



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2002

No. 7

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 5, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

THE BUSH BUDGET

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have gotten the President's glossified 2003 budget, complete with color photos, for the first time. What a difference a year makes, not only in the format but in the content. A year ago, the President and the Office of Management and Budget said, there are surpluses as far as the eye can see, at least for the next 10 years, huge and growing surpluses.

A few of us were dubious about predicting the economy 10 years out and about this rosy scenario, but in any

case they persisted. They went on to also say, "We're going to create a lockbox for all of the Social Security surplus, \$2.5 trillion. We're going to create a lockbox for all of the Medicare trust fund surplus." And they were concerned that we would retire the \$6 trillion national debt too quickly. They were worried about that.

Well, here we are a year later and rather than paying down the debt too quickly, as was projected last year, the Bush budget will create an additional \$2 trillion of deficit by 2012, if you do not take the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and spend them, which, of course, he proposes to do. The President's budget would divert all of the Medicare surplus and 60 percent, or \$1.5 trillion, that is \$1,500 billion for those who cannot go to the Ts, of the Social Security surplus to pay for other government programs.

What are the causes of this? We would be led to believe there is only one cause, the attacks on America. Let us look at the real underlying causes. Actually, the disappearance of the surplus is due to, and these are figures from the Congressional Budget Office which is headed by a Republican, 41 percent are due to the tax cut, 23 percent are due to the recession, 10 percent increased military spending, 8 percent increased spending for homeland security, and 16 percent technical adjustments.

What is the reaction down at the White House? The reaction at the White House is, "Let's make those tax cuts," which are contributing 41 percent of the increase in deficit, "let's make them permanent. Let's in fact expand them." That is what the President's budget proposes. So that those who earn over \$383,000 a year and those with estates over \$5 million will be assured that the laughable assumption in last year's budget that their tax cuts will be sunsetted after 10 years and everything, all the tax cuts, will be going

away; let's make those permanent with the strange exception of one that would particularly benefit the middle class, which has to do with a complicated computation of an alternative tax for individuals, that one does not get made permanent.

But the exemption of estates over \$5 million does, and the huge reduction in rates for people who earn over \$383,000. At what cost? At tremendous cost. The cost is a whole host of reductions in worthy domestic programs which the President has proposed in this year's budget hidden sort of in the appendices and the asterisks and some obfuscation here and there; but there are cuts in education, there are cuts in needed social programs. There is inadequate funding for a prescription drug benefit for people on Medicare, with no cost controls on the pharmaceutical industry. Basically, the program would tend to very, very few seniors' needs. But all this is being done so that the tax cuts can be made permanent.

Usually, when a country is under attack, Presidents call for sacrifice; and many Americans and many in Congress agree with that, homeland security, necessary expenditures to arm our young men and women serving so valiantly in the military. There is tremendous agreement on those. But let us also make our economic future secure. Unfortunately, the only security in the President's budget goes to, again, those at the very top, those who earn over \$383,000 a year, and those who have estates worth more than \$5 million.

If you just froze the benefits for those people, the elite of the elite, the richest of the rich, those who do not care about Social Security, do not care about a prescription drug benefit, do not care about education funding because their kids go to private schools, if you just froze those people in place so they contributed a little bit more in this time of sacrifice and attack on the United States of America, then you

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H111

could reduce substantially the draw on the Social Security trust funds and the increase in the deficit.

But the President and his advisers say, no, absolutely not, those people, those \$5 million-plus estates, those people who earn over \$383,000, they need every penny of that tax cut because they will spend the money in ways that might put some people to work at a minimum wage which could then pay taxes which would help defray the deficit and the economy will be growing into the future.

I would hope that the Congress rejects these assumptions, these priorities, and substantially rewrites this budget.

INTRODUCTION OF ULTRASOUND LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to alert Members to a piece of legislation that I will introduce today, and I hope they will consider it. It is a bill that will be of benefit to health clinics all over this country. Many health clinics that wish to provide medical services to unprepared pregnant women are prohibited from doing so because of the lack of funds to purchase medical equipment. The mother is, therefore, forced to wander from one clinic to another in search of the services she so desperately needs. Enabling these health clinics to purchase ultrasound equipment would be a persuasive push in the direction of transitioning from a health clinic to a medical facility.

Mr. Speaker, the advantages of ultrasound machines are many. It is fast and relatively cheap, costing as little as \$50 per exam. Ultrasound exams are performed at about 10 to 14 weeks of the pregnancy and are considered the best way to gauge growth and anatomy before birth. Ultrasound can diagnose heart problems in this country in the unborn child, find neural tube defects, including spina bifida, and determine the position of the placenta. There is now even ultrasound equipment that can provide a three-dimensional image that can rotate 360 degrees to see all the sides of the baby.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I plan to introduce a bill today that will authorize Health and Human Services to establish grants for which nonprofit health clinics could apply and, if awarded, purchase needed ultrasound equipment. This legislation will ensure that doctors can provide critical information to mothers in their decision-making process regarding their pregnancies. Nothing in this bill makes ideology regarding abortion a condition of the grant. Whether a center offers abortion or abortion alternatives, the clinic is still eligible.

In the fiery controversy over abortion in America, emotionally charged

rhetoric clouds the issue and does damage to the efforts made on behalf of mother and child. No matter what one's conviction is concerning abortion, we can all agree that the mother deserves as much information as is available in making this solemn decision. Information is the best weapon in defusing the volatile discussion and returning us to our first concern, which is the health of the mother and the child. The ultrasound is a valuable tool in expanding the debate beyond traditional platitudes on both sides of the argument.

Modern medicine has provided us with a window into the womb. These advances in technology empower women with as much information as possible regarding her pregnancy. The goal of this legislation is to provide women who find themselves with an unplanned pregnancy with the full scope of information such that they may make a fully informed decision.

This bill is about the dissemination of information. This bill is about extending more free services to women and about making available this vital technology to the poor and, of course, to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when people of good faith who differ on an issue can come together and find a place to agree. I believe this legislation brings us beyond the shrill arguments regarding abortion and makes a meaningful step forward, a meaningful effort to care for the mother and child and bring more information to the woman.

I urge the Members to support my bill.

TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REIN IN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President released his budget yesterday. Congress and probably many in America and throughout the world are starting to analyze just what this budget does.

I compliment the President for sending out a warning to Congress that he is not going to stand for excessive discretionary domestic spending for additional social programs. I think most of us agree that his increase in spending for defense and national security is not only reasonable but is required, realizing what happened on September 11 and the fact of what we have discovered in Afghanistan, that there are many terrorists throughout the world dedicated to cause the same kind of damage that those 19 individuals did on September 11. We are faced with the fact that thousands of individuals went through that same kind of perverted religious indoctrination and eventually the training on how to be terrorists with a dedication to injure the people of the free world, especially in the

United States, and destroy some of our symbols of the freedom and liberty that we have in this country. It is a \$2.13 trillion budget, a budget that has continued to grow faster than inflation for the last 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, my particular concern is the fact that government is growing so rapidly. And I would hope that we could comply with the President's suggestion that we hold down the discretionary domestic spending so that the deficit is minimized, or hopefully there will be no deficit this year in terms of all funds coming into the Federal Government versus the funds going out of the Federal Government.

It was only a short time ago that both Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber pledged not to spend the Social Security surplus money. Maybe, maybe the kind of war that we are in justifies spending that money. But if I had had my druthers, I would have preferred that the President gave us a budget that was balanced, at least in the unified sense of total revenues coming in versus total expenditures going out. The reason for that is I think by the President suggesting that maybe it is okay this year to have an \$80 billion deficit, it is going to open the door for spenders, it is going to open the door for individual Members of the House and the Senate to suggest that as long as the President says it is okay to have a little deficit spending, let us have more deficit spending for some of these, quote-unquote, important programs that we think should go back to my particular district.

Pork-barrel spending has increased tremendously. I think that is because when Members learn that most of the other Members are getting things for their district, it is only fair for them in the treatment of their particular constituents to try to get pork-barrel spending for their particular district.

□ 1245

I think pork-barrel spending has got to stop. It is my hope and my encouragement to the leadership of this House on both sides of the aisle that this Chamber pass a budget resolution that is in balance; that we say here is the possibility of the \$80 billion that might go into a stimulus tax cut package to stimulate the economy, but, if that does not happen, we are going to balance the budget. The challenge now is holding the line on spending.

Let me give one example of what has happened in the last 5 years. In 1998 Congress said we promise to balance the budget by 2002. That balanced budget was predicated on an estimate by both OMB and CBO that there would be approximately \$1.4 trillion of revenue by 2002.

Guess what the revenue actually is going to be in 2002, this fiscal year ending next October? The actual revenue is going to be \$1.9 trillion. So my point is, Mr. Speaker, that revenues are much larger than we anticipated, but what happened is spending increased

significantly more, so that we have ended up with a great deal of deficit spending. The difference between \$1.4 trillion and \$1.9 trillion in revenues, between the \$1.4 trillion we estimated 5 years ago and the \$1.9 trillion that is actually going to happen, even takes into consideration the tax cut we did last spring.

I would suggest that it behooves the United States to have the kind of economic expansion we want by not going deeper into debt, causing extra demand by the government in the money that is available for borrowing, which is ultimately going to increase interest rates and ultimately going to have a depressive effect on the economy.

I would close by again urging my Republican and Democratic friends to work towards a total unified balanced budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, ever present to Your people and closest to those in most need of Your mercy, we commend to You this day the Members of the United States House of Representatives with all their prayerful concerns.

Last week both Republican and Democratic Members set time aside to be on retreat, Lord.

As they drew away from the daily routine to gain deeper perspective, hopefully Your presence was made known to them.

As they examined issues facing this Nation and they crafted plans for the future, unexpectedly, Your provident love lifted their hearts to greater service to Your people.

As they became more aware of different opinions and the many possibilities open to achieve a common purpose, surprisingly Your spirit invited them to be respectful of others in every debate, patient in listening, as well as committed to finding solid resolve.

May personal convictions always be refined when civility reigns.

May partisan formulations always give way to what You require of this Nation.

For You are the eternal guide and strength for each Member personally and for the House as a whole both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Private Calendar.

NANCY B. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 392) for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MORE CRITICISMS OVER YUCCA MOUNTAIN: WHEN WILL THE DOE RESPOND?

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board joined an ever-expanding list of independent experts who are criticizing the science being touted by the Department of Energy regarding the Yucca Mountain Project.

In its report the board called the DOE's science "weak to moderate."

Board member and hydrologist Paul Craig added that "many of the DOE's assumptions regarding Yucca Mountain are extreme and unrealistic."

John Bartlett, former Director of DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, stated that "the documentation does not provide a sound foundation for the basis of a site recommendation."

Moreover, the GAO has raised its own concerns with the Yucca Mountain Project, stating that "making a site recommendation at this time would not be prudent or practical."

Mr. Speaker, when will the DOE begin to answer the serious questions being raised about its failed science?

Hopefully they will do that before going any further into the site recommendation process and before the lives of millions of Americans are jeopardized.

ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, February 2, 1848, marks the anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

This is a treaty between Mexico and the United States which guaranteed Mexican citizens who remained in the United States certain property rights. One of the promises was to secure and protect the property rights of Mexican and Spanish citizens that have been granted land grants from Spanish and Mexican Governments.

