United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2001 No. 149

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

Eternal God, from the beginning, You know how we are made and how fragile our life. Bring an end to the anthrax threat upon America.

Today we pray for all those who are diagnosed with this biological invasion; and we commend to You all those who are taking medication because they have been exposed to this dreadful disease. Renew them in spirit as You strengthen and restore them in body. Remove anxiety that surrounds their family and friends as powerful medicine now wars within them.

Divine Physician, we praise You and bless You for the doctors, nurses and scientists who assist those now doing battle with anthrax. You have called these professionals to care for their brothers and sisters in a holistic way that reveals Your own holiness and love. Guide and protect them as they serve on the homefront or on the battle lines across land or sea in the war against terrorism.

May medical victory on this frontline of an unseen war not only dissipate exterior anger and blame, but galvanize our determination and patience, as we as Americans battle on to defend life, liberty and the pursuit of daily happiness.

We know You are with us now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. GRAVES. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. There will be 10 one-minutes on each side.

FINDING A CURE FOR AUTISM

(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. Mr. Speaker, the pictures that you see here, Mr. Speaker, are of Bonnie and Willis Flick, who were able to go trick-or-treating last night, but only as a result of hard work. Bonnie and Willis dressed up as wizards; but it was really their mother, Patience, who was the true Wizard of Oz in making this night special for them.

You see, Bonnie and Willis have autism, a neurological disorder that affects the development of the brain, especially in the areas of social interaction and communications skills. Autism impacts half a million people in our Nation; and in my home State, 50 percent of autistic children reside within our community.

Autism manifests itself in different ways. Bonnie can read, but Willis is mostly non-verbal and is only able to tell his mother, with whom he has a strong bond, when he is hungry or sleepy or sick. Others would not understand Willis.

Life through the eyes of an autistic child may be a puzzle; but autistic children, as this T-shirt says, are part of our world, not a world apart.

I congratulate the National Alliance for Autism Research for hosting Walk FAR for NAAR this Saturday in Key Biscayne. With continued support, we will soon find a cure for autism and the much-needed help for Bonnie and Willis Flick.

MAY GOD BLESS JERRY SOLOMON

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday you led a delegation to upstate New York to attend the funeral services of Congressman Jerry Solomon; and today our hearts go out to his wonderful wife, Freda, and their children and grandchildren on this tremendous loss for their family and for our country.

Jerry Solomon was a friend of mine for 30 years, and I served with him in this House for the past 10 years. He will be most remembered as a friend to veterans everywhere, and I am so happy that he lived to see the day when the United States won the Cold War, to be around to witness the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, the tearing down of the Berlin Wall and the breakup of the Soviet Union into individual democratic republics.

Printed on recycled paper.

He is someone who always remembered that freedom is not free, we paid a tremendous price for it; and he tried to always express his gratitude to all of the men and woman who wore the uniform of the United States military, because he understood had it not been for them, their efforts and their sacrifice, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the Earth.

It is so fitting that he was buried in Saratoga National Cemetery, which he worked 15 years to produce for the people of upstate New York.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Solomon was famous for constantly saying ''God bless America''; and today, I say may God bless Jerry Solomon.

SUPPORT YOUNG-MICA AIRPORT SECURITY BILL

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are dealing with airport security, an issue vitally important to the travel and tourism industry and to every American. I want to take a moment to reflect on this chart of the House aviation security plan, backed by the Secretary of Transportation, the former chairman of the Committee on Transportation for the Democratic Party, on this floor, a plan that he supports, President Bush supports, and I think every traveler will find comfort in.

My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), in a moment will talk a little bit about another bill that exists on the other side of the aisle, or the other Chamber, but let me show you exactly what is involved in our plan.

It covers everything in airport security, from drop-off to transportation to terminal security to tarmac security, and it does so to ensure the American public that they are safe when they board aircraft.

There is going to be a fight and debate today about who should they be, Federal employees or law enforcement employees. My view is this: let us make it safe. In Palm Beach County, the sheriff department's deputized law enforcement officers are well-equipped to, in fact, be the persons to intervene in the baggage screening area. I would welcome that. I would be delighted to have that.

I wish their side would recognize that local flexibility is vitally important in securing our air space. Support President Bush today in his call for aviation security. Support the Young-Mica bill. You will be pleased with the results of passage of that legislation.

PROVIDING FEDERAL AVIATION SECURITY

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose the aviation security bill which the other body passed 100 to 0 are arguing that the bill would create yet another public employee union. Those who preach the evils of public employees unions ought to remember one thing: the heroes of the World Trade Center disaster, the policemen, the firefighters, were union members, and about 400 of them lost their lives rescuing others.

Public employees do a great job protecting us here in the Capitol, and they can do a great job protecting our constituents at airports. We are at war. Polarizing a debate by criticizing working men and women who devote their lives to serving the public is exactly what we do not need to do. Terrorists look for weak spots. They do not care about unions either.

We cannot wait any longer for airport aviation security. Pass the Senate bill.

MAKING AIRPORTS SAFER

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, simply making an airport baggage and passenger screener a Federal employee will not make airports safer. Tougher standards and strict Federal oversight will make airports safer; and that is exactly what this act does, the one we have up today.

The American public needs to regain its confidence in flying. How will they do that if we do not have the ability to discipline or remove screeners who are not performing? How will they regain confidence if we cannot equip personnel with superior technology? And how will they regain that confidence if qualified retired Federal workers, such as Federal marshals, are unable to be hired because they will have to sacrifice their retirement benefits and their health care benefits?

The answer is they will not.

The Secure Transportation for America Act gives the administration the flexibility that they need to have the best possible employees screening passengers and baggage. The American people deserve no less.

CHINA AND PAKISTAN HELP TALIBAN

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a Taliban commander said, ''China is secretly helping our Taliban government.'' China has united.

In addition, news reports say that Pakistan is giving weapons to the Taliban. Pakistan has united.

Unbelievable here. China gets $100 billion a year in trade surplus from Uncle Sam, and Pakistan is now asking for foreign aid.

Beam me up.

I say it is time for China and Pakistan to stop their tricks and cheating here. I yield back the forked tongues of the lies coming out of China and Pakistan, who are subverting our mission against these terrorists.

SUPPORT SECURE TRANSPORTATION ACT FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Secure Transportation for America Act. The Good Book tells us if we owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect.

□ 1015

I rise today to honor the President of the United States of America and his vision for airport security. As the gentleman from Florida indicated, it is a vision supported by his Transportation Secretary, who chaired the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as a Democrat in this very institution, and the President's vision is the right vision.

As Robert Poole of the Public Policy Institute wrote recently, while all parts of airports need improving, the biggest hole is to secure areas. The truth is that the Senate bill does absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, to control access to secure areas of airport. Caterers, cleaners, refuelers and others who lack security background checks at the Nation's airports are not addressed in the substitute bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to honor the President of the United States, respect his vision for airport security and vote yes on H.R. 3150.

OVERHAULING THE AVIATION SECURITY BILL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 weeks and 2 days since the terrorist attacks, 2 weeks since the Senate passed the aviation security bill 100 to 0. Finally, we can overhaul this failed system. There are three private foreign-owned firms that provide security at most U.S. airports. Their performance is miserable. One is under indictment for having violated its parole from its last criminal conviction.

Now we are going to have a choice today. We could pass the Senate bill and have a bill on the President's desk tonight and begin an overhaul, a major change, put those people out of business, or we can adopt the Republican manager's amendments, which will not only continue these failed private

firms and convicted felons in business, it will reward them amazingly with an exemption from liability for past actions.

Yesterday was Halloween, but today the Republican leaders are trying one last trick and treat on the American public. Reject the private firms that have failed us so miserably. Put Federal law enforcement in the airports and make the traveling public safe.

FEDERALIZING AIRPORT EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the characteristics of an aviation security bill we must not lose focus of our responsibility to the flying public. Airline passengers must feel safe before they return en masse to the skies. Nothing will guarantee their safety until all items placed on an aircraft are thoroughly screened by skilled professionals using the best available technology. As we implement new changes to be aviation security, we must ensure that all baggage entering the plane is properly screened.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for their untiring efforts to draft the most comprehensive, sensible transportation security legislation possible. Enforcing strict Federal supervision on the Nation's screening programs makes sense. Furthermore, it is a method proven to work. Simply federalizing 28,000 employees will not change the quality of our screening process.

Now is the not the time to implement a one-size-fits-all cure. Rather, the security needs of each airport should determine what screening measures work best for their particular situation. It is absurd to think that mere federalization is the answer to such severe structural problems that presently exist.

Mr. Speaker, I adamantly believe that the Federal role is to set the standard and enforce it. Then each situation must be met as it dictates. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3150, the Transportation Act of 2001.

IMMUNIZATION FOR AMERICANS

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about something that is very important to our country, adult immunization. Immunizations have helped prevent many illnesses and possible complications due to illness. Unfortunately, there is a misconception that immunization is only for children and for childhood diseases. The fact is that adults benefit from immunizations also. Hepatitis B, chicken pox, pneumonia are just a few examples of vaccine preventable illnesses affecting adults.

Data for the year 2000 show an increase in the number of deaths due to influenza and pneumonia, now over 67,000 deaths. This is the seventh leading cause of death in the United States. Although the flu vaccine may not prevent the flu, it greatly reduces the severity of the illness and the risk of complications, especially in adults over 50 years of age and those who suffer chronic health conditions.

Immunization is a cost-effective way of preventing disease and at a time when our Nation is faced with the possibility of unlikely yet very threatening infections, we must take the opportunity to be proactive against illnesses that we can prevent.

EXTENDING CONDOLENCES TO FAMILIES OF MURDERED PAKISTANIS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer condolences to the families of the 16 Pakistanis brutally murdered on Sunday as they worshipped in their church in Pakistan. Barbaric criminals burst into the church, locked the doors behind them and started firing guns into the worshippers. These twisted terrorists then continued to pump bullets into toddlers and women who lay wounded and dying in a pile on the floor of the church.

To the families of those killed, please know that our hearts and prayers are with you in this time of suffering and mourning.

In the midst of the important battles against terrorists and the Taliban, our Nation must also continue to stand with those around the world whose fundamental rights are violated at the hands of extremists in their communities. The danger faced by Christians and other religious and ethnic minorities in Pakistan cannot be overestimated, particularly in this time.

I commend President Musharraf for his unequivocal condemnation of this tragedy and his pursuit of the murderers, and urge him to do all in his power to ensure that this does not happen again and that they bring these criminals to justice.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR FEDERALIZING AIRPORT EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, aviation security is a national security. Protecting our skies is a matter of national defense and we should not leave national security to the private companies that contract to the lowest bidder. We would not expect the President to be protected by the lowest bidder. We do not do that. We do not expect our leadership here in the House to get protected by the lowest bidder contract.

The current system is broken and needs to be corrected. Contracting to the lowest bidder has created a workforce that suffers from high turnover, and we have seen the turnover over 400 percent, low pay and low morale. Baggage screeners should be a highly skilled, highly trained workforce that serves the frontline of this Nation's national defense. There is a broad bipartisan support for federalizing the workers.

The Washington Post just came out with a report that 82 percent of Americans support this effort. We need to make sure that every American feels secure when they go to the airport, and making them feel secure is by making sure that those people are well-trained and well-educated. The Air Pilots Association has endorsed it, and I ask your support.

FAITH IN THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Senate version of the airline security bill. The plan presented by the majority is simply just flawed. It does nothing to ensure that screening routines in this country are uniform, where screening in La Guardia Airport in my district is the same as screening in Des Moines, Iowa, where the screening in LAX is the same as in Butte, Montana. That is what the Democratic substitute does and the majority bill simply does not.

The Senate bill passed 100 to 0 with 49 members of the Republican Party supporting that bill. Can they all be wrong? We need to give the American people full faith and confidence in the airline industry. The majority bill simply does not do that. The Senate bipartisan bill begins to do just that.

AMERICA'S FEAR OF FLYING

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, while America is afflicted by a fear of flying, this House, or certain Members are afflicted by a fear of federalization and I have to ask, what are you all afraid of? What is wrong with a Federal workforce? Is it the same thing that is wrong with a Federal workforce at the FBI that is now investigating terrorist incidents? Do you criticize the so-called Federal bureaucracy at NASA that won us the race to the Moon? Are you afraid of government influence, such as the government issue GI's who went ashore on D-Day and won us World War II? Would you privatize the military now fighting in the Middle East? Of course not.

These are all good government employees who did their jobs well in the service to this country. And I might just say one more thing. If you are so afraid of Federal influence, I dare you, I just dare you to submit a bill to privatize the Capitol Police that protects this building.

Now, this building does not take off and go anywhere. It does not fly, and Americans who do fly deserve just as good protection as the Members in this Chamber with a Federal force outside.

CREATING SAFE AIRLINES

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to end the rhetoric and do what is right for American people. We say that business must move on and we must continue as we did before. But we cannot do that unless we fix the problem of airline security. And clearly, as the Senate has said in a unanimous voice, the way we fix security in the airline industry is by federalizing it.

We must make sure that our airports are like our borders. We would not privatize the border line with individuals to monitor the borders, nor can we do that with our airlines.

If we want to go back to normal, if we want our business community to resume itself, we must make it safe for them to fly, because that is what is going to help stimulate our economy so we can get back to normal and we can begin to focus on the things that are important to all Americans. We cannot do it until people feel safe flying, and the only way we can do that is by federalizing.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 272 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 272

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), 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.

House Resolution 272 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2311, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial conference report, and I am asking for us to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

I want to congratulate the conferees on their hard work and urge passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Members to support this rule and this conference report. Both the House and the Senate passed this bill on a bipartisan basis, and this conference report also represents a bipartisan, bicameral compromise.

Additionally, this conference report contains provisions that are very important to the people that I represent in north Texas. It provides $5.5 million in critical funding for a flood control project along Johnson Creek in Arlington, Texas. It provides $10 million for the Dallas Floodway Extension, and it provides $1.2 for the Trinity River Basin. The final funding that each of us will receive meets the needs identified by the Army Corps of Engineers and local authorities.

The conference report also provides $1 million for a state of the art annex to the Science Center at Texas Wesleyan University, which serves neighborhood children as well as students in a historic inner-city neighborhood on the east side of Fort Worth, Texas.

□ 1030

I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for working with me to fund these critical provisions for north Texas.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker, and the conferees should be commended for doing the best they could under the circumstances. But as many of them will tell us, they were hamstrung by the fact that the Senate originally passed these bills before September 11.

Since that infamous date, Mr. Speaker, all of us have become acutely aware of the massive security needs facing America. This bill does not reflect many of the priorities of today's new war against terrorism.

For instance, the conference report provides no additional funds to address terrorist threats related to nuclear weapons plants or Department of Energy labs. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) offered an amendment to beef up the Nation's nonproliferation activities that prevent terrorists from getting Russian nuclear materials. Indeed, the administration had proposed cutting $98 million from this critical program.

Fortunately, this conference report restores $81 million to this vital program, but that is still $17 million below last year's level.

Overall, the Federal agencies funded by this bill have identified about $1.2 billion in additional security needs, but this conference report funds only $287 million of that, leaving us about $900 million short.

Since September 11, Mr. Speaker, America's security needs have increased, not decreased. The safety of every American depends on whether this Congress and this President will invest more, not less, in meeting them.

So after we pass this conference report today, it is crucial that all of us work together to immediately ensure all of our homeland security needs are fully funded. There is no higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for putting together this energy and water appropriation bill on a genuine bipartisan basis. This bill, because of their leadership, funds vital flood control and water projects for communities throughout the Nation. It funds important energy and research programs.

I also commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for working hard to plus up about $85 million in the administration's ill-advised and dangerous budget proposal that would have cut $100 million from our programs designed to keep nuclear material and weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I know this bill will pass by a strong margin on a bipartisan basis because of all the good things in it. However, Mr. Speaker, in good conscience I cannot remain silent about some decisions that have been made by this Congress, some of which go beyond the authority of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

I find it unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, unbelievable that just 1 week ago this House said that we could afford to give $7.4 billion in unearned corporate rebate checks to just 16 Fortune 500 corporations. Yet, this Congress to date will have cut programs designed to keep nuclear weapons and materials away from terrorists.

I find it irresponsible and dangerous that even in light of the September 11 terrorist attacks, this House has said, in effect, by our votes that giving special huge tax breaks to corporations like General Motors, they got nearly $1 billion, IBM got $1.4 billion, General Electric a little under $1 billion, that those tax rebate checks to those corporations are more important than

protecting 281 million Americans and their families from the threat of nuclear terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report from a committee co-chaired by Republican former Senator Howard Baker and former Senator Sam Nunn, a Democrat, said that the threat of nuclear terrorism against the United States is the single most important national security concern facing this Nation.

I do not question anyone's intentions in this House. I believe genuinely that every one of us in this House shares the belief that protecting Americans' lives and security is the first responsibility of our government. But in government, good intentions do not count if our budget decisions undermine the principles we preach.

We can talk about homeland defense all we want, but may God help us in our war on terrorism if this Congress decides corporate tax rebate checks are more important than keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention five facts about the possibility of nuclear terrorism against American citizens:

Fact No. 1, had the September 11 terrorists been able to use a nuclear bomb built with a Coke can size of plutonium and placed it in a car in Lower Manhattan, over 2 million American citizens, not 5,000, would have been killed;

Fact No. 2, there are over 600 metric tons, enough for 41,000 nuclear devices, of weapons-usable material in Russia that is in urgent need, urgent need of additional security improvements, according to our own U.S. Department of Energy;

Fact No. 3, we know of 14 separate seizures of highly-enriched, bomb-grade uranium that had been stolen from Russian nuclear sites since 1992. Frighteningly, in eight of those 14 cases the uranium was not seized until it had escaped out of Russia, and was found in Germany, the Czech Republic, and Bulgaria;

Fact No. 4, we know that since 1993 Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda organization have made attempts to obtain nuclear material from Russia;

Fact No. 5, because of an agreement just signed on September 26 of this year, just last month, between the United States and Russia, we have a window of opportunity to put in place antiterrorist safeguards at numerous Russian nuclear sites, some of which we have never been able to visit prior to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows when that window of opportunity might close. I believe it would be dangerous for this Congress not to take advantage of such a chance and carry out our responsibility to get better control of Russian nuclear material so it will not some day, God forbid, end up in a major American city as part of a terrorist bomb.

Based on these known five facts and the devastating potential of nuclear terrorist attacks, I believe strongly that Congress should act immediately, not next month, not the month after that, not next year, but we should act immediately to work with Russia in providing adequate safeguards at their numerous nuclear sites.

I find it hard to believe, frankly, that in this energy and water appropriation bill we are adding $400 million to improve the U.S. offensive nuclear arsenal, which everyone would agree in all nations is by far the most powerful nuclear force in the world; yet, in my opinion, we are cutting what is generally considered the single most effective program in keeping nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists: a materials prevention and control accounting program.

Mr. Speaker, I know every single Member of this House would do almost anything, personally or publicly, to prevent a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States. Sadly, though, sadly, though, our spending and tax decisions in this Congress are not consistent with that commitment.

