had the courage to stand up and oppose illegal immigration, as we should have.

The Democratic Party has made its deal with the illegal immigrants at the expense of the standard of living of our poorest citizens and at the expense of the wages that have been kept just level because we have had a massive flow of illegal immigrants into this country. The Democratic Party has made its deal for political power's sake.

The Republicans, on the other hand, will not touch the illegal immigration issue because they are afraid to be called racist. They have been told over and over again that Mexican-Americans, Hispanic Americans, are in favor of illegal immigrants, for some reason. That is absolutely not true. We have finally got a pollster who has done a legitimate poll to show that Hispanic Americans, just like all other Ameri-

cans, oppose illegal immigration. That is understandable.

Tomorrow we will have our chance to vote against an amnesty program for illegal immigrants by voting against H.R. 1885, which will be coming on the floor.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2001 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

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, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through September 5, 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accompanying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the state-

ment of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the establish limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only. The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned by the budget resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2002	Fiscal years 2002-2006
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,627,934	n.a.
Outlays	1,590,617	n.a.
Revenues	1,638,202	8,878,506
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	977,964	n.a.
Outlays	1,198,811	n.a.
Revenues	1,672,152	8,897,349
Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-649,970	n.a.
Outlays	-391,806	n.a.
Revenues	33,950	18,843

n.a.—Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of \$649,970,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of \$391,806,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of \$33,950,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of \$18,843,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2002		2002-2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	7,350	7,350	7,350	7,350
Current Level	0	2	0	0