The U.S. violated these promises. The General Accounting Office is looking into this historic wrong, and I have introduced a bill to remedy the situation and to correct these injustices. I urge my colleagues to help me in this effort. Please review my legislation and take a good hard look at it.

NO SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR JOHN WALKER LINDH

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about John Walker Lindh, the 20-year-old Californian who joined forces with the Taliban. Some observers have suggested that we cut him some slack since he is only 20 years of age.

There were 20-year-olds who showed up for work on 9/11 at the World Trade Center. Who cut them slack? There are 20-year-olds fighting in Afghanistan today, 20-year-old firefighters, 20-year-old policemen, 20-year-old EMS personnel who responded on 9/11. Who cut them slack? No. This young man should be prosecuted, and if convicted, appropriate punishment should be forthcoming.

Our Attorney General said it more eloquently than I, but I paraphrase: Simply because an accused is of tender years, Mr. Speaker, he is worthy of no special defense when he has committed criminal acts. No special treatment should be available to this young man or to others like him.

CAROL WRIGHT

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, with the Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Games just a few days away, today the Olympic torch will pass through Parowan, Utah.

Parowan is the hometown of Alma Richards, Utah's first Olympic gold medalist. When it passes through that southern Utah town, it will be held by one of Parowan's greatest daughters, my great aunt, 93-year-old Carol Wright.

Aunt Carol has lived in Parowan her whole life and is the second cousin of Alma Richards, the 1912 gold medalist in the high jump. She made a career in the banking industry and today holds a place of honor as the one selected to run the torch to Alma Richards' home. The torch will stop at his home for 2 minutes as the community holds a ceremony honoring Alma, Aunt Carol and the Olympic spirit.

Parowan is a small town. In small towns everybody knows everybody. Aunt Carol was chosen to run the torch not only because of her relation to Utah's first Olympic gold medalist, but also because she is well respected and, indeed, beloved in her community.

So I am proud of my aunt and proud of Parowan, the place where my Utah roots began, a city with a long tradition of Olympic spirit, and I am very grateful for this honor. I ask that the Members of the House of Representatives join me today in honoring Carol Wright and the city of Parowan as the Olympic torch passes through that city.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

(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, it has been 10 months since this recession began, and it has been nearly that long since President Bush created a plan to boost the American economy. The House of Representatives passed that plan. It was a good one. It would have put people back to work, but there are two halves to Congress, and the other half did not like the plan, so we compromised.

We passed a new plan. This one was reported to have the votes to pass both Chambers, but the vote has not been allowed on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of Americans are out of work. Several major employers have gone bankrupt. Pension funds have shriveled up. The American people need an economic stimulus package, and they need it now.

I do not know what more we can do on this side of the Rotunda to make that happen, and I think we are all getting tired of waiting for the other side, and the American people are, too.

DELTA DAYS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is part of what is called Delta Days, and although my wife is an active, delightful AKA, if my colleagues have seen a group of ladies wearing red, they are Deltas, and I simply want to welcome them to the Nation's Capital and commend them for their interest in public policy decisionmaking. They are indeed a wonderful group of ladies, and we welcome them for Delta Days.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 4, 2002 at 12:52 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits his Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2003.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH,
Clerk of the House.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-159)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Americans will never forget the murderous events of September 11, 2001. They are for us what Pearl harbor was to an earlier generation of Americans: a terrible wrong and a call to action.

With courage, unity, and purpose, we met the challenges of 2001. The budget for 2003 recognizes the new realities confronting our nation, and funds the war against terrorism and the defense of our homeland.

The budget for 2003 is much more than a tabulation of numbers. It is a plan to fight a war we did not seek—but a war we are determined to win.

In this war, our first priority must be the security of our homeland. My budget provides the resources to combat terrorism at home, to protect our people, and preserve our constitutional freedoms. Our new Office of Homeland Security will coordinate the efforts of the federal government, the 50 states,

the territories, the District of Columbia, and hundreds of local governments: all to produce a comprehensive and far-reaching plan for securing America against terrorist attack.

Next, America's military—which has fought so boldly and decisively in Afghanistan—must be strengthened still further, so it can act still more effectively to find, pursue, and destroy our enemies. The 2003 Budget requests the biggest increase in defense spending in 20 years, to pay the cost of war and the price of transforming our Cold War military into a new 21st Century fighting force.

We have priorities at home as well—restoring health to our economy above all. Our economy had begun to weaken over a year before September 11th, but the terrorist attack dealt it another severe blow. This budget advances a bipartisan economic recovery plan that provides much more than greater unemployment benefits: it is a plan to speed the return of strong economic growth, to generate jobs, and to give unemployed Americans the dignity and security of a paycheck instead of an unemployment check.

The plan also calls for maintaining low tax rates, freer trade, restraint in government spending, regulatory and tort reform, promoting a sound energy policy, and funding key priorities in education, health, and compassionate social programs.

It is a bold plan—and it is matched by a bold agenda for government reform. From the beginning of my Administration, I have called for better management of the federal government. Now, with all the new demands on our resources, better management is needed more sorely than ever. Just as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 asks each local school to measure the education of our children, we must measure performance and demand results in federal government programs.

Where government programs are succeeding, their efforts should be reinforced—and the 2003 Budget provides resources to do that. And when objective measures reveal that government programs are not succeeding, those programs should be reinvented, redirected, or retired.

By curtailing unsuccessful programs and moderating the growth of spending in the rest of government, we can well afford to fight terrorism, take action to restore economic growth, and offer substantial increases in spending for improved performance at low-income schools, key environmental programs, health care, science and technology research, and many other areas.

We live in extraordinary times—but America is an extraordinary country. Americans have risen to every challenge they have faced in the past. Americans are rising again to the challenges of today. And once again, we will prevail.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
February 4, 2002.

□ 1415

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 5, 2002 at 10:12 a.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the Economic Report of the President.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESI-
DENT—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107–158)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Since the summer of 2000, economic growth has been unacceptably slow. This past year the inherited trend of deteriorating growth was fed by events, the most momentous of which was the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The painful upshot has been the first recession in a decade. This is cause for compassion—and for action.

Our first priority was to help those Americans who were hurt most by the recession and the attacks on September 11. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, my Administration sought to stabilize our air transportation system to keep Americans flying. Working with the Congress, we provided assistance and aid to the affected areas in New York and Virginia. We sought to provide a stronger safety net for displaced workers, and we will continue these efforts. Our economic recovery plan must be based on creating jobs in the private sector. My Administration has urged the Congress to accelerate tax relief for working Americans to speed economic growth and create jobs.

We are engaged in a war against terrorism that places new demands on our economy, and we must seek out every opportunity to build an economic foundation that will support this challenge. I am confident that Americans have proved they will rise to meet this challenge.

We must have an agenda not only for physical security, but also for eco-

nomics security. Our strategy builds upon the character of Americans: removing economic barriers to their success, combining our workers and their skills with new technologies, and creating an environment where entrepreneurs and businesses large and small can grow and create jobs. Our vision must extend beyond America, engaging other countries in the virtuous cycle of free trade, raising the potential for global growth, and securing the gains from worldwide markets in goods and capital. We must ensure that this effort builds economic bonds that encompass every American.

American faces a unique moment in history: Our Nation is at war, our homeland was attacked, and our economy is in recession. In meeting these great challenges, we must draw strength from the enduring power of free markets and a free people. We must also look forward and work toward a stronger economy that will buttress the United States against an uncertain world and lift the fortunes of others worldwide.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2002.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on motions to suspend the rules ordered prior to 6:30 p.m. will be taken today. Record votes on remaining motions to suspend the rules will be taken tomorrow.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY
CONTRIBUTION DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 577) to require any organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for the creation of a Presidential archival depository to disclose the sources and amounts of any funds raised, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 577

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

**SECTION 1. REQUIREMENT TO DISCLOSE
SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF FUNDS
RAISED FOR PRESIDENTIAL ARCHI-
VAL DEPOSITORY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2112 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h)(1) Any organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at a Presidential archival depository or any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository, shall submit to the Administration, the Committee on Governmental Reform of the House of

Representatives, and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate on an annual basis, by not later than the applicable date specified in paragraph (2), information with respect to every contributor who, during the year—

“(A) with respect to a Presidential archival depository of a President who currently holds the Office of President or for which the Archivist has not accepted, taken title to, or entered into an agreement to use any land or facility, gave the organization a contribution or contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) totaling \$200 or more for the year; or

“(B) with respect to a Presidential archival depository of a President who no longer holds the Office of President and for which the Archivist has accepted, taken title to, or entered into an agreement to use any land or facility, gave the organization a contribution or contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) totaling \$5000 or more for the year.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the applicable date—

“(A) with respect to information required under paragraph (1)(A), shall be January 31 of each year; and

“(B) with respect to information required under paragraph (1)(B), shall be May 31 of each year.

“(3) As used in this subsection, the term ‘information’ means the following:

“(A) The amount or value of each contribution made by a contributor referred to in paragraph (1) in the year covered by the submission.

“(B) The source of each such contribution, and the address of the entity or individual that is the source of the contribution.

“(C) If the source of such a contribution is an individual, the occupation of the individual.

“(D) The date of each such contribution.

“(4) The Archivist shall make available to the public through the Internet (or a successor technology readily available to the public) any information that is submitted in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(5)(A) It shall be unlawful for any person who makes a contribution described in paragraph (1) to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information with respect to the contribution to an organization described in such paragraph.

“(B) The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

“(6)(A) It shall be unlawful for any organization described in paragraph (1) to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information under such paragraph.

“(B) The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

“(7)(A) It shall be unlawful for a person to knowingly and willfully—

“(i) make a contribution described in paragraph (1) in the name of another person;

“(ii) permit his or her name to be used to effect a contribution described in paragraph (1); or

“(iii) accept a contribution described in paragraph (1) that is made by one person in the name of another person.

“(B) The penalties set forth in section 309(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) shall apply to a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as if such violation were a violation of section 316(b)(3) of such Act.

“(8) The Archivist shall promulgate regulations for the purpose of carrying out this subsection.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2112(h) of title 44, United States Code (as added by subsection (a))—

(1) shall apply to an organization established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at a Presidential archival depository or any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall only apply with respect to contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 577, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Presidential libraries are a valuable resource for historians, faculty professors, and the public. Over the years, Presidential libraries have evolved into elaborate institutions. They house the official papers of a former President. They have museums. They have conference facilities and classrooms.

The cost of building and maintaining these facilities can be substantial. The George Bush Library, located at Texas A&M University, cost \$22 million from citizens and foundations. Former President Clinton's library foundation is attempting to raise \$200 million to cover the cost of his library complex.

To establish a Presidential library, representatives of a sitting President can set up a private foundation to receive contributions, obtain a site, and build a facility. After it is built, the structure is decided over to the Federal Government, along with an operating fund, in some cases, and is run by the National Archives.

Through their private foundations, Presidents and their associates are free to raise unlimited amounts of money for their libraries. There are no limits on contributions. There is no public disclosure. This secretive fund-raising process can become an invitation for abuse or accusations of influence peddling.