I believe the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), who already worked hard to support these programs, are genuine in their efforts to convince this House and the other body that we in this Congress have a moral obligation to the American people to do everything possible to prevent terrorists from using nuclear weapons against the American family.

If the decisionmakers beyond the scope of this appropriations subcommittee's jurisdiction do not this year either expand the budget allocation for nuclear nonproliferation programs or add significant funding in the supplemental appropriations bill, if we fail to do that, then we will have failed the American people in our sworn oath to protect and defend them.

We know terrorists are at war with us. If we Americans are truly at war with them, then this Congress must make homeland defense our top priority, not just our favorite rhetoric.

The clock is ticking and our children's future is at risk. I intend to work with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and other Members of this Congress who agree that we must act now, immediately, to ensure that our families and children never have to witness an American holocaust perpetrated by nuclear terrorists.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

In response to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas about the shortages that are apparent in our bill for the nuclear nonproliferation account, certainly he is correct. However, we have assured him, and we discussed this at great length in conference, that we are going to correct that in some supplemental bill somewhere before the end of the year.

He is absolutely right, the commission that President Clinton put together, including former Senator Sam Nunn and Susan Eisenhower, have come to us and they have told us of the serious need for additional funds. We are going to find those funds. There were just no more additional funds available in this bill.

I assure the gentleman from Texas and assure this Congress that we are going to provide adequate resources to this administration to ensure that the nonproliferation agreement works.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would just like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), who just spoke, for his leadership to date on this effort. I am convinced had it not been for his work, along with that of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), we would be looking at this administration's proposed $100 million cut in nonproliferation nuclear programs.

I would have been much more comfortable had I been able to say to my colleagues and the American people that we are taking care of this problem today in this energy and water appropriation bill, but I failed in my effort to add an amendment which would have given $131 million extra to these programs.

But I appreciate the leadership of the chairman to date, what he has already done, and I am especially deeply grateful for his commitment to this Congress to continue those efforts and see that we adequately fund this budget, in light of what has happened September 11. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, right after the Soviet Union collapsed, I was at a bipartisan conference in Budapest and we met with a series of Soviet and Russian officials. Among those in attendance was the then Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrov and the Deputy Defense Minister Andre Kokoshin.

Also present at that meeting were a number of Members of this House and the other body, such as Senators Nunn, LUGAR, Congressman Aspin, who later went on to become Secretary of Defense, Senator LEVIN, myself, and a number of others.

We were asked by two Russian officials if we could come into a private hotel room to discuss a very serious situation, so we gathered. They described to us their terror at the lack of security relative to the kind of nuclear material which the gentleman from Texas just discussed.

As a result of those discussions, the Nunn-Lugar program was born. This country then began an effort to try to slowly but surely pull nuclear weapons from the various Soviet provinces into Russia itself so there would be better control over those weapons. And in addition, this country began, at the urging of the Russians, who were most concerned about it, we began a variety of programs to try to help not only secure nuclear material from warheads, but we also began to think about what we were going to do about the fact that we had many, many Russian and Soviet scientists who were out of work, who had very little income, and who were very easy pickings for terrorist groups all around the world who might want to find a way to get knowledge they did not have or to obtain nuclear material that they did not have.

□ 1045

Our efforts to fund those programs have been sporadic at best since that time; and in my view, that is leading ever more inexorably to a serious, serious problem and perhaps even at some point a crisis.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) has pointed out to you that, even with the meager funds we have put into these programs, on eight occasions authorities have seized nuclear materiel that was in the wrong hands and had already been secreted out of Russia itself. Four of those recoveries took place in Germany; three took place in the Czech Republic; one in Bulgaria. In addition, there were six other incidences during which materiel was recovered within Russia itself that had fallen into the wrong hands, and we do not know how many other examples there are of this materiel falling into the wrong hands.

Now, under those circumstances, one would think that we would make as our number one priority securing that threat. We have not done so. We have had a lot of sporadic effort, but we have not accomplished what we needed to accomplish.

The Department of Defense has responsibilities in this area; so does the Department of Energy. This bill corrects to a large extent the budget reductions made by the administration in the program that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) just described; but in my view, we have an obligation to go far beyond what was merely provided last year in order to really get a handle on this problem.

Now, the problem that we have in addition to this is that DOE has told us that they have at least $1.2 billion of additional needs, and they have been funded only to a very small extent in this bill because of funding limitations imposed on it by the allocation.

In addition to that, we have been told that there are at least half a billion dollars' worth of defense funding requirements relating to nuclear materiel that we ought to be providing for recovery programs here or for security programs within our own country, and very little of that is being responded to.

Those requirements are far beyond what was included in the fiscal 2002 budget or the House or the Senate bill. It just seems to me that a Congress that can provide $25 billion in tax gifts to General Electric, to AT&T and to other truly needy people in this society like that, and I am being sarcastic, Mr. Speaker, when I say that, it seems to me that if Congress can find the money to provide that kind of gift to the nonneedy, we certainly ought to have enough common sense to find enough room in our budget to deal with one of the most serious security problems that faces this country and this planet.

I regard the lack of funding across DOE for a number of programs not even mentioned here today, including one that I brought to the attention of the committee in a private session, I regard the neglect of those vulnerabilities to be almost criminal negligence, not on the part of this committee but on the part of people in the Government who know the serious problems and vulnerabilities that exist out there that are not being dealt with.

Now, I love to give tax cuts as much as the next man; but our first obligation in this instance is to secure the home front. We are not doing it sufficiently with this bill. We are not doing it sufficiently with other bills that will be before this Congress; and until we do, we are failing our principal obligation to protect the public safety of each and every citizen that we represent.

That is why, despite many of the good things in this bill, I will be voting against this bill to try to indicate my extreme concern about the lack of attention and the lack of follow-through on these problems.

I appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) when he says we will try to deal with this in a future bill. My suggestion to the House is that I think, if this is a high priority, it ought to be dealt with immediately. It is not, and that is why I am going to be voting against this bill.

This is not due to any negligence on the part of the subcommittee chairman or the ranking member, any of the subcommittee members; but in my view the priorities of this Congress, given this problem, I think these priorities are misbegotten.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the majority wishes to reserve its time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the majority that we have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, which will allow us to consider this important conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
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 (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
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 (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
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
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Berkley
Stark

NOT VOTING—9

Brown (FL)
Cubin
Dunn
Hall (OH)
Herger
McCrery
Thompson (MS)
Wexler
Young (AK)

□ 1116

Messrs. STEARNS, SHAYS and ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 2311, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 272, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 272, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 30, 2001, at page H7418.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 2311, the fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

At the outset, I would like to state how pleased I am that the conference committee was able to work out the dramatic differences between the House and Senate bills so amicably and to such a positive effect. Given the great divide over the House and Senate priorities, many concluded that we would never be able to resolve our differences. Not only did we resolve those differences, we did so in such a way that the critical priorities of the House and Senate were carefully protected.

I am proud of the agreement struck between the House and Senate on energy and water development programs. It was a difficult and arduous negotiation, but the product of our deliberations is a package that will help strengthen our defense, rebuild our critical infrastructure, and increase our scientific knowledge.

The total amount included in the conference agreement for energy and water programs is $24.6 billion. This is $891 million over the amount included in the House-passed bill and about $2.1 billion over the budget request.

I am especially pleased with the level of funding we have recommended for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. At $4.5 billion, the recommended funding is $586 million higher than the administration's inadequate budget request. The majority of this increase, about $391 million, is in the Corps' construction program. While that may sound like a large increase, the amount we have recommended is about the same as the amount the Corps spent in fiscal year 2001 on construction. If we had funded the construction program at the level requested by the administration, the result would have been schedule delays, increased project costs, and the loss of project benefits.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, we have provided $914 million, which is $95 million above the budget request.

For the nondefense programs of the Department of Energy, we were able to provide modest increases over the last year for several programs. The basic research performed by the Department of Energy has led to many of the technological breakthroughs that have helped our economy grow. These programs will even be more important as we move into the 21st century.

I am pleased to report that the additional allocation we received has enabled us to fund these programs slightly above the levels requested by the administration. For renewable energy programs, we were able to provide about $19 million over the House-passed level.

For the Atomic Energy Defense Programs of the Department of Energy, the conference agreement includes $14.7 billion, a significant increase of almost $1.2 billion over the budget request. These funds will ensure that we have a reliable and safe nuclear weapons stockpile, continue to fund important nuclear nonproliferation programs to secure nuclear materiels in Russia, and meet our commitments to communities throughout the United States to clean up the damage done to the environment over the past 40 years.

I want to thank my Senate counterpart, Chairman HARRY REID, and his ranking minority member, Senator PETE DOMENICI, for their cooperation and hard work. Moreover, I would like to expression my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, whose devoted efforts made this conference report possible.

I am especially grateful to my good friend and ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). I want to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their cooperation in enabling us to bring this conference report before the House today.

Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to the House Appropriations staff for the Subcommittee for Energy and Water Development: Bob Schmidt, Jeanne Wilson, Kevin Cook, Paul Tuminello, Tracey LaTurner, Dave Killian, Rich Kaelin, Jennifer Watkins, and my personal staff, Mike Sharp and Nancy Tippins.

Their expertise, knowledge, and negotiating skills have helped produce the bipartisan product that we present for Members' consideration today, and each is to be commended for their fine

effort. Additionally, I would like to thank each of them for making my first session as chairman of this subcommittee an extremely pleasurable experience.

I believe the conference agreement is balanced and fair, and I would urge a unanimous support of the House for its adoption. I would hope that we could quickly conclude action on this conference report so that we can get this bill to the White House for the President's signature.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2311)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
General investigations	160,584	130,000	163,260	152,402	154,350	-6,234
Construction, general	1,716,165	1,324,000	1,671,854	1,570,798	1,715,951	-214
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	350,458	280,000	347,655	328,011	345,992	-4,466
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	9,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-9,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,897,775	1,745,000	1,864,464	1,833,263	1,874,803	-22,972
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	86,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-86,500
Regulatory program	124,725	128,000	128,000	128,000	127,000	+2,275
FUSRAP	139,692	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	+308
Flood control and coastal emergencies (supplemental appropriations) (P.L. 107-20)	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Rescission	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000	-25,000
General expenses	151,666	153,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	+1,334
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,686,565	3,900,000	4,468,233	4,305,474	4,486,096	-200,469
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Central Utah Project Completion Account						
Central Utah project construction	19,524	24,169	24,169	24,169	24,169	+4,645
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	14,136	10,749	10,749	10,749	10,749	-3,387
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	4,989	.....	.....	.....	.....	-4,989
Subtotal	38,649	34,918	34,918	34,918	34,918	-3,731
Program oversight and administration	1,213	1,310	1,310	1,310	1,310	+97
Total, Central Utah project completion account	39,862	36,228	36,228	36,228	36,228	-3,634
Bureau of Reclamation						
Water and related resources	678,953	647,997	691,160	732,496	762,531	+83,578
Loan program	9,348	7,495	7,495	7,495	7,495	-1,853
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,941)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(-941)
Central Valley project restoration fund	38,360	55,039	55,039	55,039	55,039	+16,679
California Bay-Delta restoration	.....	20,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Policy and administration	50,114	52,968	52,968	52,968	52,968	+2,854
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	776,775	783,499	806,662	847,998	878,033	+101,258
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	816,637	819,727	842,890	884,226	914,261	+97,624
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Energy supply	659,918	544,245	639,317	736,139	666,726	+6,808
Non-defense environmental management	277,200	228,553	227,872	228,553	236,372	-40,828
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	11,950	.....	.....	.....	.....	-11,950
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	392,502	363,425	393,425	408,725	418,425	+25,923
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	30,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-30,000
Science	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,166,395	3,268,816	3,233,100	+52,759
Nuclear Waste Disposal	190,654	134,979	133,000	25,000	95,000	-95,654
Departmental administration	225,942	221,618	209,611	208,948	210,853	-15,089
Miscellaneous revenues	-151,000	-137,810	-137,810	-137,810	-137,810	+13,190
Net appropriation	74,942	83,808	71,801	71,138	73,043	-1,899
Office of the Inspector General	31,430	31,430	32,430	30,000	32,430	+1,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:						
Defense function	(6,254,464)	(5,740,783)	(6,410,625)	(6,627,943)	(6,480,991)	(+226,527)
Non-defense function	(711,652)	(591,978)	(621,297)	(637,278)	(654,797)	(-56,855)
Total	(6,966,116)	(6,332,761)	(7,031,922)	(7,265,221)	(7,135,788)	(+169,672)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
National Nuclear Security Administration:						
Weapons activities	5,006,153	5,300,025	5,123,888	6,062,891	5,429,238	+423,085
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	126,625	.....	.....	.....	.....	-126,625
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	872,273	773,700	845,341	880,500	803,586	-68,687
Naval reactors	688,645	688,045	688,045	688,045	688,045	-600
Office of the Administrator	9,978	15,000	10,000	15,000	312,596	+302,618
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,703,674	6,776,770	6,667,274	7,646,436	7,233,465	+529,791
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,174,539	5,389,868	5,234,576	+271,043
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	95,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-95,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,092,878	1,080,538	1,092,878	+12,547
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	21,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-21,000

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 (H.R. 2311) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Defense environmental management privatization	65,000	141,537	143,208	157,537	153,537	+88,537
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	29,600	.....	.....	.....	.....	-29,600
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,254,464	5,740,783	6,410,625	6,627,943	6,480,991	+226,527
Other defense activities	582,466	527,614	487,464	564,168	544,044	-38,422
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	199,725	310,000	310,000	250,000	280,000	+80,275
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	13,745,329	13,355,167	13,875,363	15,088,547	14,538,500	+793,171
Power Marketing Administrations						
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	3,891	4,891	4,891	4,891	4,891	+1,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	28,038	28,038	28,038	28,038	28,038	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	165,465	169,465	172,165	169,465	171,938	+6,473
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 107-20)	1,578	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,578
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,663	2,663	2,663	2,663	2,663	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	201,635	205,057	207,757	205,057	207,530	+5,895
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission						
Salaries and expenses	175,200	181,155	181,155	187,155	184,155	+8,955
Revenues applied	-175,200	-181,155	-181,155	-187,155	-184,155	-8,955
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	-75,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+75,000
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	-97,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+97,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	18,623,901	18,106,554	18,747,360	20,061,975	19,501,126	+877,225
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,254	66,290	71,290	66,290	71,290	+5,036
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,459	18,500	18,500	18,500	18,500	+41
Delta Regional Authority	19,956	19,992	.....	20,000	10,000	-9,956
Denali Commission	29,934	29,939	.....	40,000	38,000	+8,066
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:						
Salaries and expenses	481,825	506,900	516,900	516,900	516,900	+35,075
Revenues	-447,958	-463,248	-473,520	-468,248	-473,520	-25,562
Subtotal	33,867	43,652	43,380	48,652	43,380	+9,513
Office of Inspector General	5,500	6,180	6,180	5,500	6,180	+680
Revenues	-5,390	-5,932	-5,933	-5,280	-5,933	-543
Subtotal	110	248	247	220	247	+137
Total	33,977	43,900	43,627	48,872	43,627	+9,650
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,894	3,100	3,100	3,500	3,100	+206
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	171,474	181,721	136,517	197,162	184,517	+13,043
TITLE V - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL						
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations)	203,012	.....	.....	.....	.....	-203,012
Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations)	10,976	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,976
Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental	213,988	.....	.....	.....	.....	-213,988
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	24,512,565	23,008,002	24,195,000	25,448,837	25,086,000	+573,435
Appropriations	(24,470,577)	(23,008,002)	(24,195,000)	(25,448,837)	(25,111,000)	(+640,423)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(213,988)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-213,988)
Rescissions	(-172,000)	.....	.....	.....	(-25,000)	(+147,000)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and congratulate him on the work product that the subcommittee has brought before the House today. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is the chairman, but he is also my classmate from the class of 1984 and also my good friend. He has been a delight to work with. He is very serious about the work product, but not serious about himself. He is very deliberate, and he is very conscientious. He has done a very good job.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) also enumerated by name each member of the staff on both sides of the aisle, and I would like to add my own personal gratitude for the work that the staff has done. We would not be here today without them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good solid work product. It is good for the American economy. It is good for the national security. I would hope that all Members of this body do support this bill.

I do, however, want to make two comments. One is that I would hope as the administration looks at its budget request for 2003, that it send a realistic budget for our investment in our economic infrastructure and our national security.

On the economic front, I would point out that while we did the absolute best that we could with the resources possible, in constant dollars in fiscal year 2002, the appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers civil works has drastically declined. In fiscal year 2002, we appropriated $4.486 billion compared to $7 billion in constant dollars for 1967.

Additionally, a similar ratio would exist for the general construction dollars. I would point out that backlog for the Army Corps of Engineers totals about $40 billion, and backlog for operation and maintenance for this year alone is estimated to be about $835 million. I hope as the administration and as the Congress looks ahead to the next year, that we recognize a greater investment in our economic infrastructure is going to be necessary.

There has also been a lot of debate on the House floor in the last several days as far as nuclear nonproliferation; and within our financial limitations, we tried to do the best job possible, but there remains problems.

As we look towards a supplement for the coming year and again in investment in ensuring that these weapons of mass destruction cannot be proliferated world-wide, we will have to make a greater investment, and again would call upon the administration. I would call upon the Congress to do a better job in a comparative fashion in fiscal year 2003.

At this time, however, the chairman has covered the elements of the bill. He has done it well. It is a good bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, regarding the comment the gentleman made about the submission this year by the administration for these very important projects that are included in this bill, the gentleman is exactly right. In defense of the administration, they only had a couple of weeks to prepare for the submission of the budget that they sent to the House. In subsequent discussions with both the director of OMB and the President, I recognize that they had to submit something. But along with the gentleman from Indiana, I would like to invite him to come with me to the White House between now and the end of the year so we can have a discussion with the President and with the director of OMB to submit to this body a more realistic proposal for the energy and water needs of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have served on this subcommittee for 10 or 12 years at least. I know how difficult it is to balance the needs of the Members of this body and the needs of the Nation, frankly, and these vital programs that this bill covers.

I have to tell Members that the maiden voyage that the captain has steered us on this bill has been masterfully done.

□ 1130

This is the first bill that Chairman CALLAHAN has had the opportunity to work on. This is a tough bill. You have got the nuclear weapons program, of course, in this bill; all of the energy issues of such vital importance to the Nation at this time. The security issues, of course, this year are very important; and also the work of the Corps of Engineers and all of the programs that Members are so vitally interested in. It is a tough bill to try to weigh all of those interests and find enough funds with which to do the necessary work. I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for working together as they do, and have, and working with all the Members in such a nice spirit.

I was hopeful in this bill that we could have had some more money for those Krispy Kreme doughnuts, but I do not guess we are going to get that this time. But I want to compliment Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for a great job, salute them on the work that they have done, and wish them well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and dear friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for recognizing me and supporting our efforts to ban oil drilling in the Great Lakes.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, together this is a bipartisan effort. When we passed the amendment in the House of Representatives, we garnered, I think, somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 Republican votes on this issue and we have worked hard and long on this issue. Today we will have achieved an important bipartisan victory for both the House and the Senate. Today, that work that we have devoted over a period of years has paid off.

I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and others on the other side of the aisle who have worked to make this amendment happen. I want to thank all of my friends who came together on this issue. In the other body, Senators DEBBIE STABENOW and PETER FITZGERALD were very helpful in their efforts as well.

This legislation is a terrific victory for the people of Michigan and all of the Great Lakes States. Elementary school science will teach you that oil and water do not mix. One quart of oil could contaminate 2 million gallons of drinking water. The Great Lakes contain nearly a quarter of the world's fresh water and 95 percent of all the fresh water in the United States. An accident in a contained system would indeed be catastrophic. We cannot afford the risk of drilling.

Michigan, my home State, is a land of breathtaking beauty. The Great Lakes define our communities, our recreation, our tourism, our landscape, our commerce. It is an integral part of who we are and what we are about in our history. Michigan lakes are not oil fields. Our shorelines are not pipelines. Michigan families deserve clean water and beaches free from oil rigs. We have an enormous amount of people who come into our State, Mr. Speaker, every year who visit, who come and camp. They do not come to see oil wells. They do not come to see oil derricks. They come to use our beaches, to use our sand dunes, they come to swim in our beautiful lakes. This crucial environmental protection will keep big oil and reckless drilling out of our lakes.

This is a victory for Michigan, a victory for the environment, and a victory for future generations who deserve clean drinking water and an unspoiled landscape. I thank my colleagues for their help on this issue. I urge the House to pass the conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), who is a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I rise in support of our energy and water appropriations bill.

Let me first thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his forceful leadership of our committee's work and also the ranking member's leadership on this bill, and my thanks to the very forceful leadership, and to thank our subcommittee staff for their tireless efforts to put this bill together.

While much public attention is rightly focused on the war abroad, our committee continues to do its part to protect our Nation's security at home. The issue of energy security is now clearly before us. Our energy facilities must be safe and secure and we must continue the critical work of the Department of Energy to research and develop domestic sources of energy of all types and to protect our nuclear stockpile.

On another front, Chairman CALLAHAN has produced a bill, insisted on a bill, in fact, that continues the Federal commitment to work in partnership with our States and local communities to address such vital needs as flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration and improving our Nation's waterways.

I especially want to thank the chairman for his support of top priorities in my home State of New Jersey. Keeping our ports open for business is critical to our regional economy and the nearly 230,000 jobs related to port activity in both New York and New Jersey. Protecting and restoring our shoreline is also vital. This bill continues to protect communities from natural disasters such as flooding and continues New Jersey's special role to provide a future energy source that is clean and unlimited. That is the special work of the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab.

I also thank the chairman for working with me to consolidate the port dredging projects within the New York and New Jersey commercial waterways into one single project to expedite dredging to the recommended 50-foot depth. Combining these projects and expediting this critical work is a huge victory for our regional economy and for the environment and for the taxpayer at a time when our people are suffering and thousands of jobs have been lost in our area.

Finally, I want to pay special tribute to the Army Corps of Engineers for their response to the September 11 attack in Lower Manhattan and at the Pentagon. While we know the Army Corps does fantastic and important, essential work during war and in peacetime with flood control and dredging and other projects, many are not aware that the Army Corps acts in very important ways during times of disaster and national crisis. Since the day of these tragedies, the Corps has assisted in the Federal national response both in Lower Manhattan and at the Pentagon. They have worked tirelessly to do emergency dredging, debris removal and to address complex engineering and structural security issues in Lower Manhattan besides looking after thousands of people who needed transportation.

After visiting ground zero, Army Secretary White commented on the Corps effort and said, ''While your history is impressive, given the current situation your finest hour is a chapter yet to be written.'' I am sure we would agree with him.

I want to personally thank the Army Corps for all their work to meet the needs of our citizens and our communities when we needed it the most. I know our committee also shares my pride in their professionalism. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the bill.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank my good friend from Indiana for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the Corps of Engineers small flood control projects, also called section 205 projects, am I right in understanding that the conference report directs the Corps to proceed with all the projects listed in both the House and Senate reports?

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. So that would mean the conferees intend for the Corps to proceed with the Van Bibber-Arvada Plaza drainage project in Colorado as specified in the House report?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, few people ever get to witness a conference committee meeting. Generally it is in a late-night session, either in the basement of the House or the Capitol. That is where all of the serious negotiations take place rather than on the floor or even in a committee meeting. I wish the American people could have seen the professionalism and the dedication that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) had in trying to correct and trying to preserve some concerns that he had over the Missouri River project. He along with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), who is also a member of our subcommittee, should have made the people of Missouri and Iowa proud.

I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for those kind words and also want to certainly thank the chairman for doing a fabulous job leading our subcommittee on these very, very important issues and the ranking member and the cooperation that we have on this subcommittee, and certainly the staff did an outstanding job and we really appreciate all of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a very broad jurisdiction but extraordinarily important when we talk about our nuclear arsenal, when we talk about research, trying to make America independent in its energy needs. This is the place where that type of research is done, and I am very pleased with the funding levels. We could always find more uses for more money, obviously, but the chairman and ranking member did an outstanding job.

I would also like to say that this bill does a lot for Iowa. We have flood control projects in Sioux City, the Perry Creek ongoing project; in Denison, Iowa, where the floods were so devastating in 1993, the levee project there is funded to our request; and a couple of very, very important projects in Fort Dodge, Iowa, the river enhancement, in trying to make sure that that community can handle not only flood control but also have enhancement of the livelihood in Fort Dodge itself; and Webster County with their flood control concerns they have downriver on the Des Moines River.

The chairman brought up the issue of the Missouri River. I was somewhat disappointed in the results in this bill. Obviously the special interests upstream, upriver had a major influence, especially in the other body, but I think working in a cooperative basis that we can be successful in the future if we all use some common sense to bring this issue finally to closure so that we can all proceed and not destroy the livelihood and endanger the lives of the people downstream.

I again thank the chairman very much for the opportunity and for his great work.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. Let me thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the work that they have done on this bill. I also want to thank my fellow Texan and our colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) for the help that he has provided.

Once again this bill provides necessary funds for a number of water projects in the Greater Houston Area. In particular, it provides $4 million for the Brays Bayou project which is a precursor to a large Federal-local flood control project that borders up against the Texas Medical Center, which is the largest medical center in the world; and it includes $9 million for the Sims Bayou project, which is a Federal-local project that is halfway through construction.

Last summer, as Members know, all of southeast Texas but in particular in the Greater Houston Area, we suffered a very catastrophic flood event through Tropical Storm Allison. In

fact, this was somewhat of a 100-year event. We had over 70,000 homes which had water damage. We had floodwaters come out of the banks of most of the bayous and watersheds in the area. The total cost of the storm is estimated to be in excess of $5 billion, close to $2 billion of that occurring in the Texas Medical Center with the 45 institutions that are included within that center. The four major hospitals in the Houston area were closed down for some period of time as a result of that storm as well. The funding that is in this bill will go a long way in helping to try and address and alleviate that situation for future storms.

While we would like to get more money, obviously that is true for every Member, I believe we were treated fairly in this. We also have to do this in a fiscally responsible way. I know that the chairman and the ranking member are committed to these projects for the long haul.

I would also just add that I appreciate the fact that the committee provided about $34 million for the ongoing Houston ship channel project, the deepening and widening project which will allow the Port of Houston to maintain its status as one of the powerful economic engines in the Greater Houston Area. I appreciate the work of the committee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, putting together a bill such as this is not something one man can do. I thanked the staff earlier for their tremendous professionalism. But it also requires a lot of dedicated time and effort on the part of the subcommittee members as well as the full committee members.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who has dedicated untold hours and tons of professionalism towards the drafting of this bill.

□ 1145

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for those kind remarks. I rise in strong support of this bill. It is a pleasure to be on this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make three points about this legislation which, of course, will pass overwhelmingly in just a few moments.

First of all, the chairman and the ranking member mentioned the Corps of Engineers construction account. My chairman mentioned that the administration's request was, frankly, inadequate when it came to us. Certainly there may be reasons for that, the lack of time the administration had in being able to put the budget together. My friend from Indiana, the ranking member, called on Members to speak to the administration about the fact that, frankly, the request was unrealistic, and perhaps we can do a better job of communicating with the administration in the future about this.

But this has happened year in and year out, Mr. Speaker. It is not just the Bush administration, and it was not just the Clinton administration. Year in and year out, Democrat and Republican administrations have cut needed funds from the Corps' budget request, knowing full well that this House of Representatives and the other body would have to restore those funds in order to meet the needs.

There is a simple principle that applies to everyone's home, or if you are in a business it applies to the businesses, and it is so simple it almost goes without saying. That principle, Mr. Speaker, is that oftentimes you can spend a little money today in order to save the expense of a whole lot of money tomorrow.

If there is a problem with the seal around your front door, if you just spend a little money and it keeps the water from coming in, you are saving yourself from having to replace a whole bunch of carpet and a whole bunch of things inside the building later on. If you own a business and that roof needs to be repaired, I think all of my colleagues would agree you better go ahead and spend the little money now to repair the roof, rather than to spend all the money that it will take to correct the situation once it gets out of hand.

That is why we needed the plus-up; and that is why I commend the leadership of the committee, both in the House and in the Senate, for putting the adequate money in there and addressing the need, so we could save money tomorrow.

Now, let me just also mention a second point. Waterways are national issues. Our Nation's waterways do not recognize State lines. For example, over 40 percent of our Nation's water flows by the borders of my home State of Mississippi. So flood control and maintaining navigable waterways is a national issue, and I am pleased that this subcommittee and this bill makes the needed infrastructure investments for those activities.

Finally, I would join the rest of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in commending the leadership of this committee, my chairman and my ranking member, for working on a bipartisan basis. This is a bipartisan effort, and this is the sort of way in which our House of Representatives should conduct itself.

I urge overwhelming support for this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the next gentleman, I would want to agree with the points that the previous speaker, my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), made and particularly the point that this was not just a failure of the current administration, whatever the circumstances, as far as timing, or the Clinton administration, and would reiterate in my opening remarks I mentioned in constant dollars since 1967 we have seen the Corps budget drop from $7 billion to $4.48 billion, so that clearly is a generational failure by administrations and Congresses of both parties.

It is time we all collectively come together to come to grips with this and make a solid investment in the United States of America. So I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member and also our Chair of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the energy and water conference report, and particularly appreciate the hard work of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from my home State of Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and appreciate his advice during the process. I also appreciate the chairman of the committee and our ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees saw fit to boost funding for the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channel and the Port of Houston by $3 million, to $33,785 million. The Houston Ship Channel and the Port of Houston are vital not just to the economy of Houston but to our national economy. It is the second largest port in America and the largest in the Nation in foreign tonnage. It is also critical to our Nation's energy industry.

In addition to this channel project, I appreciate the conferees' efforts on the flood control projects in my districts. The importance of flood control to Houston was highlighted by the disastrous flooding caused by Tropical Storm Allison in June 2001. Total damages from this storm are estimated to be $5 billion.

One of these projects is Greens Bayou, which I wish I could say was named after me, but was there long before I came around, which the committee saw fit to fund at $377,000; and I appreciate the work of the committee to provide this continuing funding. Greens Bayou alone was responsible for nearly half of the nearly 30,000 homes that were flooded by Tropical Storm Allison's heavy rains.

The other major project in my district is Hunting Bayou, which was unfortunately not included in the conference report; and I will take a minute later to clear up some confusion. Hunting Bayou was mistakenly listed by the Corps as a new start, and thus would have been funded out of the fiscal 2002 construction general account. What the Corps should have requested was the project continue to be funded under general investigation as it had been over the last 3 years.

While Hunting Bayou is progressing at a reasonable pace, it is not ready for a new start designation until fiscal year 2003, and I want to make sure this point is clear because of the critical public safety implications that we have for East Harris County.

Hunting Bayou, which flows through East Harris County, was again hit hard

by Tropical Storm Allison. Approximately 7,500 homes were flooded, with damage estimated at $250 million. This total does not count the millions of dollars that were lost to businesses in the area through the loss of sales and cost of repairs.

Currently, the Hunting Bayou project is 80 percent through its general evaluation phase; and when the construction on this project is finished, it will reduce the number of structures subject to the 100-year flooding from 7,300 to 1,000. According to the estimates, this project could deliver $8.2 million per year in flood protection, and the minimum estimated life of this project would be at least 50 years, so it makes good sense.

I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the chairman and ranking member to clear up any of the further issues with the project and seek commitment next year that we will continue to work on this important project.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by expressing my deep gratitude for the hard work you and your ranking member and staffs put on this legislation. I know you each had difficult decisions to make, and the bill we have before us today is a fair compromise for all concerned.

I just want to take the opportunity to clean up some confusion about the Hunting Bayou project created through the Corps of Engineers and maybe even our own problems.

In my earlier statement, I mentioned the Corps mistakenly classified the project as a new start under the construction account, when in fact it should have been listed as continuing investigation. Is that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and want to say his understanding is identical to mine.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the chairman and my ranking member, and know that we will be back next year seeking a new start for Hunting Bayou, and with the cost-benefit analysis. I certainly will appreciate your support at that time.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to continue to work with the gentleman on the matter.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of this committee for a fine, fine bill and for working with me on several issues, and the ranking member as well.

I regrettably stand here today and tell you that I will have to vote ''no.'' There is a provision in this bill that I think is extremely dangerous. The gentleman from Michigan, a previous speaker, spoke very eloquently about protecting the Great Lakes and all that are right with our precious resources and that 20 percent of the fresh water of the whole world that resides there. I could not agree more with his intent. I could not agree more with his heart. I could not disagree more with the policy, as I think it is extremely dangerous.

In this bill, there is a section that was not added by the Members of this body, but came out of that conference committee, that has the single largest encroachment over control of the Great Lakes that I have ever seen. It says to the Great Lakes Governors and the Great Lakes legislators that we know better in the United States Congress how to protect your resources, a place of previous jurisdiction that they had themselves.

As a matter of fact, the last time Congress tried this, they exempted in navigable waterways ballast water. Now do you know what the number one threat is in our Great Lakes? It is non-native species that came to us because of that ballast water that the great wisdom in the halls of Washington, D.C. gave us.

Mr. Speaker, this is very, very dangerous stuff. What we have done now is we have taken control of the Great Lakes and given it to the majority of the southwest States that are thirsty, that see the Great Lakes as a great opportunity to water their lawns, to make their golf courses green. We have given the control of the Great Lakes to the oil-producing States that outnumber us in the Great Lakes; and believe me, there have been attempts in the past to drill on our Great Lakes. Something that started out I think pure of heart, is extremely dangerous.

The Governor, who I happen to disagree with on his position on angle drilling in the Great Lakes, is working on this issue. But both bodies of the legislature are acting, and acting now to stop angle drilling in the Great Lakes, a place, Mr. Speaker, where it ought to be debated.

We are telling the people who are debating now, the Speaker of the House of the State of Michigan in a bipartisan way is working to stop angle drilling in Michigan; but we are going to stand here today and say Mr. Speaker, back there in Michigan, you do not know what you are doing. You cannot protect your Great Lakes. We are the Federal Government. Trust us.

We did that before, Mr. Speaker; and we have the greatest threat, and I am going to say it again, to the Great Lakes, an act given to us by the United States Congress by not regulating ballast water, that gave us non-native species that are damaging and harming our Great Lakes today.

People who do not live there, people who do not work there, people who do not raise their children there, people who do not live there in February, and, believe me, Mr. Speaker, that is a trick, ought not to be making decisions about how to best protect our Great Lakes. This is the wrong direction. I think their intent is pure, but I think the results are disastrous.

I would urge those who believe that the States, our Great Lakes Governors, and Great Lakes legislators ought to control this issue, to vote ''no'' on the bill. I again regrettably, because there are a lot of good things in this bill, Mr. Speaker, will be voting ''no'' for that very specific reason.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this energy and water appropriations conference report. I want to begin by extending my sincere gratitude to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for all of his work and for the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for his great work in drafting a solid bipartisan piece of legislation, a bill that will meet many of the needs pertaining to important energy and infrastructure needs throughout our entire Nation.

Particularly, I want to thank both gentlemen for including in this bill $4.4 million for the cleanup of Flushing Bay and Creek in my congressional district. For those of you who may not be familiar where Flushing Bay is, when you land at LaGuardia Airport, between Shea Stadium and LaGuardia airport, that is Flushing Bay.

It is a gaping wound within the estuary of the Long Island Sound. For many, many years it has been in need of cleanup. The funding that will be provided here will be used to dredge parts of this water body, to clean up old sediment and other debris built up in the bay and creek for many years. The pollution built up in Flushing Bay has resulted in foul odors and water discoloration, making this a blight on the Borough of Queens. But this investment by the committee in the cleanup effort, as well as other infrastructure investments in the area, surrounding this water body, will make this portion of Flushing Sound and Creek what I believe will be the pride of Queens County.

There is a great deal of work that needs to be done. They are finishing the study stage, and we are grateful to the work of the Army Corps of Engineers; but we need to move beyond the study stage. We believe that will happen very soon, and a large portion of this $4.4 million will go towards actually dredging and cleaning up this bay, which is in desperate need of it, to bring it back to life for the people not only of my Borough of Queens County, but for all the city and all those people who visit our city on a daily basis and

fly over Flushing Bay and wonder what that exactly is.

□ 1200

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there is much that is good in this bill, and I would commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Visclosky) for a good bipartisan effort. But I would like to draw attention to a serious shortcoming in the bill.

This bill provides $69 million less than in fiscal year 2001 for nonproliferation programs to stop the development of nuclear weapons and to stop the spread of nuclear materials around the world. Is there a person in America who thinks we should be doing less this next year than this year to keep nuclear materials out of the hands of terrorists? There are at least 14 documented instances over recent years of diversion of nuclear materials from the Soviet Union. We think we have caught most of them.

On the front page of the New York Times on September 11 was an article about attempts to smuggle nuclear materials out of the Soviet Union. This is a real threat. Right now, because of new access and good agreements with the Soviet Union, we have a particularly good window of opportunity to put in place antiterrorist safeguards at numerous nuclear sites in Russia and the former Soviet Union. I do not see how we can look Americans in the face and say that we are going to shortchange this important program.

I would like to see the bill returned to committee so that we could make these very important changes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a very valuable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his time and for his leadership, along with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan). The primary statement I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, at this moment is that I deeply appreciate the very bipartisan, fair, conscientious leadership of this subcommittee through the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). The work of this subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, is often passed over by members of the press in Washington, D.C., but to the communities who are affected by floods, devastated by floods, this bill is as important as any that will ever be considered in this House. To communities that benefit from the infrastructure commitments of that bill, this legislation, is terribly, terribly important.