H.R. 577, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), would change that. It would make the fund-raising process for Presidential libraries transparent and open to public scrutiny. It would amend the Presidential Libraries Act to require the disclosure of the sources and amounts of funds raised for the Presidential libraries.

The vast majority of individuals who contribute to Presidential libraries are

well-meaning, public-spirited people. They believe that these libraries are a positive contribution to society. They are right. However, there are also those who make contributions for less public spirited reasons: to gain access and influence. That is why we need public disclosure. We have laws requiring public disclosure of political contributions. For the same reason, contributions to Presidential libraries should be disclosed.

H.R. 577 would not prohibit or limit contributions to Presidential library foundations. This bill simply requires disclosure. It would require Presidential library foundations to disclose to Congress and the National Archives the amount, source, and date of the contributions they receive. The National Archives would be required to make the information publicly available over the Internet.

While a President is in office, or until his library is turned over to the National Archives, the foundation would be required to disclose contributions totaling \$200 or more. After a President leaves office and the archivist has accepted title to the facility, the foundation would be required to disclose contributions totaling \$5,000 or more.

This bill would make it illegal for either a contributor or a foundation to submit false information about a contribution. It would also be unlawful for a person to make a contribution in the name of another. The bill would apply to all Presidential library foundations. But disclosure would only have to be made for contributions received after enactment of the legislation.

A hearing was held on the bill of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) last April, before the Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations, which I chair. The subcommittee heard from a number of witnesses, including election law experts who supported full disclosure of contributions to Presidential libraries. They likened fund-raising for Presidential libraries to fund-raising for political campaigns.

Last May, the bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Reform. I hope it will receive the strong bipartisan support it deserves on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I hope we are not infringing on the minority's time by going ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his hard work on this legislation. He has worked on it for a long time, hit a few bumps in the road, but it is a good bill and it should pass. I want to personally thank him for being a new and more valuable member of our committee. He has worked very hard with us.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), who is one of the unsung heroes of the Committee on Government Reform. He works probably as hard or harder than anybody on the committee. He shepherded this bill through the subcommittee and full committee, and I appreciate all the hard work he has been doing for us. We will miss him when he leaves next year. He has been a great chairman.

Mr. Speaker, our Presidential libraries are a valuable part of our society. They are monuments to our Presidents. They are places where young people can go to learn about history. They are places where scholars do serious research. We should be proud of each and every one of them.

However, Presidential libraries cost a lot of money, and that money has to be raised from private sources. We all know that when money and politics cross paths there is always the potential for mischief, and that is why I think public disclosure is so important and why I support this bill. When there is secrecy in government, people have doubts; and when there is openness in government, people have confidence in their government.

The vast majority of people who give money to Presidential libraries do it for the right reasons: they admire the President; they want to make a contribution to his legacy; they want to see history preserved. And they should be proud of their contributions. But there is always going to be those who make contributions for other reasons: to gain access to the President and staff; to gain influence. And that is why we need public disclosure.

Right now, you can contribute \$1 million to a Presidential library while the President is in office and nobody would know about it. That is not good for our democracy, and it is not good for the reputations of Presidential libraries. That is why we need this legislation.

We have tried not to make this bill overly burdensome. While a President is in office, contributions over \$200 have to be disclosed. That matches campaign finance law. Once a President is out of office and once the library has been turned over to the archives, only contributions over \$5,000 have to be reported. Those contributions already have to be reported every year to the IRS, so the foundations already have to keep that information; and we are not asking them to create any more work for themselves.

I am sure that everyone remembers the controversy over President Clinton's pardon last year. He pardoned a man named Marc Rich, who was an international fugitive. Marc Rich's wife gave \$450,000 to President Clinton's library foundation. Nobody knew it at the time. So this is a perfect example of why we need public disclosure.

But let us be fair. This is not a Democrat problem, and it is not a Republican problem. This system we have is

an invitation to abuse no matter what party you are from or who occupies the White House. Having unlimited contributions in complete secrecy is a recipe for scandal, and we are doing the right thing by addressing it today.

Let me close by repeating what I said in the beginning. We should be proud of our Presidential libraries. They should be places of honor. We wanted people to contribute to them and be proud of their contributions. We do not want our Presidential libraries to be tainted by accusations of influence peddling or frauds. Public disclosure is the right thing to do; and, therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 577. This bill began with the principle that all contributions to foundations that support Presidential libraries should be made public. That is a principle that I strongly support.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bipartisan product. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) have worked with us to produce a bill both sides can support. The gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member of the subcommittee, made an especially valuable contribution. The gentlewoman's amendment lowered the threshold for reporting to \$200 during the years of active fund-raising.

Unfortunately, this bill does not include a provision that would apply these principles of disclosure to foundations in the names of Members of Congress. Such an amendment was considered and adopted in committee. However, it was dropped from the version that we are considering today. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) has agreed to work with us to develop that concept as stand alone legislation, and I look forward to bringing it to the floor later this year.

We live in an era where large corporations and wealthy individuals use money to gain access to policymakers. That access can easily turn into influence, and the process of developing public policy can become distorted. Today's bill is a step forward in curbing these trends. H.R. 577 provides the public the information it needs to judge the behavior of those it elects. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the author of this very fine piece of legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me this time, and for the gentleman's very strong support of this legislation. As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) mentioned, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) has shepherded this through the legislative process in the

Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations and in the Committee on Government Reform. The gentleman has been an outstanding Member of this body for many years. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for his support and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for his support of this legislation.

I rise to urge support for the Presidential library contribution disclosure bill that I first introduced in the last Congress. I believe this is common-sense legislation. It simply requires disclosure, public disclosure, of donations and donors to Presidential libraries.

I first introduced this bill in 1999, many months before anyone heard of Marc Rich or the Presidential pardons that the gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago. I introduced this bill because I felt the public should be made aware of possible conflicts of interest the sitting Presidents could have while raising funds for their libraries. In most cases we do not know who these donors are or what interests they may have on any pending policy decisions.

This bill will shed light on an otherwise secretive process. With disclosure, the public is able to draw its own conclusions about whether conflicts of interest are present. Without it, the appearance of impropriety could often exist.

This bill is not aimed at any one President in particular. This is a problem that can be faced by Democrat and Republican Presidents alike. This bill does not prohibit or limit contributions to these organizations. It simply requires disclosure of the name of the donor and the amount donated.

Mr. Speaker, no one should be against this bill unless for some reason they want to keep this process secret.

I also want to say that I understand the concerns of those who say it is impossible to influence a deceased President, and I agree. We may be able to address this concern and the concern that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) mentioned later on.

As others have mentioned, these Presidential libraries serve a good and noble purpose in our Nation. However, they should not serve as a way for Presidential foundations to peddle influence to the highest bidder.

Mr. Speaker, the organization Vote.com ran a poll and received almost 26,000 votes over the Internet, and 94 percent of those 26,000 who voted on this issue voted for it in a poll that ended September 13, 2001. Ninety-four percent supported this bill. Larry Noble, executive director of the Center for Responsive Politics, at our hearing that we held on this bill in the subcommittee said, "The potential for real and apparent corruption that this fund-raising brings is obvious. The public, however, is still in the dark with regard to several back-door ways of buying influence in Washington. One of

them is the funding of Presidential libraries."

Scott Harshbarger, president of Common Cause, said, "Presidents should not be in the business of raising funds for their libraries while in office. Gifts to the library can be a powerful means to secure access and influence at the White House, especially with a President eager to burnish his legacy."

Kenneth Gross, who is an attorney who is a specialist in this type of fund-raising, said, "The bill will prevent donors from sidestepping disclosure by agreeing, pledging or promising, while the President remains in office, to make contributions to a Presidential library after the term has expired."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is good legislation. I think it is legislation that almost all of our colleagues can and should support. As I said, it just sheds lights on an otherwise secretive process, and I urge support for H.R. 577.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a key member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 577. I wish I was a cosponsor of the bill. I commend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working to pass this legislation.

Presidential libraries date back to the Rutherford B. Hayes Memorial Library's completion in Fremont, Ohio, in 1914, and since that time have become an important part of our national heritage and history. Their value to students, historians and visitors from all over America and the world is tremendous.

Since the completion of the Hayes library, the size, popularity and cost of Presidential libraries has increased exponentially. Libraries have evolved into elaborate centers that, in addition to housing the official papers and records of former Presidents, often include museums, conference facilities and classrooms. As a result, the need for donations for their creation and maintenance has increased, but disclosure of these donations has not.

In my judgment, the more information the public has, particularly of sitting Presidents, the better. Under this bill, a sitting President would be required to disclose library contributions of \$200 or more annually to Congress and to the National Archives. In addition, under the bill, once a President has left office, library contributions of \$5,000 or more must be reported. Just as we need to know who is giving campaign contributions to politicians, so, too, the public needs to know who is contributing to sitting Presidents.

Our hearings on Marc Rich last year, which were bipartisan, obviously pointed out the need to carry forward with this bill. It gave us the added impetus to move forward, and I thank Members on both sides of the aisle for supporting it.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), a very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Efficiency, Financial Management, and Intergovernmental Relations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 577, a bill to require the annual disclosure of the sources and amount of funds raised to create, maintain or expand a Presidential library. In addition, the bill requires the National Archives and Records Administration, known as NARA, to post this information on the Internet. The transparency provisions in this good government bill should help ensure that donors are not afforded an unfair advantage in the policymaking process or other governmental benefits.

On March 15, 2001, I introduced a companion bill, H.R. 1081, Accountability for Presidential Gifts Act. Its prime objective is to establish responsibility in one agency, NARA, for the receipt, valuation and disposition of Presidential gifts. It, too, seeks to ensure that there is no unfair advantage to donors in the policymaking process or in the receipt of other governmental benefits.

Common Cause president Scott Harshbarger and Dr. Paul Light, director, Center for Public Service of the Brookings Institution, testified in favor of the disclosure provisions of H.R. 577 at the April 5 hearing of the Committee of Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management and Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with these good government advocates, and I applaud the initiative of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) in pursuing this important change in law.

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

Mr. Speaker, I underscore my support for this legislation because I believe there ought to be full reporting by those who give donations, whether it is to campaigns or even to libraries. We need disclosure because some may have political hope that in exchange for their contribution or gift, they may receive some influence.

That is why I strongly support, and hope my colleagues who are going to support this bill will join me in supporting, similar legislation regarding Members of Congress, when they set up foundations or libraries or other attributes to themselves and receive contributions from outside sources. They also should be required to report donations. At one point we had such reporting in this legislation, but we did not want to in any way endanger this piece of legislation because it is a good bill. It is the right thing to do to pass this bill. But I hope to get full disclosure of those donations to Members of Congress, just as we want full disclosure of

those donations to Presidential libraries. All foundation donations, all donations similar to campaign contributions, should be disclosed because the giver may hope to gain some influence. All donations ought to be on the table, ought to be publicly disclosed.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in supporting the bill that is before us. I hope later in the year we will be able to carry the other bill to the House floor so we will follow in the path that is being set in this legislation, that the public has the right to know who is funding what when it comes to anything to do with politics. I think that is the way to assure the American people that they have all information and the American people will make of it what they will.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to thank the staff who worked on this legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Bert Robinson of my staff, who has done an outstanding job on this bill. He has been working on it for many, many months. I also want to thank those on the committee staff who have helped us with this legislation, Jim Wilson, Kevin Binger, David Kass, Randy Kaplan, and Russell George; and Michelle Ash and David McMillen from the minority staff. All have been very, very helpful on this legislation, and I thank them at this time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 577, a bill to Require Disclosure of the funding sources for Presidential Libraries. I want to congratulate and thank the author of this measure, the Chairman of the Government Reform Committee, the Chairman of the Government Efficiency Subcommittee, and our ranking member, the gentleman from California for his efforts to improve this legislation. The improvements that were made to this bill prior to floor consideration are due in large part to his efforts and he should be commended.