This bill deals with important university research across our country; it provides Department of Energy funding to protect American citizens from the threat of nuclear attack, terrorists; it deals with a whole range of issues that have a direct impact on the quality of life of American citizens. It is a pleasure as a member of this subcommittee to see its leadership work in a totally fair, totally nonpartisan manner.

I also want to compliment the staff for their work on dealing with unlimited numbers of very legitimate requests from flood control to energy projects, to research, yet making logical, carefully drawn out, fair decisions on how to allocate our limited resources.

A lot of people do not understand, Mr. Speaker, that this subcommittee, as a part of the Committee on Appropriations, does not make the decision on how big the pie is we spend under which committee's jurisdiction; the Committee on the Budget and other decisionmakers give us a size of the pie and the committee then has to decide how to divide it up. I think they have done excellent work.

The chairman and others know of my great concern about the overall lack of commitment of actual funds in this Congress to nuclear nonproliferation, and I frankly do wish we had been successful in convincing our colleagues in the other body in this bill that we should have spent somewhat less on strengthening the finest offensive nuclear arsenal in the world and spent significantly more using those dollars on protecting American citizens from the threat of terrorists getting their hands on nuclear material. But we did the best we could, and the leadership of this committee by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) deserve great credit for stopping a proposed reduction of $100 million in nuclear nonproliferation programs.

I look forward to joining with them in their efforts to convince others in this body and in the other body in the Capitol that we have an obligation to the American people to put homeland defense as our first priority, not as our second, third or last priority. I am confident that will happen in the days ahead with the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY). I again want to thank them and their staff for their tremendous effort in putting together this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I simply would conclude by again thanking the gentleman for a terrific work product, and that it is very pleasing to me that the Alabama-Indiana connection has been reestablished on this subcommittee.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make just a couple of comments before I yield back my time, and that is we mentioned the work of the subcommittee members and the staff people and all of that, but also the individual Members of Congress who have come to us as members of this subcommittee throughout the year explaining their projects and doing it very well, of protecting their home districts.

There are some in this country, mostly neophytes; George Wallace, when he was governor of Alabama, used to talk about those people that cannot park their bicycles straight in pointed-toe shoes, but we have some people in this country that think a great deal of this bill has to do with pork, and that is just not the fact. Actually, less than one-fifth of this bill even has to do with the Corps of Engineers. I mean this issue, this measure today is the protection for the American people for all of our nuclear programs, the safeguarding of our nuclear missiles, the safeguarding of nuclear disposal needs, the nonproliferation programs, reclamation, all of these things are always overlooked by these prognosticators of the news, and they are the ones who complain about this bill containing so much pork.

But that, in this country, is what we are all about. They have that right for their viewers. But I do wish once in a while they would take the time to look at the important issues that we address here.

Also, I mentioned the fact that many Members call on us about their issues, and one of these Members was the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), who is very disrupted because his office is in the Longworth Building and he does not even have an office in this Capitol, yet he has made numerous trips back to this Capitol to talk with me and others, and it is solely because of the gentleman's efforts that we have corrected a portion of the bill that some people in New York were concerned about. Had it not been for the gentleman's efforts on the West Valley project, the measure would have been right where it was when it left the House, but because of his efforts, we reinstated his requested language. One of those reporters wrote that he had nothing to do with it and gave the Members of the Senate credit for it from New York. Well, I never even heard from the Members of the Senate, I only heard from the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and, as a result, we corrected the bill, as per his request.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those involved.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2311, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2002.

As a new member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee this year, I enjoyed working with Chairman SONNY CALLAHAN, ranking Member PETER VISCLOSKY and the other subcommittee members in support of projects and

activities that are important to California and the nation.

Although more than two-thirds of the spending in our bill is for the Department of Energy, the important work done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation demands much of our attention as our constituents request funding that will help our ports, waterways and communities.

In Los Angeles, a project to deepen the main channel of Los Angeles Harbor is key to economic activity throughout southern California. The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have increased container traffic by 40 percent in just one year, and it is expected to double again in the next 10 years. I am pleased that our bill contains $2.825 million to complete the pre-construction, engineering and design for this important project and immediately move forward to the construction phase.

The Energy and Water Appropriations Bill has also provided a mechanism for solving a severe problem affecting the drinking water supply for millions of southern Californians. Last year, the San Gabriel Restoration Fund was established in order to assist the San Gabriel Water Control Authority and the Central Basin Municipal Water District with cleaning up contamination in the groundwater basins they administer. Unfortunately, $23 million sat in the fund all year while contamination seeped into the Central Basin from the San Gabriel Basin at a rate of nearly three feet per day.

Working with Congressman DAVID DREIER, we included statutory language that will permit clean-up of the San Gabriel and Central Basins to get underway almost immediately. We will accomplish this by transferring administration of the San Gabriel Restoration Fund to the Bureau of Reclamation, which is better suited to administer grants for these clean-up activities. Clean drinking water is far too important to my constituents and other southern Californians to let bureaucratic hang-ups get in the way, so I am pleased that this project can now begin to move forward.

The Title XVI projects administered by the Bureau of Reclamation are also very important to southern Californians. These projects, where costs are borne primarily by the local water authorities, have been one of the keys to enabling southern California to grow over the past 15 years without requiring any additional supplies of water. By taking water that has already been used by residences or businesses and treating it again, this water can then be used for any industrial or municipal use that doesn't require drinking grade quality. Although the treatment costs can be considerable, this still saves businesses money when they use the recycled water for industrial purposes, and they enjoy the water supply reliability that results from this process. Many municipalities are also investing in recycled water to cut their costs by using reclaimed water to keep parks and golf courses green. Nearly one-third of Los Angeles County's water is recycled now, and with sufficient investment, that percentage can grow further, providing significant help with our water supply needs. I am pleased that $740,000 is included for the Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation/Reuse Project, and a number of other southern California projects are also going forward with funds in this bill.

Another key to clean drinking water for southern Californians is a clean Colorado River, which is a major source of drinking water for the entire southern California region. Within the Department of Energy, $2 million has been included to begin clean-up of a uranium mine tailings site in Moab, Utah that is perilously close to the Colorado River. This project is long overdue. Fortunately, no contamination has been detected in the Colorado River, but if it was to occur, the clean-up would be far more costly than removing the pile of tailings.

The impact of commercial marine activity, flooding, and dispersal of pollutants from contaminated coastal sites upon the southern California shoreline is of enormous importance. The Corps of Engineers has been given $400,000 to complete a study of the Los Angeles County shoreline and to determine any needs for beach nourishment based on erosion and other factors.

The scope of the bill's funding for programs of the Department of Energy is very wide and include activities vital to our national defense such as uranium facilities maintenance, nuclear waste disposal and funding for the new National Nuclear Security Administration which works to keep our nuclear stockpile safe. We also provide funding for important energy supply activities such as research into renewable energy technologies including biomass, biofuels, solar energy and wind energy. These energy sources will play a significant role in meeting the nation's energy needs of tomorrow.

I also want to take particular note of the extensive research that is conducted by our national energy laboratories, including the Lawrence Livermore and Lawrence Berkeley Laboratories in California. Whether it is high-energy physics, nuclear physics or basic energy sciences such as materials, chemical, engineering and geosciences, these laboratories are on the cutting edge of scientific breakthroughs. Our national laboratories are a valuable national resource.

My only regret in the bill is that we didn't do more for non-proliferation activities. I supported the effort made by Congressman CHET EDWARDS at the House-Senate conference committee to provide additional resources for our non-proliferation program. The report issued by Howard Baker, Lloyd Cutler, and Sam Nunn on the DOE's nonproliferation programs with Russia said:

> The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction of weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home.

Unfortunately, the conference amendment to transfer funds from some of our nuclear maintenance programs to this non-proliferation effort was unsuccessful. However, I am glad that House and Senate leaders of the Energy and Water Subcommittee gave their commitment to pursuing significant funds in a supplemental appropriations bill to address this continuing threat to the security of the U.S. and the world.

It has been a delightful and satisfying year working with Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Democrat VISCLOSKY, and I look forward to years of service on this subcommittee and to working with these important agencies as they carry out their missions in service to our nation.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2311, the Energy & Water Appropriations Conference Report. The bill contains important funding for America's waterways, irrigation infrastructure, flood control and programs administered by the Department of the Energy.

While I will support the conference report, I am disappointed that the conferees chose not to include an increase in borrowing authority for the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to fund critical transmission improvements. The Northwest is still experiencing an electricity crisis caused by a shortage of new development, the failed attempt by California to achieve deregulation and a severe drought. Additional generation is under construction and on the drawing board. More than 3,000 megawatts of generation is now fully permitted in the Northwest with 20,000 more megawatts in the regulatory pipeline. BPA will need increased Treasury borrowing authority to assist the agency in upgrading and building transmission lines. Without additional transmission capacity in the Northwest, additional generation coming online may not be able to reliably reach consumers.

BPA's transmission investments will easily pay for themselves in the long run and are essential in order to improve wholesale electricity markets in the Western United States, and to maintain the basic reliability of our region's electrical system. The increase is supported by the Northwest Energy Caucus, consisting of every House Member from Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana. We will continue to pursue an increase in BPA's borrowing authority through other venues.

I am pleased that the Conference Report continues funding for the Inland Northwest Natural Resources Research Center at Gonzaga University, albeit at a substantially lower level of funding than was provided by the Energy and Water Appropriations Conferees for fiscal year 2001. I will work to ensure that funding is provided in future years to allow for the smooth continuation of this project.

$1 million was provided at my request for the Walla Walla River feasibility study, the same level as was included in the House bill. The Walla Walla basin has established a successful broad-based watershed planning/HCP process. This formal process includes participation by federal, state, and local governments and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). It also includes participation by local and regional environmental groups and stakeholders representing local businesses, agri-business, recreational, and cultural interests. At its core, the watershed planning/HCP effort focuses on restoring adequate flows for listed species.

To insure that the federal funding provided does not create a parallel process to the existing process underway, it is the intent of Congress that the Crops shall integrate its activities into the framework of the existing watershed planning/HCP process already established in the basin. In addition, to maintain the success of the efforts underway, it is the intent of Congress that the Corps shall not develop an instream flow target that is inconsistent with flow targets set through the Watershed Planning/HCP process.

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

move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 273, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 30, 2001 at page H7512.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to present the Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2002 to the House for consideration. I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and all of the members of the subcommittee, for their support in crafting this legislation. I would like to also say thank you to the staff for all of their hard work during these times, especially to Chuck Turner, Manny Crupi, Ed Lombard, Liz Dawson, Mark Murray and Tim Aiken. All Members owe them a special thanks for their work.

I would like to say a special thank you to the Capitol police who are listed under this bill. We have gone through unusual times in the last almost 60 days, and we owe them a special thanks for their undying efforts to maintain protection for the Members of the House, our staff, and our guests who come to the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, we have a non-controversial, bipartisan bill. With respect to the items that were sent to the Senate in the House passed bill, we have held the increase over the 2001 bill to 4.6 percent. Now, that is an increase which is well below the President's request for 2002 appropriations.

And the committee bill meets our 302(b) allocations for budget authority and is $15 million below our outlay target.

Mr. Speaker, the House has approved the rule for this report. The committee has done its job and it has done its job well, I believe, and this bill deserves the overwhelming support of the House. I do not intend to extend the debate, and I will include a summary of comparison of accounts in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does contain the funds and language to implement the tuition loan reimbursement plan for our agencies, for the Congressional Budget Office and the Senate, and the bill contains funds from committee and members' representational allowances accounts to fund the program for House employees. We are awaiting the Committee on House Administration to respond to our call for rules and regulations in this area, and we feel that will be forthcoming.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2002 to the House for consideration.

I'd like to thank the ranking member, Mr. MORAN, and all the members of the subcommittee for their support in crafting this legislation.

I would like also to say a thank you to the staff for all their hard work during these times. Especially to Chuck Turner, Manny Crupi, Ed Lombard, Liz Dawson, Mark Murray, and Tim Siken—all members owe them special thanks.

And, Mr. Speaker a special thanks to the Capitol police who risk their lives daily, and have been doing so diligently, since the September 11 attacks, to protect House members and staff, and our visitors. They are heroes to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we have a non-controversial, bipartisan bill. With respect to the items that were sent to the Senate in the House passed bill, we have held the increase over FY2001 to 4.6 percent. That's an increase which is well below the President's request for 2002 appropriations.

And the Committee bill meets our 302(b) allocation in budget authority and is $15 million below our outlay target.

We have had some questions about a student loan repayment program for House staff. The Committee has no objection to including the appropriate legislation in the Legislative bill. But it is a complicated technical matter that involves internal House policy and must be integrated into the legislative authority for allowable uses of members' allowances and committee funding. Under the rules, those mattes are within the jurisdiction of the Administration Committee.

We have received no requests from the Administration Committee to include such authority. Therefore, the joint statement of the managers that accompanies this conference report encourages the House Administration Committee to develop and recommend guidelines and appropriate legislative language to establish a student loan repayment program. The funds to carry this out are included in the bill. The Appropriations Committee will be happy to carry such authorizing language in the appropriations bill. That is in accord with long standing practice of the Appropriations Committee to assist House Administration and the Leadership in achieving administrative improvements in the operations of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House has approved the rule for this conference report by unanimous vote.

The Committee has done its job; it has done a good job. This bill deserves the overwhelming support of the House. I do not intend to extend the debate and will include a summary of the comparisons of accounts in the record.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

H.R. 2647 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
Gratuities, deceased Members	141					-141
Expense Allowances						
Expense allowances:						
Vice President	10	10		10	10	
President Pro Tempore of the Senate	10	10		10	10	
Majority Leader of the Senate	10	10		10	10	
Minority Leader of the Senate	10	10		10	10	
Majority Whip of the Senate	5	5		5	5	
Minority Whip of the Senate	5	5		5	5	
Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee	3	3		3	3	
Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee	3	3		3	3	
Chairman of the Majority Policy Committee	3	3		3	3	
Chairman of the Minority Policy Committee	3	3		3	3	
Subtotal, expense allowances	62	62		62	62	
Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders	30	30		30	30	
Total, Expense allowances and representation	92	92		92	92	
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Vice President	1,785	1,867		1,867	1,867	+82
Office of the President Pro Tempore	453	473		473	473	+20
Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders	2,742	2,868		2,868	2,868	+126
Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips	1,722	1,912		1,912	1,912	+190
Committee on Appropriations	8,747	9,875		9,875	9,875	+1,128
Conference committees	2,304	2,500		2,500	2,500	+196
Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority	590	618		618	618	+28
Policy Committees	2,342	2,550		2,550	2,550	+208
Office of the Chaplain	288	301		301	301	+13
Office of the Secretary	14,738	15,424		15,424	15,424	+686
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	34,811	39,082		39,082	39,082	+4,271
Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority	1,292	1,350		1,350	1,350	+58
Agency contributions and related expenses	20,507	25,219		25,219	25,219	+4,712
Total, salaries, officers and employees	92,321	104,039		104,039	104,039	+11,718
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate						
Salaries and expenses	4,046	4,306		4,306	4,306	+260
Office of Senate Legal Counsel						
Salaries and expenses	1,069	1,109		1,109	1,109	+40
Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate						
Expenses allowances	12	12		12	12	
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
Inquiries and investigations	83,000	107,264		107,264	107,264	+24,264
Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control	370	370		370	520	+150
Secretary of the Senate	2,077	3,511		8,571	8,571	+6,494
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	71,511	95,904		95,904	95,904	+24,393
Miscellaneous items	8,655	10,274		11,274	14,274	+5,619
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554)	6,500					-6,500
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	251,929	285,494		270,494	270,494	+18,565
Town Meeting notices				3,000		
Official Mail Costs						
Expenses	300	300		300	300	
Total, contingent expenses of the Senate	424,342	503,117		497,177	497,327	+72,985
Total, Senate	522,023	612,675		606,735	606,885	+84,862

H.R. 2647 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
Gratuities, deceased Members	714	.....	.....	.....	145	-569
Salaries and Expenses						
House Leadership Offices						
Office of the Speaker	1,759	1,866	1,866	1,866	1,866	+107
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,726	1,830	1,830	1,830	1,830	+104
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	2,096	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,224	+128
Office of the Majority Whip	1,466	1,562	1,562	1,562	1,562	+96
Office of the Minority Whip	1,096	1,168	1,168	1,168	1,168	+72
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities	410	431	431	431	431	+21
Republican Steering Committee	765	806	806	806	806	+41
Republican Conference	1,255	1,342	1,342	1,342	1,342	+87
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee	1,352	1,435	1,435	1,435	1,435	+83
Democratic Caucus	668	713	713	713	713	+45
Nine minority employees	1,229	1,293	1,293	1,293	1,293	+64
Training and Development Program:						
Majority	278	290	290	290	290	+12
Minority	278	290	290	290	290	+12
Cloakroom Personnel:						
Majority	.....	.....	330	330	330	+330
Minority	.....	.....	330	330	330	+330
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices	14,378	15,250	15,910	15,910	15,910	+1,532
Members' Representational Allowances Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official Expenses of Members, and Official Mail						
Expenses	430,877	479,339	479,472	479,472	479,472	+48,595
Committee Employees						
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)	100,272	104,492	104,514	104,514	104,514	+4,242
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations)	22,328	23,000	23,002	23,002	23,002	+674
Subtotal, Committee employees	122,600	127,492	127,516	127,516	127,516	+4,916
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Clerk	17,740	16,025	15,408	15,408	15,408	-2,332
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	3,692	4,083	4,139	4,139	4,139	+447
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer	72,848	67,480	67,495	67,495	67,495	-5,353
Office of Inspector General	3,249	3,754	3,756	3,756	3,756	+507
Office of General Counsel	806	892	894	894	894	+88
Office of the Chaplain	140	144	144	144	144	+4
Office of the Parliamentarian	1,201	1,344	1,344	1,344	1,344	+143
Office of the Parliamentarian	(1,035)	(1,168)	(1,168)	(1,168)	(1,168)	(+133)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives	(166)	(176)	(176)	(176)	(176)	(+10)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House	2,045	2,104	2,107	2,107	2,107	+62
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House	5,085	5,454	5,456	5,456	5,456	+371
Corrections Calendar Office	832	883	883	883	883	+51
Other authorized employees	213	230	140	140	140	-73
Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician	(213)	(230)	(140)	(140)	(140)	(-73)
Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees	107,851	102,393	101,766	101,766	101,766	-6,085
Allowances and Expenses						
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	2,235	3,359	3,379	3,379	3,379	+1,144
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House	410	410	410	410	410	.....
Government contributions	150,776	153,167	152,957	152,957	152,957	+2,181
Miscellaneous items	393	690	690	690	690	+297
Special education needs	215	.....	.....	.....	.....	-215
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses	154,029	157,626	157,436	157,436	157,436	+3,407
Total, salaries and expenses	829,735	882,100	882,100	882,100	882,100	+52,365
Undistributed reduction	.....	.....	.....	.....	-4,050	-4,050
Total, House of Representatives	830,449	882,100	882,100	882,100	878,195	+47,746