While I rise in support of this measure today, I do not believe this bill goes far enough. I am disappointed that one of the amendments I offered in the Government Reform Committee and which was included in the Committee-passed bill, is not a part of the measure we are debating today. The provision would have made congressional foundations disclose funding sources as well. I offered that provision because I believe that members of Congress should be at least as accountable to the public as we expect the President to be. Congressional foundations and the members that run them should make public the sources of major funding they receive to prevent any accusations of undue influence on the legislative process.

H.R. 577 requires the disclosure of the sources and amounts of donations made to foundations raising money to build and maintain presidential libraries. I am pleased that the measure we are debating includes an amendment of mine that passed in Committee to reduce the disclosure requirement for donations to \$200 or more. That is the same level of the requirement that currently exists for

congressional campaigns and it is a valuable component of the legislation we are debating today. The bill provides that once the National Archives and Records Administration assumes the responsibility for the presidential library in question, the threshold for such disclosure would be raised to \$5,000.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support the goals of H.R. 577 but believe the Congress needs to go further. I hope that this year, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support stand-alone legislation I plan to introduce that will impose funding disclosure requirements on congressional foundations.

I urge all members to vote in support of H.R. 577 and look forward to working with my colleagues on related issues in the time to come.

□ 1445

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 577, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF WAUKEGAN MAYOR DAN DREW

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the life of Dan Drew, our mayor of Waukegan, Illinois. Dan died of a heart attack, and he was only 53 years old.

Last year, Dan ran for mayor. It was a hotly fought contest. He won by the slimmest of margins, six votes. He took over a city beset with problems, environmental cleanups, the loss of key industries, a crisis of confidence in the city administration. But Dan proved he was the right leader for these challenges. He brought confidence, commitment, and boundless energy as mayor. Despite his narrow victory, he became a mayor of all of Waukegan and showed us that the city faced better days ahead.

I worked with Dan only a short time. After one city meeting I said that all I needed from his office was a mayor ready to quickly sign any Federal grant application that could benefit

Waukegan. He replied, "My pen is ready." I can count at least seven major projects we were working on for the city of Waukegan.

Mayor Drew's sudden death shocked us all. It was only after he passed away that I learned about his long struggle with diabetes. Tall, skinny, and with a quick smile, Dan looked the picture of health as he led Waukegan down Sheridan Road in the Fourth of July parade. His fellow Bears season ticket holders sent a wreath to his wake that said, "Good-bye, Slim."

Dan's family will bury him today in a sad funeral. The crowd at last night's wake stretched around the church many times. We will sorely miss Dan's smile and humor. He became Waukegan's brightest political star. All of us, his fellow Democrats, we Republicans, white, African Americans, Hispanics, young and old, will miss him. Dan Drew was the right man for the right job who left us at the wrong time.

On behalf of Congress, I want to express my sorrow to his wife and family and the people of Waukegan. Our mission now is to pick up from his vision for the city as we see it through as Dan would have wished.

HORATIO KING POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 970) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, as the "Horatio King Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 970

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

SECTION 1. HORATIO KING POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, shall be known as the "Horatio King Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Horatio King Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

S. 970, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street in Paris Hill, Maine, as the "Horatio King Post Office Building."

Mr. Speaker, Horatio King was a former Postmaster General of the United States and a native of Paris, Maine. Mr. King's long career with the postal service began in 1839. In 1850, he became affiliated with the foreign mail service and was instrumental in its development. In 1854, Mr. King was appointed First Assistant Postmaster General. And in 1861, he was appointed the 22nd Postmaster General of the United States by President Buchanan. In 1863, President Lincoln appointed Mr. King, a Democrat who was loyal to the Union, to the commission responsible for implementing the Emancipation Proclamation in Washington, D.C.

In addition to his public service, Mr. King lectured and hosted literary events at his Washington home and published numerous magazine articles. Today, his birthplace is preserved as the King's Hill Inn in Paris, Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of S. 970.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) in consideration of S. 970, legislation naming a postal facility in Paris Hill, Maine, after Horatio King. S. 970 was introduced by Senator SUSAN COLLINS on May 25, 2001.

The Honorable Horatio King, a former newspaper publisher and postal employee, began his career with the postal service in 1839. In 1854, he was appointed assistant Postmaster General, a post he held until becoming Postmaster General in 1861. Two years later, President Lincoln named Mr. King to a commission charged with carrying out the Emancipation Proclamation in the District of Columbia.

A man of letters, Horatio King was noted for hosting intimate literary evenings in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, today the birthplace of Horatio King is well preserved as the King's Hill Inn. It is indeed most appropriate that Congress recognize Horatio King's contributions to our country and the postal service by naming a postal facility in the town of his birth. I urge the swift passage of this bill and note that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC) wishes to support our efforts by submitting a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I will read:

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of S. 970, legislation to designate the Paris Hill, Maine, post office as the Horatio King Post Office Building. This bill is a fitting tribute

to a former Postmaster General and advocate of national unity during one of our Nation's most trying times.

Horatio King was born on his family farm in Paris Hill, Maine, in 1811. His family had fought for freedom against the British. Horatio had a deep sense of commitment to his community, first serving as the editor and owner of a local paper in Paris, Maine.

In 1839, Horatio King began his career in the United States Postal Service. In 1861, President Buchanan named him Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. King maintained a deep interest in politics throughout his life. He was a contemporary and close friend of Hannibal Hamlin, who served as President Lincoln's Vice President in his first administration.

Horatio himself became an ardent advocate of national unity. Although a Democrat, he supported Abraham Lincoln because of the candidate's conviction that the Republic must be saved. Mr. King continued at his post under President Lincoln for a short period of time. Although he could not serve in a military capacity during the Civil War, his son did join the Army and received a Medal of Honor for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 970 as an appropriate tribute to Horatio King for his many dedicated years of service to the United States Postal Service and for the patriotism he exhibited throughout his adult life.

I note again, Mr. Speaker, that this is the statement of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC).

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of S. 970, legislation to designate the Paris Hill, Maine, Post Office as the Horatio King Post Office Building. This bill is a fitting tribute to a former Postmaster General and advocate of national unity during one of our nation's most trying times.

Horatio King was born on his family farm in Paris Hill, Maine in 1811. His family had fought for freedom against the British. Horatio had a deep sense of commitment to his community, first serving as the editor and owner of a local paper in Paris, Maine.

In 1839, Horatio King began his career in the United States Postal Service. In 1861, President Buchanan named him Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. King maintained a deep interest in politics throughout his life. He was a contemporary and close friend of Hannibal Hamlin, who served as President Lincoln's Vice President in his first administration.

Horatio himself became an ardent advocate of national unity. Although a Democrat, he supported Abraham Lincoln because of the candidate's conviction that the Republic must be saved. Mr. King continued at his post under President Lincoln for a short period of time. Although he could not serve in a military capacity during the Civil War, his son did join the army, and received a Medal of Honor for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 970 as an appropriate tribute to Horatio King for his many dedicated years of service to the United States Postal Service and for the patriotism he exhibited throughout his adult life.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of S. 970.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 970.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JOSEPH E. DINI, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 737) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, as the "Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 737

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

SECTION 1. JOSEPH E. DINI, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 737 was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, HARRY REID. This bill designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, as the "Joseph E. Dini Post Office Building." A bill for the same purpose was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. Speaker, Joseph E. Dini was born and raised in the small town of Yerington, Nevada. Mr. Dini was first

elected to the Nevada State Assembly in 1966 and is currently the longest-serving member of the State Assembly in Nevada history. Mr. Dini has served Nevada as speaker pro tempore, majority leader, and speaker of the State Assembly. During his tenure, Mr. Dini became the legislature's leading authority on Western water issues.

In addition, Mr. Dini is an active participant in many community service organizations throughout Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of S. 737.

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

□ 1500

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am again pleased to join with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), in consideration of S. 737, a bill which designates the post office in Yerington, Nevada, after Joseph E. Dini, Jr. S. 737 was introduced on April 6, 2001, by Senator HARRY REID of Nevada.

Born on March 28, 1929, in Yerington, Nevada, Joseph Dini was educated in the Yerington public schools and at the University of Nevada. He went on to represent his hometown of Yerington well in the Nevada Assembly, where he amassed several impressive records. Not only did he serve the longest of any member in the Nevada Assembly, from 1967 to 2001, but also he served as speaker of the Assembly more sessions than anyone else in Nevada history. For an unparalleled eight times he was elected speaker by his Assembly peers. In 2001, Joe Dini became the speaker emeritus.

Joe Dini devoted much time to numerous community service organizations, including the Yerington Rotary Club, the Yerington Volunteer Fire Department, the Nevada American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, the Yerington Lions Club, the Yerington Rotary Club, among other organizations.

The awards that Mr. Dini has earned are quite impressive and numerous. Let me just mention a few. He was designated as the Outstanding Senior Advocate by the Governor's Conference on Aging, the Citizen of the Year by the Nevada Judges Association, and Man of the Year by the Yerington Kiwanis Club. He received the Outstanding Citizen Award by the Nevada Education Association, the Excellence in Public Service Award by the Nevada Trial Lawyer Association, and the Friend of Education Award from the Nevada State Education Association. Of course, we could go on and on listing Mr. Dini's awards.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph E. Dini, Jr., is the epitome of what a public servant should be; a man who has honored his State of Nevada, his hometown of Yerington, and, yes indeed, his coun-

try, the United States of America, through his years of dedicated service.

By naming the post office at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, for Joseph E. Dini, Jr., we will not only be honoring a man, but also we will be honoring a building, a building that serves the citizens each and every day. I would urge swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I also would like to thank my colleagues who have allowed me time to speak on this very important bill. It brings me a great deal of pleasure to offer my full support of this legislation here that is before us today, S. 737.

As you know, this legislation, as has been described, will designate a facility of the United States Postal Service located in Yerington, Nevada, as the Joseph E. Dini, Jr., Post Office.

Madam Speaker, it was my great honor and great privilege to work with Speaker Dini when we served together in the Nevada State Legislature. As a freshman legislator, I can speak from experience and fact that very early in my political career, Speaker Dini taught me some very valuable lessons about the passage of legislation, about bipartisanship and all the things that are important to doing a job as a public servant in a legislative body.

I can remember how well Speaker Dini worked with those from both sides of the aisle, focusing more on the legislative accomplishments than on one's personality or partisanship.

Still to this day, after serving in our State legislature since 1967, Speaker Dini maintains his ability to put people before politics. Mr. Dini certainly is a natural leader. He has achieved one success after another, as you heard my colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) say, and he has avoided the political grandstanding that tends to stymie the legislative process.

Madam Speaker, Speaker Dini has not only served his constituents in the Nevada Assembly, district 38, with distinction and class, but he has served and continues to serve the entire State of Nevada in the same fashion.

Madam Speaker, I would ask all my colleagues to join me today in honoring one of our country's, and, yes, Nevada's, finest public servants by supporting Senate bill 737.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the First District of Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am going to join my colleague from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) in praising Assemblyman Joe Dini. This is an extraordinary man. We know him very, very well. I am very proud to stand here and speak on his behalf.

Assemblyman Dini, as we have heard, was born in Yerington, Nevada, in 1929. He went through school in Yerington. He went to the University of Nevada in Reno. He is truly a homegrown and cherished possession of the State of Nevada. He has served his constituents in Yerington very well. He has served the people of the great State of Nevada very well.

I, too, have a number of remembrances of Joe Dini, having also served in the Nevada State Legislature with him, but I would like to harken back to the time that I was a freshman.

Mr. Dini had already been speaker of the Nevada State Assembly, and he was going to become speaker again. But during my first term as a young assemblywoman in Nevada in the early 1980s, he did not speak to me very much during the session. Every time I saw him, I was a bit in awe, and I used to step back, and I thought perhaps the less interaction we had, the better. He observed me and he watched me, and we kept our distance. He was certainly somebody that I would want to impress and want to do well for.

I did not hear from him the entire session. Towards the very end of the session, the end of May, he came over to where I was sitting. He sat down, he looked at me and spoke to me for the first time, and he said, "You did a good job. I am proud of you."

Those words meant everything in the world to me. It was more affirmation that I could actually do the job that I had been elected to, and there was somebody from the State of Nevada that was such an icon and such a respected member not only of his community of Yerington, but of the entire State of Nevada that I felt that what I was doing had been appreciated, and it gave me inspiration to continue and do other things.

I am sure that I am not an isolated incident, and I suspect there are literally thousands of young Nevadans that Joe Dini has significantly impacted on their lives and made a significant difference.

So I am delighted to be here today. This is a much-deserved honor. The people of Yerington, the people of the great State of Nevada, are very grateful for this honor for our homegrown native son, Assemblyman Joe Dini.

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

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 737.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 4, 2002 at 12:52 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with regard to Iraq.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-179)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I am providing a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 2002.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on February 4, 2002 at 12:52 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits an extension of an Agreement between the United States and the People's Republic of China extending the Agreement of June 24, 1985, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

EXTENDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA CONCERNING FISHERIES OFF THE COASTS OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-180)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China extending the Agreement of June 24, 1985, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States, with annex, as extended (the "1985 Agreement"). The present Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes in Beijing on April 6 and July 17, 2001, extends the 1985 Agreement to July 1, 2004.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the People's Republic of China, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 2002.

COMMUNICATION FROM SENIOR ACCOUNTANT, OFFICE OF FINANCE, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Philip J. Berisko, Senior Accountant, Office of Finance, Office of Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 4, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for certification of documents issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,
PHILIP J. BERISKO,
Senior Accountant, Office of Finance.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 577, by the yeas and nays; and S. 970, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second vote in this series.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY CONTRIBUTION DISCLOSURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 577, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 577, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]
YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Bryant	Davis, Jo Ann
Ackerman	Burr	Davis, Tom
Aderholt	Burton	Deal
Akin	Buyer	DeFazio
Andrews	Callahan	DeGette
Army	Calvert	Delahunt
Bachus	Camp	DeLauro
Baird	Cannon	DeLay
Baker	Cantor	DeMint
Baldwin	Capito	Deutsch
Ballenger	Capps	Diaz-Balart
Barcia	Capuano	Dicks
Barr	Cardin	Dingell
Barrett	Carson (IN)	Doggett
Bartlett	Carson (OK)	Dooley
Barton	Castle	Doolittle
Bass	Chabot	Doyle
Becerra	Chambliss	Dreier
Bentsen	Clay	Duncan
Bereuter	Clayton	Dunn
Berkley	Clement	Edwards
Berman	Clyburn	Ehlers
Berry	Coble	Ehrlich
Biggert	Collins	Emerson
Bilirakis	Combest	Engel
Bishop	Condit	English
Blumenauer	Costello	Eshoo
Blunt	Cox	Etheridge
Boehlert	Coyne	Evans
Boehner	Cramer	Everett
Bonilla	Crane	Farr
Boozman	Crenshaw	Fattah
Borski	Crowley	Ferguson
Boswell	Cubin	Filner
Boucher	Culberson	Fletcher
Boyd	Cummings	Foley
Brady (PA)	Cunningham	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Davis (CA)	Ford
Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)	Fossella
Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)	Frank

Frost	Lee	Ross
Ganske	Levin	Rothman
Gekas	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Gibbons	Lewis (KY)	Rush
Gilchrest	Linder	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	LoBiondo	Sabo
Gilman	Lofgren	Sanchez
Gonzalez	Lowey	Sanders
Goode	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Goodlatte	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Gordon	Maloney (NY)	Saxton
Goss	Manzullo	Schaffer
Graham	Markey	Schakowsky
Graves	Mascara	Schiff
Green (TX)	Matheson	Schrock
Green (WI)	Matsui	Scott
Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Sensenbrenner
Grucci	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Gutierrez	McCrery	Sessions
Gutknecht	McDermott	Shadegg
Hall (OH)	McGovern	Shays
Hansen	McHugh	Sherman
Harman	McInnis	Sherwood
Hart	McIntyre	Shimkus
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Shows
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shuster
Hayes	McNulty	Simmons
Hayworth	Meehan	Simpson
Hefley	Meeke (FL)	Skeen
Herger	Menendez	Skelton
Hill	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hilleary	Miller, Dan	Smith (NJ)
Hilliard	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hinchee	Miller, Jeff	Smith (WA)
Hobson	Mollohan	Snyder
Hoefel	Moore	Solis
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Spratt
Holden	Moran (VA)	Stark
Holt	Morella	Stearns
Honda	Murtha	Stenholm
Hoolley	Myrick	Strickland
Horn	Nadler	Stupak
Hostettler	Napolitano	Sununu
Houghton	Neal	Sweeney
Hoyer	Nethercutt	Tancredo
Hulshof	Ney	Tanner
Hunter	Northup	Tauscher
Hyde	Norwood	Tauzin
Inslee	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Isakson	Oberstar	Taylor (NC)
Israel	Obey	Terry
Issa	Olver	Thomas
Istook	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Jackson (IL)	Osborne	Thompson (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Ose	Thornberry
(TX)	Otter	Thune
Jenkins	Owens	Thurman
John	Oxley	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Tiberi
Johnson (IL)	Pascrell	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Toomey
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Towns
Jones (NC)	Pelosi	Turner
Jones (OH)	Pence	Udall (CO)
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Udall (NM)
Kapur	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Keller	Petri	Velazquez
Kelly	Phelps	Visclosky
Kennedy (MN)	Pickering	Vitter
Kennedy (RI)	Pitts	Walden
Kerns	Platts	Walsh
Kildee	Pombo	Wamp
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Watkins (OK)
Kind (WI)	Portman	Watson (CA)
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Watt (NC)
Kingston	Putnam	Watts (OK)
Kirk	Quinn	Waxman
Kleczka	Rahall	Weiner
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)
Kolbe	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Kucinich	Regula	Weller
LaHood	Rehberg	Wexler
Langevin	Reyes	Whitfield
Lantos	Reynolds	Wicker
Largent	Rivers	Wilson (NM)
Larsen (WA)	Roemer	Wilson (SC)
Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Latham	Rogers (MI)	Woolsey
LaTourette	Rohrabacher	Wu
Leach	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—40

Allen	Blagojevich	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bonior	Conyers
Baldacci	Bono	Cooksey

Frelinghuysen	Luther	Roukema
Gallegly	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Granger	McCollum	Shaw
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Hastert	Millender-	Souder
Hinojosa	McDonald	Stump
Jefferson	Miller, George	Trafficant
LaFalce	Pryce (OH)	Waters
Lampson	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Riley	Young (FL)
Lucas (OK)	Rodriguez	

□ 1651

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require any organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at a Presidential archival depository or any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository to disclose the sources and amounts of any funds raised, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

HORATIO KING POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 970.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 970, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]
YEAS—394

Abercrombie	Bass	Borski
Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Aderholt	Bentsen	Boucher
Akin	Bereuter	Boyd
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Army	Berman	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Berry	Brown (OH)
Baird	Biggert	Brown (SC)
Baker	Bilirakis	Bryant
Baldwin	Bishop	Burr
Ballenger	Blumenauer	Burton
Barcia	Blunt	Buyer
Barr	Boehlert	Callahan
Barrett	Boehner	Camp
Bartlett	Bonilla	Cannon
Barton	Boozman	Cantor

Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
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
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)

Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
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)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary

Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns

Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman

Allen
Baca
Baldacci
Blagojevich
Bonior
Bono
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Capito
Cooksey
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Granger
Hall (TX)

□ 1901

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 7 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote Nos. 6 and 7. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" or "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 6 and 7.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 6, H.R. 577, to require any organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for the creation of a Presidential archival depository to disclose the sources and amounts of any funds raised. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 7, S. 970, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, as the Horatio King Post Office Building. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was attending a funeral and was unable to return in time for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls 6 and 7.

□ 1900

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-356) on the resolution (H.Res. 342) providing for

Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3394, CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-357) on the resolution (H.Res. 343) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3394) to authorize funding for computer and network security research and development and research fellowship programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF ERROR IN THE CODIFICATION OF TITLE 36

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1888) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to correct a technical error in the codification of title 36 of the United States Code.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1888

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF ERROR IN THE CODIFICATION OF TITLE 36.

Section 2320(e)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "section 220706 of title 36" and inserting "section 220506 of title 36".

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1888.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1888, legislation to correct a technical error in the Federal Criminal Code concerning the protection of certain Olympic trademarks.

As you know, a great tradition resumes this week. The Winter Olympic Games begin in Salt Lake City, Utah. The tradition of the Olympics is more important than ever. Amateur athletes from around the world come together

to compete in goodwill and strive towards excellence in their sport. They are an inspiration to us all.

Since the tragedies of September 11, it is more important than ever that the nations of the world are united in peaceful exhibition. Surely my colleagues join me in the pride that our country hosts the games this winter.

The Departments of Justice and the Treasury and the U.S. Olympic Committee have recently notified Congress that an incorrect citation was made when a recodification of certain laws was passed in 1998. This typographical error, the insertion of the number 7 instead of 5, inadvertently undermines the protection of Olympic trademarks such as the Olympic rings. This legislation corrects the error.

The need to protect trademarks and other intellectual property is stronger today than ever. There are disturbing reports detailing how the proceeds of counterfeit and pirated goods are used to fund a variety of dangerous criminal enterprises including terrorism. It is important that we safeguard the integrity of the goodwill of the Olympics as well as our public safety by giving Federal law enforcement the tools to go after wrongdoers and to protect these important trademarks.

I would also like to say a few words about something that is very disturbing to me. When I was driving in from the airport today, the radio carried a report that the International Olympic Committee had denied the request of the United States Olympic team to carry as the American flag that flag which had been recovered from the wreckage of the World Trade Center. Today we are talking about legislation relating to the meaning of symbols, the Olympic rings in particular, and how important symbols are to the fight against evil and for good, and how important symbols are in terms of preventing criminals and terrorists from appropriating those symbols for their own use.