H.R. 2647 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
JOINT ITEMS						
Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 2001	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000
Joint Economic Committee	3,315	3,424	3,424	3,424	3,424	+109
Joint Committee on Taxation	6,416	6,733	6,733	6,733	6,733	+317
Office of the Attending Physician						
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances	1,831	1,765	1,865	1,765	1,865	+34
Capitol Police Board						
Capitol Police						
Salaries:						
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives	47,206	54,946	55,013	55,296	55,239	+8,033
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	50,346	56,976	57,579	57,626	57,805	+7,459
Subtotal, salaries	97,552	111,922	112,592	112,922	113,044	+15,492
Security enhancements (emergency funding)	2,102	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,102
General expenses	7,243	10,394	11,081	12,394	13,146	+5,903
Subtotal, Capitol Police	106,897	122,316	123,673	125,316	126,190	+19,293
Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office	2,371	2,512	2,512	2,512	2,512	+141
Statements of Appropriations	30	30	30	30	30	.....
Total, Joint items	121,860	136,780	138,237	139,780	140,754	+18,894
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE						
Salaries and expenses	1,851	2,059	2,059	2,059	2,059	+208
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses	28,430	30,680	30,780	30,680	30,780	+2,350
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
Capitol Buildings and Grounds						
General and administration, salaries and expenses	.....	.....	46,705	.....	51,371	+51,371
Minor construction	.....	.....	9,482	.....	.....	.....
Capitol buildings	44,624	111,835	17,674	54,000	15,194	-29,430
Capitol grounds	5,350	7,754	6,904	6,000	6,009	+659
Senate office buildings	63,833	53,551	.....	47,500	42,126	-21,707
House office buildings	41,678	51,187	49,006	49,006	54,006	+12,328
Capitol Power Plant	43,728	51,499	49,724	51,803	56,983	+13,255
Offsetting collections	-4,400	-4,400	-4,400	-4,400	-4,400	.....
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant	39,328	47,099	45,324	47,403	52,583	+13,255
Total, Architect of the Capitol	194,813	271,426	175,095	203,909	221,289	+26,476
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
Congressional Research Service						
Salaries and expenses	73,430	81,139	81,454	81,139	81,454	+8,024
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
Congressional printing and binding	81,205	90,900	81,000	81,000	81,000	-205
Total, title I, Congressional Operations	1,854,061	2,107,759	1,390,725	2,027,402	2,042,416	+188,355
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES						
BOTANIC GARDEN						
Salaries and expenses	3,321	6,129	5,946	5,829	5,646	+2,325
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS						
Salaries and expenses	382,596	297,275	304,692	297,775	306,692	-75,904
Authority to spend receipts	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850	.....
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	375,746	290,425	297,842	290,925	299,842	-75,904
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	38,438	43,322	40,896	40,701	40,896	+2,458
Authority to spend receipts	-29,270	-28,964	-27,864	-27,864	-27,864	+1,406
Subtotal, Copyright Office	9,168	14,358	13,032	12,837	13,032	+3,864
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	48,502	49,765	49,788	49,765	49,788	+1,286
Furniture and furnishings	4,881	8,599	7,932	8,532	7,932	+3,051
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS)	438,297	363,147	368,594	362,059	370,594	-67,703

H.R. 2647 - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2002 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL						
Capitol Visitors Center						
Capitol Visitors Center	.....	.....	.....	1,000	70,000	+70,000
Congressional Cemetery						
Congressional Cemetery	.....	.....	.....	2,500	1,250	+1,250
Library Buildings and Grounds						
Structural and mechanical care	15,935	21,402	22,252	18,753	21,753	+5,818
Total, Architect of the Capitol	15,935	21,402	22,252	22,253	93,003	+77,068
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE						
Office of Superintendent of Documents						
Salaries and expenses	27,893	29,639	29,639	28,728	29,639	+1,746
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund						
GPO revolving fund	6,000	6,000	.....	.....	.....	-6,000
Total, Government Printing Office	33,893	35,639	29,639	28,728	29,639	-4,254
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses	387,020	430,295	424,345	420,344	424,345	+37,325
Offsetting collections	-3,000	-2,501	-2,501	-2,501	-2,501	+499
Total, General Accounting Office	384,020	427,794	421,844	417,843	421,844	+37,824
CENTER FOR RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT						
Payment to Russian Leadership development trust funds	.....	.....	.....	10,000	8,000	+8,000
Total, title II, Other agencies	875,466	854,111	848,275	846,712	928,726	+53,260
Grand total	2,729,527	2,961,870	2,239,000	2,874,114	2,971,142	+241,615
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
Senate	522,023	612,675	.....	606,735	606,885	+84,862
House of Representatives	830,449	882,100	882,100	882,100	878,195	+47,746
Joint Items	121,860	136,780	138,237	139,780	140,754	+18,894
Office of Compliance	1,851	2,059	2,059	2,059	2,059	+208
Congressional Budget Office	28,430	30,680	30,780	30,680	30,780	+2,350
Architect of the Capitol	194,813	271,426	175,095	203,909	221,289	+26,476
Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service	73,430	81,139	81,454	81,139	81,454	+8,024
Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office	81,205	90,900	81,000	81,000	81,000	-205
Total, title I, Congressional operations	1,854,061	2,107,759	1,390,725	2,027,402	2,042,416	+188,355
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES						
Botanic Garden	3,321	6,129	5,946	5,829	5,646	+2,325
Library of Congress (except CRS)	438,297	363,147	368,594	362,059	370,594	-67,703
Architect of the Capitol	15,935	21,402	22,252	22,253	93,003	+77,068
Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding)	33,893	35,639	29,639	28,728	29,639	-4,254
General Accounting Office	384,020	427,794	421,844	417,843	421,844	+37,824
Center for Russian Leadership Development	.....	.....	.....	10,000	8,000	+8,000
Total, title II, Other agencies	875,466	854,111	848,275	846,712	928,726	+53,260
Grand total	2,729,527	2,961,870	2,239,000	2,874,114	2,971,142	+241,615

NOTE: FY 2001 enacted includes 0.22% rescissions.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, who is doing such an outstanding job as the ranking member, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), and I thank Ed and Liz for the outstanding job they are doing. We are glad to have Liz Dawson with us. She is doing an outstanding job, and now doing an outstanding job with the security of our Capitol. I appreciate our former Staff Director's assistance as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a long time, but I want to talk about just a couple of things, actually three things that are in this bill with which I am very pleased.

First of all, we are moving ahead on enhancing security in this complex. That is absolutely essential. I have been talking about that for some years. I appreciate the fact that the committee has now provided the Capitol police with all of the officers that they can train within the next year to fully fund the security requirements and the Capitol police in terms of their safety as well as the safety of this complex, both from a physical standpoint and from an individual personal standpoint. I do not mean us personally, but the individuals in the Capitol.

□ 1215

It also restores pay parity of the Capitol Police with the Park Police and Secret Service. I think that is important, because we do not want to spend a lot of money training people simply to have them go off to other agencies. So I thank the committee for their efforts in that regard.

Let me mention two additional provisions, and then I will cease. Both of these provisions are related to legislative branch workers.

First, section 133 of the bill will finally end the practice of employing temporary workers for long periods without providing them access to the same valuable Federal benefits that permanent employees enjoy from the first days on the job. I think that is important as a personnel policy, and I think it is important, from a fairness point of view, to our personnel.

The Architect now employs more than 300 such workers, mostly on construction projects. Many have been employed almost continually for years, and in some cases over 15 years, and still have not had benefits: no retirement, no health care. That is obviously, when one is 25 years of age, thought to be not of much consequence; when one gets to be 50 years of age and one looks back, it is of great consequence. These workers will now have access to benefits, and no new hires can work more than 1 year without getting them.

Secondly, section 310 will ensure that the House telephone operators, who have played a key role in assuring continuity of operations during the instant crisis, will always receive the same annual wage adjustment ordered by House administration for all classified House employees.

We found a discrepancy existed. I will not go into the reasons that discrepancy existed, but it is now resolved.

There are a lot of other excellent provisions in this bill. I agree with the chairman and with the ranking member, this is not a controversial bill. It is a good bill.

Again, I thank both the chairman and the ranking member and our staffs for working so hard to make it so.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill that every member should support.

It fully funds a number of accounts, including the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Congressional Research Service, key agencies that directly support the Congress.

It fully funds the American Folklife Center in the Library, including the veterans' oral history project. It funds the new sound-recording preservation program. It provides needed funds to improve services in the law library.

To enhance security in the complex, it funds all the extra Capitol Police officers that the department can hire and train during fiscal 2002. I've fought for over two years for enough police manpower to assure adequate security. A key measure of adequate security is deployment of a minimum of two officers on every door.

We're not there yet, but this bill moves us in that direction and I hope we will move still further next year.

The bill does restore pay parity for the Capitol Police with the Park Police and Secret Service Uniformed officers.

The bill extends GPO's early-out/buy-out authority for 3 years, and funds a 4.6 percent COLA.

The bill otherwise provides sufficient funds for the operation of member offices, committees, and the officers of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions that I want to mention in particular, both related to legislative-branch workers.

It funds the same $65 transit benefit available in the executive branch for every legislative-branch agency. I especially want to compliment my friend from Virginia for making this a priority. I will work with Chairman NEY in House Administration to authorize the increased benefit promptly for House employees.

First, section 133 will finally end the Architect of the Capitol's practice of employing temporary workers for long periods without providing them access to the same valuable Federal benefits that permanent employees enjoy from their first days on the job.

The Architect now employs more than 300 such workers, mostly on construction projects. Many have been employed almost continuously for years, as "temporary" workers. Under my provision, these workers will have access to benefits, and no new hires can work more than 1 year without benefits.

Second, section 310 will ensure that the house telephone operators, who have played a key role in assuring continuity of operations during the instant crisis, will always receive the same annual wage adjustment ordered by House Administration for all classified House employees. That initially didn't happen this year.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other excellent provisions in this bill, far too many to list in the time allotted. Suffice it to say that it has been a joy to work this year with the gentlemen from North Carolina and Virginia, and with the able new subcommittee clerk, Elizabeth Dawson, all of whom I sincerely thank.

I also want to thank Mark Murray, the minority subcommittee clerk, Tim Aiken of Mr. MORAN'S staff, and Roger Szemraj ["Shemrye"] and Julie Little of Ms. KAPTUR's staff, for their fine work. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his cogent, concise, and very substantive statement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is largely the same bill that got 380 votes in the House last time. I am going to thank the appropriate people, after I just say a few words or make a few points about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to make it clear that the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, all largely received whatever they requested; the joint committees and leadership accounts, as well.

There are a number of provisions that will enable us to be better prepared to counter this new terrorist threat. Security and the need to preserve the ability of this institution to continue to function have been our paramount concern in putting this bill together.

Mr. Speaker, this does provide funds to hire an additional 79 Capitol Police officers. It will bring the total force up to 1,481 full-time equivalents, and it will fund all their benefit increases.

Several long-standing problems were resolved. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) had raised the issue of temporary workers being involved in long-term projects. These temporary workers have been working an average of 4½ years, but they were not getting health and pension benefits because they were still given that classification. That has been resolved.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was concerned about the contract cafeteria employees. They have been without pay since the closure of the Ford and Longworth cafeterias, so this bill would enable them to be compensated for their lost wages. We did not want them to find other jobs; we wanted them to be available when these office buildings reopen. But these people are not getting paid a whole lot, and so they were really suffering.

There is a provision here that provides $65 per month for an employee transit benefit for the employees of the legislative branch if they use public

transportation. They can get $65 a month tax-free. By next year, it goes up to $100 a month.

The executive branch has provided this to their employees; we felt it was the appropriate thing to do it here. We have done that.

There are provisions that will help us implement a teleworking policy, telecommuting. That is something the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has been pushing. And particularly during this period of time when the House offices were closed, we realized that we have to figure out ways to be able to continue functioning, albeit sometimes from remote locations. We will try to do that with home laptop computers, in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, I think those are most of the issues. There was an issue with regard to student loans. We hope that the Committee on House Administration can provide the same kind of student loan payback incentive that the Senate has, where we may be losing some well-qualified people to the Senate, of all places, because we do not provide the same kind of incentive they do. So we would hope that the authorizing committee would take care of that.

Having said all of this, let me first of all thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman. He has been very good to work with. As I say, this is a good bill. Every request that was even remotely reasonable has been met.

I want to recognize Mark Murray, Liz Dawson, and certainly Ed Lombard, who has been brought into service. He is the repository of all institutional knowledge on the legislative branch appropriations bill. I remember when Vic Fazio was the Chair and I was on the committee, and Ed had been a senior pro even then, so we appreciate him.

I know Liz, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), said, has been very much involved in all of the security functions that are going on. We thank Liz for doing that.

As well, Mike Harrison of the office of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), Roger France of the office of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), we thank them for his help. Manny Crupi and Chuck Turner, and of course Tim Aiken of my staff, they all deserve credit for their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. There is no good reason not to support it. It ought to be supported unanimously.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report and as a new member of the subcommittee this year, I wish to thank Chairman TAYLOR, Ranking Member JIM MORAN, my esteemed colleague STENY HOYER, and the entire subcommittee for welcoming me so warmly and for their hard work in crafting this outstanding bill.

I also rise to highlight a provision in the bill that I worked to have placed in the conference report and wish to thank the Majority for their assistance in this effort, along with Chief Administrative Officer Jay Eagen.

This provision permits the women and men who provide food service in our House office buildings to be paid for the time they were unable to come to work. It allows them to collect at least some of the wages they lost—through no fault of their own—during recent shutdowns of House office buildings.

The genesis of this provision is particularly interesting—the result of one of my staff asking cafeteria workers how the shutdowns had affected them. The reply was: it hit home and it hit hard.

Food service workers in the Ford building have not been paid since October 17. Food service workers in the other House buildings were paid for the first three days of the shutdown, but after that were forced to take leave or assume leave without pay status. We are all acutely aware that not only the Ford building but also the Longworth building and therefore the Longworth Food Court remain closed today.

These women and men are neither salaried employees, nor federal employees like their counterparts in the Senate. Thanks to the great wave of privatization in 1995, these women and men instead earn hourly wages and many rely on and are challenged to stretch every penny of their paychecks to support themselves and their families. Quite literally, every dime counts.

Many of us through the years have come to know these women and men quite well. We know them by name and have come to rely not only on their service, but also their smiles.

Whether it be a cup of coffee, lunch, or just a mid afternoon snack people like Betty, Pat, Maria, and Doris play a meaningful and consistent role in our lives.

They work hard. They help keep us going.

They deserve compensation for the days they were unable to work, just like any member of our salaried staffs and I am very pleased that as a result of this provision and bill they will indeed receive at least some of it.

Once again, I wish to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for their work in bringing the conference report before us today and would once again encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

conference report on H.R. 2311, by the yeas and nays;

conference report on H.R. 2647, by the yeas and nays;

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first vote in this series.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2311, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 29, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie	Castle	Ford
Ackerman	Chabot	Fossella
Aderholt	Chambliss	Frank
Akin	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Clayton	Frost
Armey	Clement	Gallegly
Baca	Clyburn	Ganske
Bachus	Coble	Gekas
Baird	Collins	Gephardt
Baker	Combest	Gilchrest
Baldacci	Condit	Gillmor
Baldwin	Cooksey	Gilman
Ballenger	Costello	Gonzalez
Barcia	Cox	Goode
Barr	Coyne	Goodlatte
Barrett	Cramer	Gordon
Bartlett	Crane	Goss
Barton	Crenshaw	Graham
Bass	Crowley	Granger
Becerra	Culberson	Graves
Bentsen	Cummings	Green (TX)
Bereuter	Cunningham	Green (WI)
Berman	Davis (CA)	Greenwood
Berry	Davis (FL)	Grucci
Biggert	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutknecht
Bishop	Davis, Tom	Hall (OH)
Blagojevich	Deal	Hall (TX)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hansen
Blunt	Delahunt	Harman
Boehlert	DeLauro	Hart
Boehner	DeLay	Hastings (FL)
Bonilla	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Bonior	Deutsch	Hayes
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Hayworth
Borski	Dicks	Hefley
Boswell	Dingell	Herger
Boucher	Dooley	Hill
Boyd	Doolittle	Hilleary
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hilliard
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hinchey
Brown (FL)	Duncan	Hinojosa
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Hobson
Bryant	Ehlers	Hoeffel
Burr	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Burton	Emerson	Holden
Buyer	Engel	Honda
Callahan	English	Hooley
Calvert	Eshoo	Horn
Camp	Evans	Houghton
Cannon	Everett	Hoyer
Cantor	Farr	Hulshof
Capito	Fattah	Hunter
Capps	Ferguson	Hyde
Capuano	Filner	Isakson
Cardin	Fletcher	Israel
Carson (IN)	Foley	Issa
Carson (OK)	Forbes	Istook

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)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—29

Andrews
Berkley
Brown (OH)
Conyers
DeFazio
Doggett
Etheridge
Flake
Gibbons
Holt
Hostettler
Inslee
Kerns
Kucinich
McDermott
Obey
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pitts
Rogers (MI)
Royce
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Stearns
Tancredo
Walden
Wu

NOT VOTING—4

Cubin
Dunn
McKinney
Thompson (MS)

□ 1253

Messrs. CONYERS, BROWN of Ohio, and WU changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. TIBERI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each question on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2647, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 52, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

YEAS—374

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

NAYS—52

Barr
Barrett
Berry
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Chabot
Costello
Crane
Deutsch
Doggett
Flake
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Hefley
Herger
Holt
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kerns
Kind (WI)
Kucinich
Lucas (KY)
Luther
McInnis
Menendez
Moran (KS)
Paul
Petri
Pitts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (MI)
Stearns
Strickland

Tancredo
Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cubin
Dunn
Gekas
McKinney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1304

Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. BARR of Georgia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 417, Adoption of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Conference Report, I am not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 417, which I missed, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 33, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—380

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
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)
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
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)
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—33

Aderholt
Baird
Borski
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Kingston
Larsen (WA)
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern
Oberstar
Peterson (MN)
Ramstad
Sabo
Sanchez
Schaffer
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Whitfield

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—18

Bartlett
Cubin
Dunn
Edwards
Graham
Jefferson
Larson (CT)
Lofgren
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
McKinney
Nadler
Olver
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Thompson (MS)
Walsh
Young (FL)

□ 1313

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3150, SECURE TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

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. 3150) to improve aviation security, and for other purposes. 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. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. 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 (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 3150, the Secure Transportation for America Act. This is a fair rule, allowing ample time for free-flowing discussion on both the base text and the Democratic substitute. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution. These amendments may be offered only in the order printed in the report and may be offered only by a Member designated in the report. They shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Further, the rule waives all points of order against such amendments. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to announce that at the conclusion of the debate on this resolution, it is my intention to offer an amendment to the rule that simply replaces the manager's amendment currently made in order under the rule with a new manager's amendment. This manager's amendment eliminates a provision dealing with preferred compensation for airline employees and adds airport parking lots to a provision that requires airports receiving financial aid to work with airport restaurants, shops and other concessionaires on rent adjustments to account for their loss of revenue. The new manager's amendment also adds language that establishes a preference for the hiring of laid-off airline workers as screeners and a provision that states that, where possible, airline security companies should be American companies.