I was honestly shocked to hear that the bureaucrats of the International Olympic Committee are denying the American team the right to carry the flag that they wanted to as a symbol of the solidarity of the world against the events of September 11. And while we are passing legislation today protecting one of the symbols of both the International and U.S. Olympic Committees, I would hope that the IOC would reciprocate and would reconsider the very foolish decision that they made, if this radio report was accurate, denying American Olympic athletes the right to carry the flag that they want to carry.

One must remember that there were citizens of 86 countries that died in the World Trade Center on September 11. So that flag is not just an American symbol, it is a symbol that is being carried in memory of those citizens of most of the countries participating in the Olympics, and it ought to be present when the games open up in Salt Lake City later this week.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and support passage of S. 1888.

S. 1888 appears to be a wholly technical, noncontroversial bill. Thus, while the Committee on the Judiciary did not consider and report out the bill, I believe it is appropriate to move this bill on suspension today. In essence, S. 1888 corrects a drafting error made when Congress passed H.R. 1085 in 1998. H.R. 1085 codified into title 36 of the U.S. Code certain preexisting provisions of U.S. law, including those which gave the United States Olympic Committee exclusive use of Olympic symbols such as the five interlocking rings.

It is somewhat important to move this legislation now before the Olympics in Salt Lake City begin. U.S. Customs officials have expressed concern that they will not be able to prosecute infringement of the Olympic symbols in Salt Lake City unless this legislation is passed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that while technical in nature, S. 1888 is an important piece of legislation. It is also apparent that its passage is somewhat time-sensitive with the Olympics shortly due to begin.

I have much more to say on this legislation, Mr. Speaker, but given the critical importance of the special order which will commence as soon as we are done with this bill, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge an aye vote.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, as regards the choice of flag that the American team proposes to carry and would also encourage the IOC to reconsider their decision.

I rise in support of this small but vital technical correction to the trademark law. This legislation would fix a drafting error which would otherwise allow unauthorized use of the protected Olympic symbols.

As Utah and America prepare to welcome the rest of the world this weekend to the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics, we must close a loophole that would let counterfeiters of Olympic merchandise of the games go unpunished.

Congress clearly intended to protect against the unauthorized use of Olympic-related symbols, logos, slogans and other marks without permission from the Olympic governing bodies. Such protected and familiar symbols include

the Olympic rings and even the title "Olympics." Revenues generated by the Olympic trademarks go to support the games and American athletes.

Title 36, section 220501 of the U.S. Code provides these protections and makes available the remedies under the Lantham Act for trademark counterfeiting to criminally prosecute counterfeiters of Olympic marks.

Unfortunately, the necessary cross-reference to the section entitled title 18, section 2320 of the U.S. Code, which sets forth the actual criminal penalties, mistakenly references another section of title 36. Rather than protecting Olympics trademarks, the erroneously cross-referenced section deals with the powers of a federally chartered, nonprofit veterans society of World War II submariners. This error must be corrected today.

Section 2320 of title 18 is the primary basis for criminal prosecutions of those who traffic in counterfeit Olympic goods. The start of the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics later this week is already producing a sharp spike in the amount of trafficking in phony Olympic goods and services.

The Customs officers and other law enforcement officials who have been trained to intercept fake merchandise are currently relying upon a section of the U.S. Code that does not actually provide any criminal penalties for Olympic-related counterfeiting. They are, in effect, enforcing a law that does not exist because of a typographical error.

The bill today simply corrects the cross-reference in title 18 to refer to the intended section of title 36 dealing with Olympic marks. S. 1888 passed the Senate by unanimous consent on December 20. House action today can ensure that this bill reaches the President for enactment prior to the start of the Salt Lake Winter Olympic Games.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for recognizing the urgency of the problem and acting quickly to bring this bill to the floor.

I want to take this opportunity to thank all my colleagues for their steadfast support of the Salt Lake Olympic Games. The response from this body on nearly every Winter Olympic request, especially on increased Federal security measures, has been one of unqualified support. It is a direct result of that support that the Salt Lake Winter Olympics will be the most secure and successful in history.

I hope all of the Members will get a chance to watch some of the Winter Olympic Games over the next few weeks. It will be a heck of a show and one that demonstrates the resilience of the American spirit.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I urge an aye vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1888.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

□ 1915

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING COLONEL FRANCIS GABRESKI

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Colonel Francis "Gabby" Gabreski, our Nation's highest-ranking fighter ace, who passed away Thursday, January 31.

Gabby Gabreski amassed 28 downed German aircraft in World War II and 6.5 enemy MiG fighters in the Korean War, becoming America's greatest living ace.

Gabreski graduated in 1941 from Knoxville Army Air Field as a second lieutenant and was assigned to the 45th Fighter Squadron in Hawaii where he witnessed the attack on Pearl Harbor.

In June of 1944, Gabreski led his squadron in a long fighter sweep over the beaches of Normandy. Three weeks later he surpassed Eddie Rickenbacker's World War I record and on July 5 scored his 28th victory after 193 missions, making him America's leading ace, earning him a leave back to the United States.

After pleading with his superiors to forgo his leave and fly just one more final mission, Gabreski was shot down over Europe. He spent the final 8 months as a POW.

Gabreski once again took the skies during the Korean War as commander of the 51st Fighter Wing where he helped develop tactics for jet fighters.

He retired from the Air Force as a colonel in 1967 and spent the next 20 years working in the aviation industry. Gabreski was inducted into the National Aviation Hall of Fame and later served as the president of the Long Island Railroad system.

I am proud that the home of the Air National Guards' 106th Rescue Wing in my congressional district bears his name.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring a true American hero, Colonel Francis "Gabby" Gabreski.

HONORING ROSS BEACH

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight following the 141st anniversary of Kansas' entry into the Union to honor a great Kansan, Mr. Ross Beach. A business leader, philanthropist and lifelong Kansan, Mr. Beach was recognized on January 25 of this year as the Kansan of the Year. There is no one more deserving than Mr. Beach of this recognition.

In his lifetime, Mr. Beach has changed the Kansas landscape, helping to make the State an even better place to live. A pioneer and leader in the oil and gas industry, banking, radio and television, his work has brought economic progress and jobs to our State of Kansas. In recognition of this success, Mr. Beach has been inducted into the Kansas Business Hall of Fame. Today he continues to influence Kansas as president of the Kansas Natural Gas Corporation and as chairman of the Douglas County Bank.

In my hometown of Hays, where Mr. Beach resides, his generosity has made possible the creation of two of the community's most cherished assets, a world class performing arts center and museum of natural history. The philanthropic works of Mr. Beach and his talented and gracious wife, Marianna, extend far beyond our community of Hays, enhancing the lives of Kansans across our State through the Marianna Kistler Beach Museum of Art at Kansas State University and the Beach Center on Disability at the University of Kansas. These are the gifts that Mr. Beach and Mrs. Beach have made known to our State. Many of his most important acts of generosity have been performed in anonymity.

It is with this spirit of commitment to unity and State that Ross Beach has lived his life. Not long after graduating from Kansas State University, he served in World War II as a naval aviator. Since that time Mr. Beach has repeatedly demonstrated his willingness to serve not only through his gifts but also with his time and talents, providing leadership to numerous organizations, including the Kansas 4-H and the Eisenhower Foundation. Mr. Beach has also chaired the Kansas Fish and

Game Commission and served as president of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce.

Knowing Ross Beach as a businessman, it is clear to me why he has had such a successful career. Knowing him as a friend, it is no surprise that he has used his success to benefit his fellow Kansans. I commend Ross Beach for his many accomplishments, his philanthropy and his recent and most highly deserved recognition as Kansan of the Year.

CONGRATULATING NANCY PELOSI

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the California delegation, I often wonder what it gets one besides old age and the infirmities that come with that, but I must say that it is a great pleasure today as dean because I have the honor to recognize officially the true accomplishment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as she takes over the position of minority whip and becomes the highest-ranking woman ever in the U.S. House of Representatives. I offer my congratulations to her and her family on this tremendous achievement.

Our State is proud of NANCY, as are all the women and men throughout the country. NANCY's a trail blazer for women and for our State, but she is not the first. She joins a long line of women leaders from the State of California.

Throughout American history, California has sent more women to Congress than any other State. The first woman, Mae Ella Nolan, was elected to replace her late husband and sworn in January of 1923, shortly before I got here.

In 1925 California elected Florence Prag Kahn, the State's second woman to serve in the House. She served for 12 years in the House and was the first Jewish woman to serve in Congress.

In January of 1945, Helen Gahagan Douglas became the third California woman and, of course, as my colleagues know, set the foil for our former President, Mr. Nixon.

In 1972, the year that I was first elected, California elected its fourth woman member, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke. Congressman Brathwaite had her own couple of firsts. She was the first African American woman to represent California and also was the first woman to give birth to a child while serving in Congress.

So California has a rich tradition of sending women to Washington, D.C. In my 30 years I have been proud to serve with several women leaders from our great State. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), however, has risen to the top, the best of the best.

The occasion we mark today raises the bar for women and men everywhere. She has succeeded through the

power of her ideas and the strength of her convictions. She will be a formidable and fabulous whip. She will even be able to keep me in line; and I congratulate her and I applaud her, and I am proud to call her my colleague and friend.

PLIGHT OF THE PEOPLE OF
KLAMATH BASIN

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time I have come to the well to address the House and my colleagues about the terrible plight of the people of the Klamath Basin in Oregon and northern California.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, on April 6 of last year, the water was cut off to the farmers at Klamath Basin. Some 1,400 farms were affected. The decision was unprecedented. Never in the near-hundred-year history of this water project run by the Bureau of Reclamation had the water been totally cut off; but a new scientific analysis and decisions by the various agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, said, sorry, there is not enough water for the farmers. We have to maintain the highest lake levels we have ever maintained to protect sucker fish, and then we have to release water later on in greater amounts than we have before to provide water for the Koho salmon, which are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, a number of us, especially the farmers and ranchers in the basin, argued against that, saying that there was no scientific evidence to prove that this was necessary; but those arguments fell on deaf ears. Later in the spring, the chairman of the House Committee on Resources agreed to let us have a field hearing in the Klamath Basin. Thousands of people turned out. Thousands of people turned out for that hearing, Mr. Speaker; and at that time we raised these issues and said the science just did not add up to the decisions that were being made.

We called for the Department of the Interior to get peer review of that science. We also held a rally where close to 18,000 people, in a county of 60,000, turned out. They called it the "bucket brigade," where we talked about the farm families. The veterans who were lured to this area by the same Federal Government with a promise of water for life, they were asked to come settle this project, this reclaimed land, guaranteed water to grow their crops to expand the Nation; but no water did they get this year, virtually none.

So the fields dried up. We can see the sand here and a wheel line in the sand. There was so much sand and dust that there were traffic accidents that came about, but the biggest accident that came about were the bankruptcies and

the losses that devastated this area. Oregon State University said \$134 million of potential economic loss. Bankruptcies like the Carleton family, third generation in the basin, they had farmed there three generations.