Mr. Speaker, as our Nation searches for answers in the wake of the September 11 tragedy, we find ourselves in unfamiliar territory. Our personal freedoms and liberties are so rooted in the fabric of American society that we almost take them for granted. But now that those freedoms have been attacked in the most despicable and cowardly manner, we are all keenly aware of just how precious they are. As we strive to maintain a sense of normalcy and familiarity, we also struggle to reconcile our fears and apprehensions in a new and uncertain global atmosphere. Enhancing our Nation's air travel by making it as safe and secure as possible is critical in easing those fears among our citizens.

The comprehensive legislation before us today focuses on our Nation's aviation security system. This security plan establishes a new transportation security administration within the Department of Transportation that will be responsible for the security of all forms of transportation, not just air travel. This legislation not only expands law enforcement on aircraft by placing Federal marshals on commercial airlines, but it also positions law enforcement personnel at every airport screening location, because safety must include defenses on both the ground and in the air.

Additional ground safety measures incorporate strict new standards for screening, including certification and uniformed personnel. Federal supervision will oversee the screening process, background checks and testing. Baggage screeners will have to undergo more extensive training, adhere to tougher performance requirements, be U.S. citizens, and be deputized with law enforcement powers.

As the holiday season fast approaches, it is more important than ever that Americans are free to spend time with their families and their loved ones and it is incumbent upon us to do everything in our power to make sure that their travel, by any means, but especially by air, is as safe and as secure as possible. A stronger infrastructure means a stronger economy, and a stronger economy means a stronger America. By passing this rule and its underlying legislation, we can move quickly move forward with the important business of making our airports and airplanes safe and secure for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, I would like to commend the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for his hard work and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, for his hard work.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

After September 11, it is patently clear that we need to make travel on our airlines as safe as possible. Leaving aside for the time being the fact that we have not done anything for the safety of passengers on our buses, trains or ships, what we are trying to do for the flying public is as important as anything we can do to help this economy.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me speak to the rule itself.

Mr. Speaker, there were 20 Members of the House that asked that the Committee on Rules allow their amendments to be made in order. These were Members of both parties who have some thoughtful and substantive suggestions as to how to make this legislation stronger. Of those 20 Members, exactly two of them will have their amendments heard and debated by the House. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, is permitted to offer an amendment, and, of course, the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), will be allowed to offer his amendment. Other than the two most senior members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, not one other Member of the House of Representatives is permitted to offer an amendment.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed. While I very much appreciate the fact that this rule makes in order the gentleman from Minnesota's substitute, the Committee on Rules spent hours this week listening to Members testify on behalf of their amendments. Unfortunately, the House at large will not have this same opportunity.

What I heard at the Committee on Rules this week was interesting, provocative, insightful and worthy of consideration by this House. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) made excellent points at the Committee on Rules which we will not consider today because of this closed rule. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) are all some of the other Members who will not have their amendments heard under this closed rule.

Why is the majority limiting debate on such an important issue? I have yet to hear one Member satisfactorily explain that to me. Worse, Mr. Speaker, the lengthy amendment from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure chairman constantly being amended, even here in the last 30 minutes, will only be debated for 20 minutes. This is a 16-page amendment which makes significant changes to the underlying bill. So each side will have 10 minutes to debate this. I find that incredible.

Moving beyond this restrictive rule, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch briefly on the serious deficiencies of

the underlying bill. During the minimal time allowed to debate this bill, we will hear much about who and what is screening the people and baggage on our airlines. The seminal question in my view is this: Will we have Federal law enforcement personnel screen passengers and luggage before entering airplanes or will this be left to private sector contract employees?

Before answering that question, let me ask my colleagues related questions about public safety and security, their own safety and security and their constituents'. My colleagues, do we not feel safer every morning that we enter the Capitol because we are protected by the United States Capitol Police? Do we not feel safer that our borders are protected by the United States Border Patrol and United States Customs Service? Do we not feel safer that our brave men and women in uniform and members of the United States Armed Services presently pursuing our interests in Afghanistan and elsewhere are members of the Armed Forces?

So what is my point? The point is we do not contract out our own security in the Capitol building, we do not contract out our security at our borders, and we certainly do not contract out for our military. However, the leadership of this House is comfortable contracting out the security of the flying public. Again I say, incredible.

Mr. Speaker, I remember several weeks ago after my leader the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) came out of a White House meeting with the President and said, ''This is a unity government now.'' It seems that all 100 United States Senators understood what that meant. That means we should stop dickering around and pass a serious bill. The bill must include federalized passenger screeners at our airports. And in case it was not just made clear, the other Chamber passed their bill with federalized screeners by a recorded vote of 100-to-nothing. Certainly if the United States Senate can pass such a bill with unanimity, the House should do no less.

Another issue that really incenses me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that our checked baggage is not screened as it should be. According to an article that appeared in yesterday's Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel, only 5 to 10 percent of checked bags are examined for explosives. The underlying bill would require examination of all checked bags by December 2003. Are we clear on this? So in 2 years and 2 months, our bags will be adequately screened.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable, irresponsible and inexcusable. There is simply no reason why Congress cannot mandate the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations immediately to require screening of checked baggage. I need not remind my colleagues that as the holiday season approaches, it is more critical than ever that our flying public not only feels safe but that they are safe.

□ 1330

That is the critical difference between the House bill and the unanimously passed Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, if I had more time, I would discuss the fact that while this House has already bailed out the airline industry, provided enormous tax breaks to the largest corporations in America, and is now set to attempt to make our skies safer, we still have not lifted a single finger to help displaced workers.

I introduced a bill more than 5 weeks ago to help those hardworking Americans who have lost their jobs because of the tragedy on September 11. My bill, cosponsored by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART) and 140 other bipartisan cosponsors, needs to be considered forthwith.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule; and that amendment would provide that immediately after the House passes the airline safety bill it will take up H.R. 2955, the Displaced Workers Assistance Act introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and myself and others. My amendment provides that the bill will be considered under an open amendment process so that all Members will be able to fully express their views and offer amendments that they think are important to this critical bill.

Mr. Speaker, more than 7 weeks have passed since the tragic events of September 11. Since that time, thousands and thousands of workers in the airline and related industries have lost their jobs. These people need relief immediately. When we passed the airline bailout the week after the terrorist attacks, promises were made at that time by the Republican leadership that a worker-relief package would soon follow. I do not have to say again that it has not happened yet, and I do not see any indication that it is on the schedule in the immediate future. It is time for the House to do its work and pass legislation to help these people.

Let me make clear that a ''no'' vote on the previous question will not stop consideration of the airline safety bill. A ''no'' vote will allow the House to get on with the much-delayed airline industry worker-aid bill. However, a ''yes'' vote on the previous question will prevent the House from taking up the airline worker relief bill.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months, this Congress has been working with unusual dispatch with an unusual degree of bipartisanship. The consideration of this bill could have been another example of this. I am disappointed, as are many Members, that the leadership chose instead to have a closed, restrictive rule this afternoon and not allow Members to offer legitimate substantive and meaningful amendments.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), commented on the length of debate, it is apparent that we will also add 60 minutes for the rule for additional debate on this subject as we continue through the time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would only advise my distinguished colleague and friend that last night we asked for more time on the manager's amendment so we could have more time on this matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I remind the gentleman that the all-powerful Committee on Rules had the tremendous opportunity to have an hour and a half on the witness stand of the inquiries that were made by both Democrat and Republican Members as to the legislation, the manager's amendment opinions expressed by the members of the Committee on Rules on various aspects of that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that this is an abundantly fair rule. It does give the minority two shots at the proposal. It does give them the opportunity to bring up in toto the Senate-passed language, as they requested.

The legislation that we have proposed on the House side, the majority side, in comments that were made by the previous speaker on the other side that it is important that we protect trains and planes and other modes of transportation, in fact the legislation that we are presenting here today is the most comprehensive security package, not only giving responsibility, which is so important, but, unlike the Senate proposal, it also gives the authority to deal with some of the problems.

In fact, today's newspaper points out one of the problems we have had in the past with security or even dealing with defects of aviation, and this is in today's Washington Post. This talks about the Value Jet crash which took place in 1996. It says: ''In fact, Federal regulations were later strengthened to crack down on passenger flights carrying hazardous waste.''

Why am I pointing this out? Because the Senate bill, the bill proposed by the other side, does nothing to deal with giving authority to deal with regulations relating to security. That is the

major flaw in this proposed piece of legislation.

The other side has said some 20 Members presented before the Committee on Rules. I participated in the Committee on Rules procedures. I will say many of the proposals from the other side have been incorporated into the manager's amendment. We have tried to accommodate those requests, including probably one of the strongest provisions for checked baggage, which was also pointed out by the other side that baggage is not checked.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) on the other side, who has done such a good job in promoting this strong provision, certainly would prefer our legislative proposal, which is the strongest ever proposed anywhere in Congress and contained in our manager's amendment, and we modeled it partly after his recommendation.

So, no, good ideas have not been left out. This process has not been a partisan issue. I have worked with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman on the other side, the ranking member, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI). We have worked together in a bipartisan fashion; and they know in their heart of hearts that the bill proposed by the majority, they agree with 100 percent, with the exception of one part, and that is, shall all of the employees who are baggage screeners be Federal employees.

What is sad about the proposal on the other side is, not only will this create a disjointed and dysfunctional security mechanism for airports, a lack of authority to deal specifically with other modes of transportation, which is so important in this time of crisis, but I have a letter from the Department of Justice, and the legislation from the other side actually will inhibit their ability to function.

The Department of Justice, let me read from their letter to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), our chairman: ''Unlike the Department of Justice, DOT has both the broad transportation-related statutory mandate and nearly 35 years of significant operational experience with transportation regulation, infrastructure, security and enforcement. Further, DOT's two components of law enforcement authority, the United States Coast Guard and the Federal Aviation Administration, possess a unique infrastructure of law enforcement personnel and expertise with broad domestic enforcement authority upon which the Congress can build and enhance DOT's law enforcement authority and responsibility.''

Listen to this. They say: ''In light of DOT's strong capabilities and DOJ's many responsibilities in fighting the war on terrorism, we feel that our resources would be better spent in carrying out our current mission than developing a new transportation infrastructure and expertise.''

So here we have the proposal from the other side, which actually will impede the Department of Justice mission which they have, and it will not do it in a small way, it will do it in an incredible way.

The Congressional Budget Office submitted to me today the proposal that it is not 28,000 additional employees; it is some 31,000 additional Federal employees. So you can go home and tell your constituents what we did is created the biggest bureaucracy in the history of a generation, the biggest bureaucracy, 31,000 Federal employees, as a cure-all, and the Department of Justice has said in fact that you are interfering with our mission and they have no expertise to deal with this. We have created a two-tier system, which is the most disjointed approach to security that we could possibly have to guarantee the safety of the flying public.

So I urge my colleagues to pass the rule and to consider very carefully what legislation is before them. When all else fails, my colleagues, read the bill. This is one of the worst pieces of legislation I have seen in 20 years in working on Capitol Hill. It was sent here in a hurry, almost immediately, so we could correct it. Now we need to do that. We cannot pass this failed piece of legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just remind my distinguished colleague from Florida that the Senate bill has been at the desk for an entire week, and I would also remind the gentleman that the vote in the United States Senate was 100 to nothing, and that included TRENT LOTT and JOHN MCCAIN and all of the other Republican Senators who still stand by their bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that it is inappropriate to state how specific Senators voted on a particular measure.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, we will hear a lot of rhetoric today; but the issue before this House is a very simple one: Do you support the current system in which low-bid private security companies are responsible for airline safety? If so, then vote for the Republican leadership's bill. Or do you feel that the current system has failed the American people and should be replaced with Federal law enforcement professionals protecting our airports, just as they protect the Capitol, the White House, and America's borders? If so, then vote for the bipartisan substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is an easy choice. Replacing the current failed system is simple. The White House said today that the President is eager to sign an aviation security bill into law. Three weeks ago, the Senate unanimously passed on a vote of 100 to zero a strong bipartisan aviation security bill that we will offer as a substitute today.

This House can send that bipartisan bill to the President's desk tonight. Then we can immediately start putting more sky marshals on planes, strengthen more cockpit doors, and start protecting our airports with Federal law enforcement professionals.

On the other hand, the Republican leaders today are offering the flying public nothing more than a fig leaf that will protect the same old failed private airport security system. Even worse, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders are offering a manager's amendment that would not just keep private security companies in charge of airport security, it would virtually exonerate them from the September 11 failures. The Republican manager's amendment would provide the private security companies with liability protection, preventing the victims of September 11 from holding them accountable for allowing terrorists to get on planes with box cutters. This is nothing less than shameful, Mr. Speaker; and I am stunned that Republican leaders are trying to slip it through the House.

Mr. Speaker, while the rest of this country pulls together to win the war on terrorism, the Republican leadership is playing politics as usual. I urge my colleagues to reject partisanship and special interest politics and to pass the bipartisan substitute so the President can immediately sign this aviation security bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, bipartisanship comes from bringing two points of view together. That is going to happen if this rule is passed when the debate will go on the merit of the legislation of the underlying bill. It will happen when a vote occurs on the manager's amendment, whether it occurs or not with passage; and it will happen with the complete Democratic substitute written by Democrats in a partisan fashion to be brought before the House in a bipartisan vote, up or down.

So we are going to have a lot of bipartisanship or nonpartisanship today, once this rule is passed. It is going to be the opportunity for those who support the President's plan to have that vote. For those who want to look at liability provisions and other aspects contained in the manager's amendment, that will be an opportunity for a vote as well. Finally, a Democratic substitute written by the Democratic minority of this House will have an up or down vote as well.

So we are going to have a lot of bipartisanship, led by the leadership in this House, let alone rank and file Members, as we pass this rule and move toward consideration of those prospects within the bill that will be before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, about a week after September 11, I stood at ground zero with my colleague from New Jersey looking at that six-story pile of rubble and smoke rising from it that was a mass grave of 5,000 of our American citizens, and I could see superimposed over that the handwriting from a victim's relief center of a little girl, written on the wall underneath the picture of her daddy, and it said, ''Daddy, I miss you. I will love you always.''

□ 1345

We need to get past partisanship.

There will be those on the floor today who will rant and rail against putting airport safety in the hands of government employees, as if that were an evil thing. Well, here is the real story. All those brave firefighters and policemen in New York City who lost their lives were government employees. All those courageous Capitol Hill policemen who lost their lives defending our offices 2 years ago were government employees. All those men and women in the armed services who are fighting in Afghanistan right at this moment are government employees. And the FBI agents who put their lives on the line are government employees. Those postal workers who lost their lives are government employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Oberstar-Ganske substitute is the bipartisan bill. It passed the Senate 100 to zero. Such well-known conservatives as TRENT LOTT, DON NICKLES, CHUCK GRASSLEY, all voted for that bill. They all voted for that bill.

The Senate bill puts the safety of our citizens ahead of special interests. The companies who are bankrolling the effort to kill the Senate bill are foreign-owned corporations.

So that is the question: Are we going to take common sense, practical steps to improve the safety, or are we going to entrust our lives to foreign corporations who pay minimum wage and are already threatening to sue the Government? The Ganske-Oberstar amendment empowers Attorney General John Ashcroft to set the terms and conditions of hiring and firing of those screeners, and there could be no strikes. The House leadership bill will produce gridlock. The manager's amendment is even worse. The voters have elected us to solve problems, not just to talk about them. Let us put this bill where it belongs: on the President's desk. He has already said he would sign it, and the sooner the better.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see again a message like another one I saw at that Victims' Family Relief Center written by a mother. Underneath the picture of her husband, it said, ''Dan we will love you always,'' signed, ''Christan and your son, Justin.''

It is time to pass the true bipartisan bill, get it to the President's desk, and get it signed into law before hundreds of thousands of our citizens are flying on Thanksgiving.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really wish to remind the gentleman from New York that when he said that this Oberstar measure that we will undertake was written in a partisan fashion, that the Oberstar substitute is the Senate bill that was passed 100 to nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question, and I do so for a very simple reason that was eloquently brought to us on the floor by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Airline workers have been laid off across this country by the tens of thousands; and so far, we have done absolutely nothing. We were told when this Congress bailed out the airline industry to the tune of $15 billion a few weeks ago that the workers would be next. On top of that, today they have something called uncapped compensation for some of these executives that would give them additional millions of dollars that was in the manager's amendment. I do not know if they are going to go forward with it and try to get it out of here today, but I tell my colleagues one thing, they had it in there originally. They are taking care of certain people and letting the others go.

We decided that we were in this together as a country, workers, executives, Democrats, Republicans. Well, that has not been the case. After they did this bailout of the airline industry, the House passed this corporate welfare package under the guise of economic stimulus. Multinational corporations received tax breaks to the tune of billions of dollars, individual companies, $2 billion, $1.5 billion. Airline workers were given the pink slip.

Mr. Speaker, 150,000 airline workers, baggage handlers, machinists, flight attendants, pilots, mechanics, are out of work. They need unemployment compensation. About 40 percent of people get it today if you are thrown out of work in this country. That is an outrage. They are not getting it. They need health care benefits to make sure that their families have health care, that they can feed their families, pay their mortgage with unemployment compensation benefits. All of that has run out or will run out without any help from this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to lend these workers a hand. How much time needs to go by? How many more bailouts and tax breaks will we need to consider before we help these 150,000 airline workers whose livelihoods have been most affected, and all of the other tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands who have been laid off as a result of their layoffs?

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass an airline security bill identical to the Senate and send it to the President tonight. The American people have waited too long for airline security, and then come back and do the Hastings-Gephardt-Bonior bill that we need to deal with on unemployment compensation and health care.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), one of the newer Members of the House of Representatives, who replaced the ranking member, our dear departed friend Joe Moakley.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his solid work on the substitute bill.

Mr. Speaker, the privilege of my new office allows me the great honor of representing many of the neighborhoods and towns that surround Logan Airport in Boston. It just so happens that today I have the sad duty of meeting with many of the families from my district who lost loved ones aboard the flights which departed Logan Airport on September 11.

Mr. Speaker, today is not the day to exempt security screening companies who failed to protect the public on September 11. I am heartsick that these families are families that we were charged and sworn to protect. They should not be overlooked by foreign security companies. We can fulfill our public duty by professionalizing and federalizing airport security personnel and by supporting the substitute bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a fair rule that will allow the people's representatives to consider federalizing the screeners in our Nation's airports. We cannot shortchange the public by continuing to contract out low-wage jobs and less-trained personnel. We need to federalize our airport security. We do not contract out our security for people who work for the INS or the military. Why then would we contract out for airline security?

We have learned the hard way that an airplane can hit anywhere. Federalization means less employee turnover, more experience and accountability. According to GAO, in 1999, turnover averaged 126 percent among screeners at 19 airports. No wonder, since the average pay that they receive is anywhere between $6 and $6.75 an hour.

The Republican bill would eliminate the salary cap that we have placed on executive pay. These people earn hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why in

the world would we eliminate the cap instead of providing support for those who are on the frontline, those screeners?

Since screening personnel check more than 2 million pieces of luggage and go through and see millions of people a day, we should upgrade their salaries and their skills.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), my good friend.

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

When I fly to Washington from Lindberg Field in San Diego and I check in my bags, I see hardworking people trying to do their best for the American public. But they are paid the minimum wage. They get 2 days of training, and there is almost a 200 percent turnover per year at our airport in San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to professionalize, it is time to stabilize, it is time to federalize that first line of defense for the traveling public. We would not contract out the defense of our border to the private sector. We are not going to contract out our national security. Let us not contract out the airline public safety.

Mr. Speaker, it is time stabilize, it is time to professionalize, it is time to federalize our airline security workforce. Let us pass the Oberstar-Ganske substitute.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), my good friend.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Florida for the work that he has done on this and how he is handling it, which is always, his work always bears the mark of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I have long thought that our Nation's airports are part of our Nation's security. That was debated in the Congress for many years. September 11 changed that attitude in the country. I do not think there is a citizen in our Nation today that would question that our national airports are and should be part of our national security. That is why I rise in support of the Oberstar-Lipinski-DeFazio bill.

Now, the Senate passed it 100 to nothing. For those that say this is partisan, it does not have to be. The Senate showed the way. They very seldom do. We know that our firefighters are part of public service. We do not go to the ABC Corporation to hire them. We do not hire our police officers that way.

Today, we need Federal standards, Federal training, baggage checks; and our Nation's airports must, indeed, be part of our national security. We need to pass the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair would also remind all Members that it is improper to characterize the action or inaction of the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Is it inappropriate to characterize that the Senate voted 100 to nothing on a specific measure?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respond to the gentleman that it is appropriate to state the collective facts of a Senate vote. It is inappropriate to characterize an action or inaction of the Senate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. We could not even call it overwhelming. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), my good friend.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 3150, because this bill does not address some of the critical issues raised by millions across this country, port authorities, aviation authority and rail authorities and emergency preparedness personnel, some of them which are the first-line responders.

□ 1400

There were 20 amendments that were presented to the Committee on Rules, in an attempt to try to fix a flawed bill that does not address anything that has to do with constituents in my district. I have laid-off workers, many of whom are single women, flight attendants. We have not talked about real anti-hijacking training for flight attendants.

I offered a noncontroversial and relevant amendment to H.R. 3150. It would require the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with Federal departments and agencies, to conduct a threat assessment on all forms of public transportation, public facilities, and gathering places. No such provision is reflected in any of the language in this bill.

I will say to all of my colleagues, vote no on this rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, when all else fails, why do we not consult the facts?

We have heard Members stand up and say that we would not contract out security responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, I will submit that 26 Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Justice, Department of State, Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, our nuclear plants, all contracted out 26 Federal agencies. The list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, this deals with facts. In fact, we do contract this out. We are not asking for any different level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to please not come before the Congress and the American people and tell them that we are protecting those private screening companies that are now doing their job. We take this responsibility away from the airlines, we make it a Federal responsibility. It is federally managed, it is federally supervised. There are Federal background checks. There is Federal testing. Most importantly, there is Federal oversight.

The Israelis, the Europeans, tried the federalize-all-public-employees method, and what did they do? They eventually evolved into a public-private partnership where the government sets the high standards, and that is what we have proposed.

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with the facts. The facts are, this piece of legislation proposed and hastily passed by the Senate creates a two-tier disastrous system, part in the Department of Justice, part in the Department of Transportation. It creates two tiers of law enforcement and leaves law enforcement in the Department of Transportation. It is a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to pass something in a hurry, yes, we can run up here and tell people we have created 31,000 Federal positions. Yet, they do not have any authority to deal with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more amazing, Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to read again today's Washington Post. See what is being proposed in the Senate. They are already trying to correct the mess that they passed here.

If we look at one of the provisions of this legislation, and again, I defy the Members, read the bill, they set up an information-sharing for the intelligence system, but they do not share it with the airlines. Who has the passengers list? The airlines. There is no provision in their bill for that.

There is no provision to require all airlines who have passenger lists, for international flights coming into the United States to provide that. That is in our bill. So their bill is a weak, hastily-prepared piece of legislation that would cause untold turmoil and not do the job.

The American people want us to do it right, even if it takes a little longer. We passed legislation in 1996 on airline security and blew it. We passed legislation in 2000, and we still do not have rules in place. There were no rules in place for box cutters.

The biggest flaw, and do not talk about Federal employment, the biggest flaw with the bill proposed by the Senate and the other side is that it has no ability to execute on an immediate basis putting in place rules and regulations. There were no rules September

11 by Federal employees or Federal agencies to prohibit box cutters. There were no rules to get standards in place for baggage screeners.

For 6 years we have been waiting, and this bill will do nothing after this if they pass that bill. It is a shame. It is a sham. Read the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, is it not characterizing the Senate's actions to call it a sham, a mess, hastily made, disastrous, and weak?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respond that it is inappropriate to characterize the actions of the Senate. It may be possible to characterize particular pieces of legislation or bills in ways in which it is inappropriate to characterize the action.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend, it is appropriate during debate for Members to characterize the content of legislation or address the content. It is inappropriate to characterize the actions of the other body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. So continuing my parliamentary inquiry, ''hastily'' is not an action? I just want equal admonitions, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend, the Chair is simply trying to uphold the rules and precedents of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I appreciate it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It becomes a delicate matter with some of the words that are being used.

The Chair would recommend that if any Member has any question about language they intend to offer, if they would check with the Parliamentarian, it would certainly be appreciated.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the Democrat substitute to H.R. 3150.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic substitute to H.R. 3150, the Secure Transportation for American Act. This substitute measure would federalize all airport security-screening personnel and restore the feeling of personal security the airline industry lost in the wake of the September 11th terrorist attacks. This is a serious safety issue, one that directly concerns the life and death of innocent Americans, and as such, the solution to this problem should not be politicized.

It has become abundantly clear in recent weeks that the current system of security checks performed by private firms in our nation's airports do not work, and simply giving the Federal Government oversight over this flawed system will not satisfy the safety standards we, as Americans, should require in air travel. Since September 11th, the news media has presented countless accounts of security breaches at airports by both employees and customers. On a flight from New Orleans to Phoenix a passenger alerted the flight crew to a loaded weapon he had unknowingly brought onboard the airplane, a weapon which was not detected by airport security prior to his boarding the flight. We have also seen evidence of criminals and non-U.S citizens employed by these private firms, overseeing the passenger and luggage screening on both our domestic and international flights. We need to look no further than right here at Dulles International Airport where Argenbright Security Inc., a foreign corporation, recently agreed to settle Justice Department allegations that the company violated a court order by, among other things, continuing to hire screeners with criminal records. Argenbright got a second chance. Airline passengers will not. As the old adage goes, fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice, shame on me.

Statistics have shown that the national turnover rule for airport screeners is around 120 percent annually. This should not come as a surprise to anyone, as a majority of the screeners receive little training and are often paid less than most the food services employees located within the same airport. With federal law enforcement personnel manning the security operations, we would develop a highly professional security operation, with the proper compensation and benefit programs to attract the right people. This solution would greatly improve the safety of not only airline passengers, but as the events of September 11th have shown, all Americans.

For the first time in our nation's aviation history, parents are struggling with the question of not only whether it is safe for them to fly, but specifically whether it is safe to bring their children along on a commercial airliner. As the father of two young sons, I can sympathize with this difficult dilemma. I want to be able to return to my district and assure all mothers and fathers that I am committed to doing what is necessary so they can safely take their children on family vacations or visits to their grandparents, without the lingering safety doubts we now face.

Airplanes are the primary mode for long distance transportation in this country, and will be for the foreseeable future. It is our duty as federal legislators to restore the confidence of the American people in the safety of air travel. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and ensure the safety of the airline industry.

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

Mr. Speaker, I heard the parliamentary inquiry from the gentleman from Florida. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) was discussing the contents of the bill. I believe under the rules of the House the gentleman has the freedom to express what he felt was in the legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me in the well talked about a sham. Let us talk about a sham. They are renaming this bill as the Airport Security Federalization Act. They are going to take the private security employees, the same ones who are failing us today, some of them are even convicted felons, some are illegal aliens, but they are going to put Federal uniforms on them. They are even going to deputize them. But guess what, they are not going to be Federal law enforcement.

They are trying to fool the American public. It is too bad that the United States Congress does not have a rule of the House that requires truth in labeling. The private security firms are failing, and in Europe the large Securicor is a dismal failure at Heathrow. They just had a huge security lapse. They own Argenbright in the United States, who is under criminal indictment for the second time in 1 year for hiring and maintaining known felons on staff, falsifying documents, all under the supervision of probation, and somehow they tell us they are going to supervise these firms better.

No, the people at the door of the House of Representatives are sworn, uniformed Federal law enforcement officers. If that is necessary for us, it is necessary for the traveling public.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. We are at war with terrorists that annihilated 6,000 Americans. We have a responsibility to work together to solve this problem.

For me it is not an issue of whether they are Federal employees or non-Federal employees. Under the bill being presented on this side of the aisle, they can be either. We can have Federal employees in some instances, and non-Federal employees in others.

The argument that suggests we are going to hire the same people that failed in the past is simply not true. The new employees will have to meet requirements that some of the people who now do this work cannot meet.

Mr. Speaker, I weep for what we have gone through in the last few weeks, but this is not about Federal employees. It is about airport security.

What I particularly like about the Young-Mica bill is that for the first time, we are going to require that the baggage that goes in the belly of an aircraft be inspected by a date certain. By the year 2003, all baggage in the belly of a plane will be inspected for explosives and weapons. That is an issue of safety that is not covered in the bill that is being presented by the Senate.

When I hear that all Senators voted for it, in the end they all voted for the bill they had. I have some sense that if our bill passes, there will be some on the other side who will support it. It

may not have been their first choice, but they are not going to vote against it because in the end it is about airport security.

I hope we are able to have a sensible debate that treats both sides fairly and does not make these wild claims.

In terms of Federal employees, terrorists would not have gotten into this country unless somebody allowed them to get here. They happened to have been Federal employees. They just were not Federal employees who were doing their job well enough.

We want professionals, whether they are Federal employees or not.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. LIPINSKI), a gentleman that has a great deal of knowledge about the subject we are discussing.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time to me.

First of all, I would like to thank the Committee on Rules and the Speaker for giving us an opportunity to actually have an up-or-down vote on this particular issue we are all debating at the present time, the Federal screening of individuals.

I also would like to compliment the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MICA) for the great deal of work they have put into this bill. They have done an outstanding job. It would have been nice if we could have come to an agreement, but unfortunately, we could not have done so.

I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and my very good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), for all the great work they have done on this bill.

I would simply like to make mention at the present time, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MICA) has talked about the failure of the FAA and the Department of Transportation to put rules in place over the course of the last 5 to 10 years.

I certainly agree with him on that. That is why I am happy to see that a portion of this legislation is going to be in the Justice Department so we will have other individuals working on this, and I am quite sure that those individuals and the new Deputy Secretary for Security in the Department of Transportation will be able to put everything in place as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my brother and friend on the Committee on Rules for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the manager's amendment should be opposed and we should support the Democratic substitute, because the limits on legal liability here are a little bit amazing. Legislation designed to enhance airport security would end up harming victims and rewarding the very firms whose negligence has contributed to the September 11 terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment does this by providing liability relief to any person liable for any damages arising out of the September 11 hijacking. What does that mean? The baggage screening firms would be protected from liability if they hired incompetent employees or deliberately failed to check for weapons. Where is the justice in that?

I urge Members to consider liability provisions that go far beyond the protections included in the airline bailout bill we passed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), representing Houston and other areas of the world.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me and for his great work.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Rules Committee should be thanked for allowing the Senate bill which federalizes airline security to be worked on.

I also thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for his work, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and all of the ranking members of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday this past week a high alert was issued to the United States of America. It is well known that we are in a crisis. On September 11, the airline security system of our Nation failed the thousands that died. Those who worked there really did not fail, it was the contract system that did not train them and did not pay them.

That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I rise for a singular reason: to support the Oberstar substitute to the underlying aviation security bill. The substitute bill is the exact same bill that the bipartisan Senate voted on 100 to 1.

That bill, if we pass it today, at 8:05 can be on the President's desk and he can sign it, more than 1½ months after the day of the terrorist attack against America. We must say to the American people that the Federal Government will provide for their security on our airliners.

It makes a difference to have every checked bag screened, to have airfield security, and to include the provision for Federal air marshals on our airplanes.

However, Mr. Speaker, we need also to insure that this legislation allows for the opportunity for those existing contract screening employees to apply for these new federal jobs. Many of these employees desire to offer their services to the new system and they should be allowed to do so.

□ 1415

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) because this is an important issue. We will for the first time in the United States of America be checking every bag that goes on the airplane, checking all checked bags. We will have Federal air marshals. We will have a reinforced cockpit. But what will be most important is the flight crew will have air hijacking training; give those frontline people, the flight attendants, the pilots, who we hope will not have to come out of the cockpit, that kind of safety training.

This is an important piece of legislation. If Members only knew the Calderon family and the children, ages 4 years and 20 months old, that lost their mother in the World Trade crash, they would know that we have to pass this bill. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation. I am disappointed that we have yet to provide for the laid off workers impacted by Sept. 11, therefore I will vote to defeat the previous question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very thoughtful gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who has distinguished herself in this body.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time. I rise in strong support of the Oberstar substitute to make our skies safe.

September 11 demonstrated that aviation security must be part of the frontline of our national defense. As such, it must be the responsibility of Federal Government. This means putting professional law enforcement agents in charge of securing our airports and our airplanes. This is essential to protect American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who fly across the country back and forth each week have come to know the flight attendants, the pilots and the gate attendants very well. They are passionate as they tell us that today's system simply does not work. The present system has not worked in the past as we have seen, and it will not work in the future.

The Oberstar substitute makes substantive and fundamental changes in our airport security. It will give the public confidence to fly again. We need professional law enforcement in charge, and this includes a process by which every piece of baggage can be screened. I urge my colleagues to support the Oberstar substitute.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time. I had not planned to discuss this bill, but I felt obliged to come over here and join the fray.

This airline security proposal is a much-needed piece of legislation. The

Young-Mica bill federalizes the process and the process should indeed be federalized. But should we bring 25,000 to 28,000 additional Federal employees on the payroll to be subsidized by taxpayers where the Government will be virtually inflexible as far as getting them on board, getting them on-line? Lord only knows how long that would take. And once they are on-line, in the event of abuse of employment, to terminate them would be virtually impossible.

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we need to emulate other countries, but I do think we can learn from other countries. The United Kingdom, Belgium, Israel, the Netherlands, perhaps others tried federalizing screeners and baggage employees initially, and I am told that each of those four scrapped the plans and perhaps other countries have done so as well.

I think to federalize the process is a course that we need to pursue to give the Federal Government to give the Congress, in fact, this body and the other body, much oversight to see that it is done properly, but not to have these additional thousands of employees on the Federal payroll to do a job that I think can better be done, provided the standards are properly enhanced; and I am confident they will be. Provided that is addressed, the way to do it is as laid out in Young-Mica, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to support the Young-Mica bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON), my very good friend.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who is certainly a superhero on behalf of the citizens of this country and across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when Thomas Edison was attempting to invent the light bulb, history suggested he tried thousands and thousands of ways, maybe 8,000, maybe 10,000. Nobody said that Thomas Edison failed to invent the light bulb. They said he simply discovered 10,000 ways that it would not work. So I am here because I know I have to be very careful about the words that I use about the manager's amendment, so I cannot call it shameless or callous or indifferent or dispassionate because that may intrude upon House rules.

So let me simply say that it will not work. I am here to represent people that are out of work and who need to work. I am here to represent people who ride the airplanes on a daily basis and are waiting for Congress to provide some common sense to protect those riders who have to fly across America, from sea to shining sea as we would wave our flag. I support the Oberstar substitute amendment because it will work.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the debate has already begun on this issue, and I would like to take just a couple of moments to say what this bill is not.

I have been following the media coverage and many people say that this measure, the package that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is going to be managing here, will block the federalization of those who are screeners at airports. It does not do that at all.

Basically, what we are saying is rather than having the United States Congress micromanage the process of determining what the very best system is to ensure the safety and security of travelers is to allow some kind of flexibility.

We know that under this bill there would be a new Secretary who would handle this, but frankly the Secretary of Transportation is the former chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in this place, one of the predecessors to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). He was a Democratic Member of this House. He is still a Democrat as far as I know, and he is our former colleague, Norm Mineta; and he is the Secretary of Transportation.

What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that they have the flexibility, the tools so that they can go forward and decide how to best implement a system that will ensure the safety of our travelers here in the United States. So I think that that needs to be understood as we proceed with this debate.

The rule is very fair. It does provide, in fact, an opportunity for not only a manager's amendment, which the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be offering, addressing a wide range of concerns, and we worked very carefully to make modifications in his manager's amendment so we could address some of the concerns of Members who came forward over the last few days; and at the same time we do provide the Democratic substitute, which the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) will be offering.

I think that at the end of the day we clearly should pass this rule, and I think there should be strong bipartisan support for that; but understand that we are not preempting any kind of decision that this administration might make. It is just that we entrust with them the power and the authority to make what we believe will be an appropriate decision to ensure the safety of all travelers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. HASTINGS) courtesy in allowing me to speak on this rule and this issue.

I take rare exception with my friend from California who just spoke. The notion somehow that we are going to establish a system that is going to deal with the problems of an already failed, decentralized, privatized system for hundreds of airports is not micromanagement. Being able to step forward with a Federal program similar to what we had with the Customs Service, what we have benefiting people here in the Capitol, as my good friend from Florida has pointed out, is not micromanagement.

What we are doing is acknowledging that the American public deserves our best. The Senate has already ratified by a hundred votes a program that steps up. We are not Europe where we have one or two airports in a small country. We have more airports in a small portion of the United States than they have in the entire European Union.

The only way we are going to get the training, the professionalism and the uniform protection around the country is to vote for the Oberstar proposal. I strongly urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I commend him on fashioning a rule that I think is fair and allows for a spirited debate on this subject.

I would simply say to my colleagues in the House that the bottom line here is how do we make air travel as safe and secure as we possibly can. It is not about whether it is Federal employees or it is not Federal employees. The President of the United States, President Bush, has asked for the House proposal and the House approach which gives him the discretion and the latitude to say whether or not we ought to have Federal employees; and perhaps in some cases, particularly at the bigger airports, that will make sense.

The problem with the Senate bill is it treats airports across this country differently. There are the bigger airports that will have one level of safety and security; and the smaller ones, like many that I represent in South Dakota, will have an entirely different set of safety and security standards.