This administration, this Congress responded with a little bit of economic assistance, saying, here we will help a little bit, \$20 million into the basin and \$134 to \$200 million economic hit. This poor gentleman, when he got that, the money went to the bankruptcy court. He got stuck with a \$60,000 tax bill out of \$122,000 in emergency aid.

I tell my colleagues that just to show the devastation not only to the environment of the farm country but the families who lived there; but the most important fact came out this weekend, Mr. Speaker, when the National Academy of Sciences finally finished their review of the data and the decisions.

Do my colleagues know what that showed, Mr. Speaker? It showed there was no scientific justification for the high lake levels or for dumping the water in the Klamath River. This is the article out of the Herald and News, irrigation cut off was not justified.

The damage done to these people is extraordinary. Some of it can never be undone. The decisions were flawed. They were based on science that did not add up to the decisions that were made.

Further, had we not had this outside peer review by the National Academy of Sciences, we would have continued down a road of dumping potentially lethally hot water into the Klamath River, killing the very Koho salmon this whole plan was supposed to fix and help. The National Academy of Sciences said one of the reasons that these Koho are surviving in this rather warm river complex to begin with is probably due to natural seepage and some cold water springs where they can go off into micro-habitat and survive.

The plan that the National Marine Fisheries Service wanted us to follow which denied water to the farmers said dump warm reservoir water into this same river system. In effect, pollute this river with warm water at the worst time of the year, providing lethal water to the salmon.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a poster child for the need for reforming of the Endangered Species Act to have precisely this kind of peer review of the science, it is the Klamath Basin.

□ 1930

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, if this government owes any debt to anyone, it is to the farmers and ranchers in this basin whose livelihoods were robbed from them, whose fields turned up dry, some of whom left; and I have not even talked about the farm-worker families that had to leave.

During the bucket brigade rally, where 18,000 showed up, a Hispanic farm worker came up to me in the high school ball field where we had all gath-

ered, tears in his eyes, and told me he had come to this country some 20, 25 years before and gotten a job on a farm in this basin the next day. He had raised his family, educated his kids, and worked every day since, until that week, when he had lost his job.

A terrible wrong has been committed here. We have an obligation and a responsibility to make it right.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, NEW MINORITY WHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate and honor our new minority whip, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), I also must really thank her for being such a role model. As a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a friend to many, a great humanitarian and a phenomenal leader, Ms. PELOSI has really demonstrated that women can do it all at the same time.

NANCY PELOSI's congressional district is right across the Bay Bridge from my district. Her constituents have recognized her intellect, her passion, and her coalition-building ability by electing her to the House of Representatives eight times. Now, as minority whip, these same attributes and values will be brought to our leadership team to meet the challenges of this new millennium.

No one is more qualified to lead than Ms. PELOSI. She understands that education is the soundest investment we can make as a Nation to secure our future. She understands that access to quality health care, affordable housing, job and pension security, and a commitment to fighting the global HIV/AIDS pandemic are essential to our economic and national security. And she knows that job security and economic security are not Democratic or Republican issues, but American issues that deserve bipartisan support.

As a true leader on international issues, Ms. PELOSI cares about our foreign policy and fights to ensure that our foreign aid is directed toward the betterment of humankind. She has been a powerful and relentless ally in the fight to eradicate HIV/AIDS in San Francisco as well as in Africa and throughout the world. Her deep commitment to civil rights and civil liberties here at home and her unwavering support for human rights abroad have given us all a standard for justice and equality.

On October 10, 2001, exactly 90 years to the day after women won the right to vote in California, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) was elected by her colleagues to become our Democratic House whip, the highest ranking woman in the 212-year history of this institution.

This victory is really a great triumph for our Nation. Ms. PELOSI has broken through a glass ceiling that has long kept women from reaching the upper echelons of power in this House. As she said shortly after being elected, "We made history; now we have to make progress."

NANCY, congratulations on earning this place in history. Congratulations and Godspeed as you accept this place of distinction in the people's House. I know that there are many girls and young women throughout the world who are saying, "When I grow up, I want to be just like Congresswoman PELOSI."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and I stand here to congratulate the new minority whip of the House of Representatives, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

This is my second term in the U.S. Congress, and I have to express the fact that the joy I have had serving in the Congress I partly owe to NANCY PELOSI and the guidance she has given me as a colleague throughout these 3, almost 4, years in the House of Representatives.

The wonderful thing is that the world is very small, because I came to know NANCY PELOSI through some friends of mine from Cleveland, the Sklars; and so I stand here celebrating with them as well this great opportunity.

I also have to say that there was no greater joy than being a monitor in the room when those votes were counted and I was able to say, yes, I have been a part of history being made as those votes were counted on behalf of NANCY PELOSI. I am looking forward to her leadership and the opportunity to be there to help her lead this Congress and lead this Democratic Party into this new century and to have an opportunity to say to the world that "a woman's place is in the House, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress."

Congratulations NANCY PELOSI, and I am here to let you know I am here for you.

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

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

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

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

MINNESOTA MOURNS THE DEATH OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE DARLENE LUTHER

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Minnesota are in mourning because we have had a death in the family. Minnesota State Representative Darlene Luther, wife of our good friend and colleague Bill Luther, passed away last week after a courageous battle with cancer.

Today in St. Paul, Minnesota, Darlene's family and hundreds of her friends and constituents attended her funeral mass at the Cathedral of St. Paul. From Governor and Mrs. Ventura, to members of Minnesota's congressional delegation, the Minnesota legislature, and supreme court; from Darlene's constituents in Brooklyn Park, Minnesota, to Darlene and Bill's legions of friends across Minnesota, we said farewell to a loving and committed wife, a caring and loyal friend, and a compassionate and dedicated public servant.

Just as we mourned a great loss, we also celebrated a life of love and a life of service, a life of passionate advocacy and genuine empathy for people, especially people in need. Mr. Speaker, Darlene Luther was truly a loving daughter and sister to the Dunphy family; a loving wife and mother to Bill, Alicia and Alex; and friend to us all. She will be sorely missed by all of us who knew and loved her, by all of us whose lives she touched.

Most of all, Darlene loved her husband, Bill, and their children, Alicia and Alex, as deeply and as dearly as any wife and mother ever could. She was so proud of them, as she told me countless times. I will never forget how proud she was of Bill when he was sworn in as a new Member of Congress. Darlene ran over to me and proclaimed, "Not bad for a kid from Fergus Falls, huh, Jim?" I know Darlene also made Bill very proud, and their love for each other will continue to inspire us all.

I will never forget Darlene's pride when Alicia was accepted by Boston College. "I am so proud of Alicia," she told me, "and she did it despite a letter of recommendation from a Republican Member of Congress." Darlene was so proud of the wonderful young woman Alicia has become and so grateful for the loving daughter she has always been.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget how proud Darlene was at Alex's very first Special Olympics, as we were there to cheer him on. And I will never forget Darlene's pride and her tears of joy when Alex moved into his new apartment. Alex Luther showed all of us what the dignity of independent living is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of Representative Darlene Luther is a great loss for Minnesota. We have lost our leader for people who need life-saving organ do-

nations. We have lost a tireless advocate for early childhood education and kids with special needs. We have lost a true champion for health care and people with disabilities. We have lost a legislator with a big heart who made a big difference in the lives of so many Minnesotans.

Darlene Luther represented the best in public service because she always put people first. As her friends and constituents know, Darlene never took herself too seriously, but she took her job very seriously. And Darlene loved her job, just as she loved her colleagues and the staff of the Minnesota legislature, just as she loved Bill's colleagues and staff, just as she loved her constituents in Brooklyn Park.

As we celebrate Darlene's life of love and service, let us honor her legacy by keeping her passions alive. And may the tender strength of her love and her kind and gentle spirit live forever in the hearts of each of us.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW MINORITY WHIP, NANCY PELOSI

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, it is really a privilege and a joy to be on the floor this evening and rise to honor our colleague, the gentlewoman from California (NANCY PELOSI).

I want to make my remarks tonight really in the form of a story. I do not have any notes in front of me, but I would like to hear back to over 25 years ago. So that is more than a quarter of a century, which certainly says something about my age, but that is how long I have known NANCY PELOSI.

Neither one of us were in elected public service at the time, but she was very well known throughout the State of California for the work that she was doing in her beloved adopted city of San Francisco, having been brought to San Francisco by a great San Franciscan, Paul Pelosi. And out of that marriage, that wonderful, wonderful marriage, have come five magnificent children.

First, let me say something about Paul. We all love him and respect him. He is one of the most gentle individuals, who always has a smile on his face and has done so much for so many of us. It is his singular joy to welcome us to his home to do for each one of us over the years. So this is a great party celebrated around the two of them and not just NANCY.

Five children: Nancy Corinne, Christine, Jacqueline, Paul, Jr., and Alexandra. Two magnificent sons-in-law, Jeff Prowda and Michael Kenneally; and five extraordinary grandchildren, Alexander, Liam, Madeleine, Sean, and Ryan. So you can see that there is both the Gaelic and the garlic that has been blended in this magnificent family.

NANCY PELOSI is recognized a leader not only in her own community but

throughout the State of California. She has been a leader in the Democratic Party, and that came to her from her magnificent mother and father, whom I think tonight and tomorrow and all days are watching NANCY and guiding her from heaven.

Her father served in this House of Representatives. He served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as his daughter does today. And her mother was a champion for housing, for the underemployed, for the unemployed, for those that did not have a voice in our society. Her father went on to become Mayor of Baltimore. Her brother, Tommy, has served as Mayor of Baltimore.

So as we Californians like to say, NANCY PELOSI was born and bred for public service and understanding what the best of it represents. Her devotion, her family's devotion to a party to give birth to ideas and to bring people forward for the best of our Nation is the tradition not only of the D'Alesandro family, but the Pelosi family as well.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, tonight we rise to pay tribute to her. Not only on the occasion of becoming elected whip, but how proud we are as Californians that we have helped to bring forward this woman for this post. She has always, always been respected by everyone here on both sides of the aisle. The gentlewoman always has a friend in her voice. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) does not make enemies. Why? Because she knows what is at stake, and what is at stake is the business, the blessed and very precious business of our Nation and a better world.

We are so proud that this woman has created another first. We saw her do it in California, and we see her do it here all over again. Whether Members supported her in the race for whip, all of that has really gone away. Tomorrow we present our gift as a caucus to the Nation, and how proud we are that she is yet another first. I think that we have helped to create and present as a party not only a gift to the House of Representatives, to the Congress, but to our Nation, because that is why we are here. I think Americans will come to know her and respect her as we do for what she believes in, for the faith that shapes all that she believes in, because she is a deeply spiritual and faith-filled woman.

Mr. Speaker, the commute across the country every week is not the easiest, but I could not wait to get up this morning to make that flight across the country and join my colleagues and so many other Californians who have flown across the country, who have come here to witness the swearing in and the celebration of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) becoming the whip of the Democrats and a gift to the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO NEW MINORITY WHIP, THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to also pay tribute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). Forty years ago in this city a beautiful young woman graduated from Trinity College. Today she becomes the highest ranking woman in the United States House of Representatives. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), now a San Francisco Congresswoman, is the pride of our great State. Born in Baltimore to a family of public servants, her father has been mentioned, Thomas D'Alesandro, served as mayor of Baltimore for 12 years after representing the city in this House of Representatives for five terms where he, like the gentlewoman, served on the Committee on Appropriations. Her brother, Thomas D'Alesandro, III, served as mayor of Baltimore.