Secondly, it charges people who fly from remote locations, airports like those that I represent, a higher fee. That is inherently unfair.

We need a system that provides safety and security and treats air travelers the same, irrespective of where they originate. That is what we ought to get. That is what this bill does, and I hope that we can adopt it today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from New York how many more speakers he has.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of speakers; and once the

gentleman yields back his time, I will close out with a summary.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). I would say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) that both sides have 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, the very distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who has so ably led the debate on our side on this rule; and I do appreciate that the rule makes in order the Oberstar-Ganske substitute without playing any parliamentary games with it.

In a moment, the manager on the Republican side for the rule will be offering an amendment to substitute a new manager's amendment for the manager's amendment made in order last night, and I call this the weight-and-balance amendment. It is an aviation term used on board small commuter aircraft when they need to shift people and baggage around to make sure the plane does not tilt one way or another or crash. They have so much ballast on board this bill that it is about to sink.

So now they are coming in adding parking lots for financial aid with other airport restaurants, shops, concessionaries. They are taking out something which is very embarrassing, preferred, in the gentleman's language, I think it means deferred, compensation for airline employees. That is the well-known Delta amendment, Delta Airlines, and then adds language for hiring airline workers to screeners, and where possible, security companies should be American companies.

That is really going to be a fun thing to do. They are going to do an awful lot of negotiating and renegotiating of contracts. They are going to have a fun time with that; but then my good friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, characterized the Senate bill as sloppily drawn, hastily drawn, but there is a lot of haste in the provisions here in this new manager's amendment that are internally contradictory.

I just think that it is ditch a little here, add a little there and again it is hastily drawn.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my distinguished colleague, we have one speaker remaining, and if the gentleman would utilize at least one of his speakers.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I have heard an alarming amount of discussion on this floor of the House today, suggesting that there may be something wrong with federalizing employees who have the responsibility to check luggage and screen passengers.

□ 1430

I have been a Federal employee three times in my life, and each of those three times I felt a whole whale of a lot more secure than I did when I was a minimum-wage worker stripping celery. What federalization does is provide worker security, it provides better wages, it provides better health care, the same kind of health care that we have, and it enhances morale.

All of us go through those checkpoints at airports and all of us are confronted with the same persons that had the responsibility on September 11 who, in many instances, are poorly trained, poorly paid, and their morale is at its lowest ebb on a continuing basis. At the very least we need to ensure that they are trained.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so we can take up the Airline Industry Worker Benefits bill immediately after passage of the Insecure Airline Security bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Democrat minority time has expired?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, let me just again try to set the record straight. We heard speakers say that these screeners, and they continue to pick on sort of the lowest end of the feeding chain here, the lowest paid, were at fault on September 11.

My fellow colleagues, our intelligence system and Federal employees involved in intelligence failed. We did not know who the hijackers were. Our Federal employees who issued visas failed, because most of the hijackers came into this country with visas issued by Federal Government employees. Our FAA failed because we had no rules in place for box cutters.

We have no provision for expedited rulemaking in the Senate bill, and that is the biggest flaw. It takes, on average, 3.8 years to pass a rule through the Department of Transportation. Look at the bill. They leave technology with the Department of Transportation; 3.8 years to get in place technology that will do the job. It will not work.

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

The comprehensive legislation before us today focuses on our Nation's security system. The security plan establishes a new transportation security administration within the Department of Transportation that will be responsible for security of all forms of transportation, not just air travel.

As the holiday season fast approaches, it is more important than ever that Americans are free to spend time with their families and loved ones. It is incumbent upon us to do everything in our power to make sure their travel by any means, but especially by air, is as safe and secure as possible. By passing this rule and its underlying legislation, we can quickly move forward with the important business of making our airports safe and secure for the American people.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYNOLDS

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. REYNOLDS:

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 3 of this resolution shall be in order in lieu of the amendment printed in House Report 107–264 and numbered 1.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. **3150**

OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Page 1, line 6, strike ''Secure Transportation for America Act of 2001'' and insert ''Airport Security Federalization Act of 2001''.

In the table of contents after line 8, strike the item relating to section 15 and insert the following:

Sec. 15. Technical corrections.

Page 2, before line 9, insert the following:

TITLE I—AVIATION SECURITY

Redesignate sections 2 through 22 of the bill as sections 101 through 121, respectively.

Conform the table of contents of the bill, accordingly.

Page 13, line 17, strike ''(1) in subsection (a) by striking'' and inserting the following:

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''a cabin of''; and

(B) by striking

Page 14, line 2, strike ''The responsibility'' and insert the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The responsibility

Page 14, after line 8, insert the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL SCREENING AUTHORITY.—The Under Secretary may perform any such additional screening of passengers and property on passenger aircraft in air transportation that originates in the United States or intrastate air transportation that the Under Secretary deems necessary to enhance aviation security.

Page 14, line 20, strike the closing quotation marks and the final period and insert the following:

''(g) DEPUTIZATION OF AIRPORT SCREENING PERSONNEL.—The Under Secretary shall deputize, for enforcement of such Federal laws as the Under Secretary determines appropriate, all airport screening personnel as Federal transportation security agents and shall ensure that such agents operate under common standards and common uniform, insignia, and badges. The authority to arrest an individual may be exercised only by supervisory personnel who are sworn, full-time law enforcement officers.''.

Page 15, after line 24, insert the following:

''(7) a requirement that any private security firm retained to provide airport security services be owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States, to the extent that the President determines that there are firms owned and controlled by such citizens;

Page 16, line 1, strike ''(7)'' and insert ''(8)''.

Page 16, line 2, strike ''and''.

Page 16, line 3, strike ''(8)'' and insert ''(9)''.

Page 16, line 7, strike both periods and the closing quotation marks and insert ''; and'' and the following:

''(10) a preference for the hiring of any individual who is a former employee of an air carrier and whose employment with the air carrier was terminated as a result of a reduction in the workforce of the air carrier.''.

Page 16, lines 11 and 12, strike ''Secure Transportation for America Act of 2001'' and insert ''Airport Security Federalization Act of 2001''.

Page 16, line 20, strike ''pursuant'' and insert ''pursuant to''.

Page 19, line 22, strike ''and''.

Page 20, line 2, strike the period and insert ''; and'' and the following:

(J) the ability to demonstrate daily a fitness for duty without any impairment due to illegal drugs, sleep deprivation, medication, or alcohol.

Page 21, line 14, strike ''and''.

Page 21, line 20, strike the period and insert a semicolon and the following:

''(5) require air carriers to provide, on a space-available basis, to an off-duty Federal air marshal a seat on a flight to the airport nearest the marshal's home at no cost to the marshal or the United States Government if the marshal is traveling to that airport after completing his or her security duties; and

''(6) provide, in choosing among applicants for a position as a Federal air marshal, a preference for the hiring of a pilot of an air carrier whose employment with the air carrier was terminated as a result of a reduction in the workforce of the air carrier if the pilot is otherwise qualified for the position.

Page 22, line 3, after ''consultation with'' insert ''and concurrence of''.

Page 22, before line 10, insert the following:

(c) BASIC PAY DEFINED.—Section 8331(3)(E) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(E) availability pay—

''(i) received by a criminal investigator under section 5545a of this title; or

''(ii) received after September 11, 2001, by a Federal air marshal of the Department of Transportation;''.

Page 24, line 1, strike ''Provide'' and insert ''Establish performance goals for individuals described in paragraph (6), provide''.

Page 24, lines 2 and 3, strike ''individuals described in paragraph (6)'' and insert ''such individuals,''.

Page 26, after line 2, insert the following:

''(16) Establish a uniform system of identification for all State and local law enforcement personnel for use in obtaining permission to carry weapons in aircraft cabins and in obtaining access to a secured area of an airport.

''(17) Establish requirements under which air carriers, under the supervision of the Under Secretary, could implement trusted passenger programs and use available technologies to expedite the security screening of passengers who participate in such programs, thereby allowing security screening personnel to focus on those passengers who should be subject to more extensive screening.

''(18) In consultation with the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, develop security procedures under which a medical product to be transported on a flight of an air carrier would not be subject to manual or x-ray inspection if conducting such an inspection would irreversibly damage the product.

''(19) Develop security procedures to allow passengers transporting a musical instrument on a flight of an air carrier to transport the instrument in the passenger cabin of the aircraft, notwithstanding any size or other restriction on carry-on baggage but subject to such other reasonable terms and conditions as may be established by the Under Secretary or the air carrier, including imposing additional charges by the air carrier.

''(20) Provide for the use of wireless and wire line data technologies enabling the private and secure communication of threats to aid in the screening of passengers and other individuals on airport property who are identified on any State or Federal security-related data base for the purpose of having an integrated response coordination of various authorized airport security forces.

Page 26, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 7 on page 27 and insert the following:

''(d) PROPERTY SECURITY PROGRAM.—

''(1) CHECKED BAGGAGE.—

''(A) FINAL DEADLINE FOR SCREENING.—A system must be in operation to screen all checked baggage at all airports in the United States no later than December 31, 2003.

''(B) USE OF EXPLOSIVE DETECTION EQUIPMENT.—The Under Secretary shall ensure that explosive detection equipment installed at airports to screen checked baggage is used to the maximum extent possible.

''(C) INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL EXPLOSIVE DETECTION EQUIPMENT.—The Under Secretary shall install additional explosive detection equipment at airports as soon as possible to ensure that all checked baggage is screened before being placed in an aircraft.

''(D) INTERIM BAG-MATCH PROGRAMS.—Until the Under Secretary has installed enough explosive detection equipment at airports to ensure that all checked baggage is screened, the Under Secretary shall require air carriers to implement bag-match programs that ensure that no checked baggage is placed in an aircraft unless the passenger who checks the baggage is aboard the aircraft.

''(2) CARGO DEADLINE.—A system must be in operation to screen all cargo that is to be transported in passenger aircraft in air transportation and intrastate air transportation as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

Page 29, line 10, strike ''and'' and insert the following:

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following:

''(G) BACKGROUND CHECKS OF CURRENT EMPLOYEES.—A background check (including a criminal history record check and a review of available law enforcement data bases and records of other governmental and international agencies) shall be required for any individual who currently has unescorted access to an aircraft of an air carrier or foreign air carrier, unescorted access to a secured area of an airport in the United States that serves an air carrier or foreign air carrier, or is responsible for screening passengers or property, or both, unless that individual was subject to such a background check before the individual began his or her current employment or is exempted from such a check under section 107.31(m) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.''; and

Page 29, line 11, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

Page 34, strike line 23 and all that follows through line 4 on page 35 and insert the following:

''(c) AIRPORT SECURITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal years 2002 and 2003 a total of $1,500,000,000 to reimburse airport operators for direct costs incurred by such operators to comply with new, additional, or revised security requirements imposed on such operators by the Federal Aviation Administration or Transportation Security Administration on or after September 11, 2001. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—Before providing financial assistance to an airport operator with funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall require the operator to provide assurances that the operator will—

''(A) meet with the tenants of the airport (other than air carriers and foreign air carriers) to discuss adjustments of the rent of the tenants to account for losses in revenue incurred by the tenants on and after September 11, 2001; and

''(B) provide to the Secretary an itemized list of costs incurred by the operator to comply with the security requirements described in paragraph (1), including costs relating to landing fees, automobile parking revenues, rental cars, restaurants, and gift shops.''.

Page 36, line 9, strike ''subsection (b)'' and insert ''paragraph (2)''.

Page 39, lines 16 and 17, strike ''Secure Transportation for America Act of 2001'' and insert ''Airport Security Federalization Act of 2001''.

Page 43, line 22, after ''sponsor'' insert ''or at a privately owned or operated airport passenger terminal financed by indebtedness incurred by the sponsor''.

Page 44, beginning on line 25, strike ''Secure Transportation for America Act of 2001'' and insert ''Airport Security Federalization Act of 2001''.

Page 45, after line 15, insert the following:

(d) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION PAYABLE PER AIR CARRIER.—Section 103 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) COMPENSATION FOR AIR CARRIERS PROVIDING AIR AMBULANCE SERVICES.—

''(1) SET-ASIDE.—The President may set aside a portion of the amount of compensation payable to air carriers under section 101(a)(2) to provide compensation to air carriers providing air ambulance services. The President shall reduce the $4,500,000,000 specified in subsection (b)(2)(A)(i) by the amount set aside under this subsection.

''(2) DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNTS.—The President shall distribute the amount set aside under this subsection proportionally among air carriers providing air ambulance services based on an appropriate auditable measure, as determined by the President.''.

At the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents of the bill accordingly):

SEC. 122. REQUIREMENT TO HONOR PASSENGER TICKETS OF OTHER CARRIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 417 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 41722. Requirement to honor passenger tickets of other carriers

''Each air carrier that provides scheduled air transportation on a route shall provide, to the extent practicable, air transportation to passengers ticketed for air transportation on that route by any other air carrier that suspends, interrupts, or discontinues air passenger service on the route by reason of an act of war or terrorism or insolvency or bankruptcy of the carrier.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

''41722. Requirement to honor passenger tickets of other carriers.''.

SEC. 123. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CERTAIN AVIATION MATTERS.

(a) FLIGHT SERVICE STATION EMPLOYEES.—It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration should continue negotiating in good faith with flight service station employees of the Administration with a goal of reaching agreement on a contract as soon as possible.

(b) WAR RISK INSURANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should implement section 202 of the

Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act (Public Law 107–42) so as to make war risk insurance available to vendors, agents, and subcontractors of general aviation aircraft.

(c) TRANSPORT OF ANIMALS.—It is the sense of Congress that an air carrier that transports mail under a contract with the United States Postal Service should transport any animal that the Postal Service allows to be shipped through the mail.

(d) SCREENING.—It is the sense of Congress that the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security should require, as soon as practicable, that all property carried in a passenger aircraft in air transportation or intrastate air transportation (including checked baggage) be screened by any currently available means, including X-ray machine, hand-held metal detector, explosive detection system equipment, or manual search.

(e) CONTRACTS FOR AIRPORT SECURITY SERVICES.—It is the sense of Congress that, in awarding a contract for airport security services, the Under Secretary of Transportation for Security should, to the maximum extent practicable, award the contract to a firm that is owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States.

TITLE II—VICTIMS COMPENSATION

SEC. 201. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF CRASHES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001.

Section 408 of the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act (Public Law 107–42; 115 Stat. 240; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note) is amended—

(1) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"SEC. 408. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF CRASHES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001.";

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) GENERAL LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—Except as provided in this section, no Federal court or agency or State court or agency shall enforce any Federal or State law holding any person, or any State or political subdivision thereof, liable for any damages arising out of the hijacking and subsequent crashes of American Airlines flights 11 or 77, or United Airlines flights 93 or 175, on September 11, 2001.'';

(3) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) DAMAGES.—If any party to any action brought under this subsection is determined to be liable—

''(A) no damages in the aggregate ordered by the court to be paid by such party shall exceed the amount of insurance, minus any payments made pursuant to a court approved settlement, which such party is determined to have obtained prior to September 11, 2001, and which is determined to cover such party's liability for any damages arising out of the hijacking and subsequent crashes of American Airlines flights 11 or 77, or United Airlines flights 93 or 175, on September 11, 2001;

''(B) such party shall not be liable for interest prior to the judgment or for punitive damages intended to punish or deter; and

''(C) the court shall reduce the amount of damages awarded to a plaintiff by the amount of collateral source compensation that the plaintiff has received or is entitled to receive as a result of the terrorist-related aircraft crashes of September 11, 2001.

''(5) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Reasonable attorneys' fees for work performed in any action brought under this subsection shall be subject to the discretion of the court, but in no event shall any attorney charge, demand, receive, or collect for services rendered, fees in excess of 20 percent of the damages ordered by the court to be paid pursuant to this subsection, or in excess of 20 percent of any court approved settlement made of any claim cognizable under this subsection. Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this subsection, if recovery be had, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.'';

(4) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) EXCLUSION.—Nothing in this section shall in any way limit any liability of any person who—

''(1) hijacks any aircraft or commits any terrorist act; or

''(2) knowingly participates in a conspiracy to hijack any aircraft or commit any terrorist act.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) DISCLAIMER.—Nothing herein implies that any person is liable for damages arising out of the hijacking and subsequent crashes of American Airlines flights 11 or 77, or United Airlines flights 93 or 175, on September 11, 2001.

''(e) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory of possession of the United States or any political subdivision of any of the foregoing.''.

Mr. REYNOLDS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and shall not be deemed as a precedent, although the Reading Clerk has done an outstanding job thus far.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued reading the amendment.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Reading Clerk for his outstanding job of reading the amendment that I brought before the House. This simply substitutes the manager's amendment made in order last night by the Committee on Rules with a new manager's amendment that eliminates a provision dealing with preferred compensation for airline employees, and adds airport parking lots to a provision that requires airports receiving financial aid to work with airport restaurants, shops and other concessionaires on rent adjustments to account for their loss of revenue.

The new manager's amendment also adds language that establishes a preference for the hiring of laid-off airline workers as screeners, and a provision that states where possible, airline security companies should be American companies. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on both the amendment and the resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR RULE ON H.R. 3150, SECURE TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA ACT OF 2001

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision in this resolution, immediately after disposition of H.R. 3150, the Speaker shall declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2955) to provide assistance for employees who are separated from employment as a result of reductions in service by air carriers, and closures of airports, caused by terrorist actions or security measures. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against considerations of the bill are waived. 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. The bill 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.

SEC. . If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on H.R. 3150 or H.R. 2955, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the question of agreeing to the amendment and on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 207, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Ballenger	Bereuter
Akin	Barr	Biggert
Armey	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Bachus	Barton	Blunt
Baker	Bass	Boehlert

Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Conyers
Dunn
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Johnson (CT)
Rangel
Thompson (MS)

□ 1519

Ms. MCCOLLUM changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 379, noes 50, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—379

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
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
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
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)
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Upton	Watt (NC)	Whitfield
Velazquez	Watts (OK)	Wicker
Vitter	Waxman	Wilson
Walden	Weiner	Wolf
Walsh	Weldon (FL)	Wu
Wamp	Weldon (PA)	Wynn
Waters	Weller	Young (AK)
Watkins (OK)	Wexler	Young (FL)

NOES—50

Andrews	Fattah	Owens
Berry	Filner	Pastor
Bishop	Flake	Paul
Blumenauer	Frost	Pelosi
Borski	Green (TX)	Sabo
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Sanchez
Brady (PA)	Hinchey	Scott
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Stark
Coyne	Lampson	Strickland
Cramer	Lee	Stupak
Cummings	McCollum	Tauscher
DeFazio	McIntyre	Towns
Deutsch	Miller, George	Visclosky
Dingell	Mink	Watson (CA)
Edwards	Oberstar	Woolsey
Evans	Olver	

NOT VOTING—3

Dunn	Gephardt	Thompson (MS)

□ 1530

Messrs. FKAKE, DEUTSCH, BISHOP, and CUMMINGS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, CLEMENT, RUSH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, HONDA, DICKS, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. 981

Mr. LaHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.