She met her husband Paul here in Washington, D.C., in Georgetown where he was a student at Georgetown University. They moved to California, and I think at that time Paul Pelosi changed the definition of the State slogan which is printed on our State library in Sacramento. That slogan reads, "Bring us men to match our mountains." Paul Pelosi brought us women to match our mountains.

The gentlewoman gave birth to five children, Nancy Corinne, Christine, Jacqueline, Paul, and Alexandra. While raising her five children, she got involved in San Francisco Democratic politics, became northern chair of the State party, and chair of the 1984 Democratic National Convention Host Committee when that convention was held in San Francisco.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) became known as a national committeewoman from California and served in that position for 20 years. She is a champion of the people's issues. She is a respected mother, a San Francisco socialite, a Congresswoman, and now Democratic whip of the House of Representatives.

As a native of California, fifth generation, this is one of the proudest moments I have had in public life, to see one of our own public servants rise to this position, and I now serve along with the gentlewoman as chair of the Democratic delegation from California. That is no small issue. We have 32 members of the 52-member delegation that are Democrats. Of those 32 members, 16 are women, 16 are men. It has the highest number of African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and, as I like to say, return Peace Corps volunteers in that delegation. Every one of the Members in that delegation and the history it is making as a delegation of parity and a delegation of broad representation pays tribute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for getting them elected to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we gather on this floor of this great institution to pay tribute to a woman who has already made history, but in the years ahead will make even more.

TRIBUTE TO NEW MINORITY WHIP, THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and a joy for me to be able to praise and recognize our new whip, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has been a role model for anyone interested in entering politics and is a shining example of effective leadership. I can think of no better Member to galvanize our efforts here in Congress during these trying yet promising times.

The gentlewoman is true to her convictions, whether that be fighting for human rights in China, defending a woman's right to choose, or looking after the well-being of working families, and she will not back down on these critical issues.

As whip of our party, it will be the gentlewoman's job to corral votes, listen to Members' concern, and help point this Congress in the direction that will take our Nation to a better future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a candidate with aspirations to become a Member of Congress, I was fortunate to have the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) there for me. My colleagues from California know how helpful she can be, and now the entire party will benefit from her advice and counsel.

History will show that to date there have been over 12,000 Members in the United States Congress, of which a little over 200 have been women. And here we are today honoring the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the first woman to the second highest post in our party. It is about time.

While breaking new ground and shattering stereotypes of who the leaders of this Nation are, the gentlewoman will bring about a much-needed change and invigorate the political process in a civil way without creating the acrimony and ill will that has all too often defined the partisan politics we have seen in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and look forward to her leadership as the House Democratic whip.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I have three words for the gentlewoman: Grit, guts and grace. I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) does a tremendous job of demonstrating what an elected official should represent. I have had nothing but pleasure in seeing her operate and seeing the gentlewoman just move forward an issue, whether it is an issue on

trade, or an issue of a woman's right to choose, or just her campaign to become historically the next Democratic whip here in the House of Representatives. I think we have someone who handles herself in a way that makes all of us proud.

For a Californian, for someone who is a minority, for someone who believes in progressive politics, we have a great deal of pride seeing that the next whip for the Democratic Caucus here in the House of Representatives will be the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I wish I could claim she was from Los Angeles where I hail from and represent instead of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saying not just to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and Paul Pelosi, who deserves a great deal of the credit as well for supporting the gentlewoman, but to all the world, let it be known that we are very proud of the Member that we elected as the next whip in the House, and very proud to be able to display her, because what we will do now under the gentlewoman's leadership will demonstrate that we knew how to choose right. I say congratulations once again.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment, this fine opportunity to celebrate with the country the new Democratic whip, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I have come to know the gentlewoman over the last year serving with her in this distinguished House. She is truly a pioneer. She is a new face for California and for the United States. She gives hope and aspirations to many young people, and people who look like many of us here who now occupy seats here in this House.

She has distinguished herself for many, many years. I recall meeting the gentlewoman once at one of our State conventions in California when I was just getting involved in the Democratic Party. The gentlewoman is a true leader for women's rights and issues. I know that the gentlewoman will be shattering the glass ceiling that is here and will help to forge new, triumphant roads for women and other people who need to have their voices heard. She is a champion.

PASS ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have an important vote in this body tomorrow, an important vote that has a major economic impact. Our Nation is in a recession. When President Bush became President, he inherited a weakening economy. In fact, his White House housewarming was essentially a

weakening economy, and it turned into a recession.

Under the President's leadership, we passed a tax cut. We decided to take 20 percent of the budget surplus that resulted from our efforts to balance the budget and take that 20 cents on the dollar, the surplus, and give it back to the American people in tax relief. That tax cut was signed into law in June. By August, economists were noting that the economy was beginning to get better, and then the tragedy of the terrorist attack on September 11 occurred, the terrorist attack that cost thousands of lives, and since September 11 has cost over a million Americans their jobs.

This House has responded, and of course we twice have passed an economic stimulus plan. I would note that on December 21 this House passed and sent to the Senate an economic stimulus plan to revive our economy. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act. The bad news today is, and it was announced by the Senate majority leader, that the Senate was going to shelve any effort to revitalize this economy. That is bad news.

Tomorrow we have another important vote that is going to have an impact on the economy, and that is regarding a proposed tax increase which Senator KENNEDY, Senator JEFFORDS and others have begun advocating. Some have been advocating that we suspend, repeal, or delay.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois suspend.

Members are reminded to refrain from referring to Members of the other body by name, except as provided in clause 1 of Rule XX.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, some have advocated repealing, delaying, or killing the implementation of these tax cuts. That is bad news for the economy. If Members look at what is in the tax cuts that are before us today, what begins getting phased in in the tax cut, because we were unable to do it all in the same year, are some pretty important provisions.

One is our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I think Members agree that under our Tax Code, it is unfair that married working couples pay more in taxes than two single people living together. We essentially wipe out the marriage tax penalty in the President's cut.

□ 2000

We help small business by eliminating the death tax, which takes away up to 55 percent of the family business when the founder passes on. The Bush tax cut also included additional retirement savings benefits which are phased in over the next few years. And, of course, we double the child tax credit, currently \$500, raising that to \$1,000. And for those in the top two tax brackets, the 39 percent and the 28 percent, we lower those tax brackets from 39 to 35 and from 28 to 25. Those are all in

jeopardy if we go along with those who want to raise taxes by suspending those tax cuts. I have yet to find a real-world economist who tells us that it is a good idea to raise taxes during a recession.

Some of those who have advocated suspending, killing, repealing, stopping the Bush tax cuts say it is really not a tax increase because those tax cuts have not gone into effect yet; but they were the same ones who a few years ago said that if you slow down the rate of growth on Medicare, that it is a Medicare cut, so we are using the same definition. The bottom line is suspending, stalling, repealing, delaying the Bush tax cut is a tax increase.

I would note a couple of key things. The Secretary of the Treasury was before the House Committee on Ways and Means today. When asked what is the economic impact of a tax increase, of delaying, stalling, repealing or killing the Bush tax cut, he said it would be devastating to the economy. Over a million Americans have lost their jobs and more would lose their jobs with a tax increase.

I would note on the rate reductions that 17 million small business owners and entrepreneurs pay taxes under the individual income tax rates, the two top brackets that are going to be phased in. Think about it. Who is it that is going to bring about the revival of this economy? It is not the major corporations, the big guys. It is the little guys and gals, the entrepreneurs, the small businesspeople. Eighty percent of those who pay taxes under the top two brackets, the two brackets being phased in, are small businesspeople and entrepreneurs. We know they generate the most jobs. We think as Members of this House about our neighbors, if every small business on Main Street or Liberty Street in my hometown of Morris, Illinois, hired one more worker, what that would mean. And, of course, raising taxes on those small businesspeople will make it much harder to provide those jobs.

From a consumer's standpoint, if you raise taxes, you take money out of their pocket. When consumers have less money to meet the needs of their families, they are not able to spend it in our local stores, in our local businesses, buying products and services. When a consumer buys a pickup truck, there is an autoworker who makes it. When a consumer buys a PC, a personal computer or a laptop, there is a worker somewhere that produces that; and a tax increase will make it much more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity tomorrow to go on the record: Are you for continuing the tax cut, or are you for raising taxes? Tomorrow this House will have the opportunity to vote for keeping the tax cut or for raising taxes. It is a simple choice. Everyone will have the opportunity to go on the record. I urge and ask bipartisan support for preserving the tax cut and ensuring that we get this economy

moving forward again and give hundreds of thousands of Americans the opportunity to go back to work.

CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI ON HER ELECTION TO MINORITY WHIP

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to tell our colleague and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that every single day she teaches me something. In my 1992 campaign, the gentlewoman from California showed me that senior Members, important Members, actually help candidates. In fact, I learned how to run my first race by watching her first race in San Francisco. After I was elected, NANCY showed me and the rest of my class that more senior Members step aside and push junior Members forward to give them the exposure that they need and to give them the guidance that is so important in getting your feet on the ground around here.

NANCY has shown us what a real Democrat is, what it is all about, while at the same time how to get bipartisan support. That is no easy task. She has shown us how to run a whip campaign, how to win, and how to bring the caucus back together at the end of that race. Finally, now that NANCY is the whip-elect and when she takes over tomorrow, she is going to show us how to fill the position of the highest-elected office for any woman in the history of the United States, while remaining the same gracious, genteel, fair and generous person that she is. I think that is the most important lesson of all that I have learned from the gentlewoman from California. You can actually be all of that and be successful.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. NANCY PELOSI is a national political leader and has deep practical political roots, while at the same time she maintains bright, widespread idealistic wings. I can think of no better trait for leadership than to have roots and wings. She is optimistic and idealistic, but she also is a great political strategist.

Last year she led the congressional delegation from California to victories which were greater than all the other combined Democratic Caucus members together. As a compassionate idealist, NANCY refuses to adopt a position that certain vitally needed reforms are impossible. We are proud to follow a great leader that has roots and wings, NANCY PELOSI.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, NANCY has asked us all to be brief and therefore I will be. After all, she is the whip.

NANCY, you are the greatest. Thank you for the passion you bring to your

office. Thank you for all you have done to improve the quality of life for America's families and our most precious resource, our children. Thank you for all you have contributed to the Congress, for your advice and counsel to Members, old and new.

And, America, get ready. If you do not know NANCY PELOSI yet, you are going to love what you see.

Congratulations, NANCY. You make us all proud.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SANDLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Focused, organized, hard working and goal oriented: those are words that spring to my mind when describing our new whip, NANCY PELOSI. As will no doubt be mentioned many times tonight, NANCY PELOSI's election is historic and an indication of positive change to come. NANCY's leadership will complement our current leadership. She will bring a new energy, a new vision to our caucus and to our country. Her leadership may be to the same destination, but I suspect that she will have a few new road maps for us to follow.

I am proud of our caucus, particularly the men of our caucus, that we were able to be a part of breaking the glass ceiling for women in leadership. And make no mistake about it, that glass ceiling is shattered forever.

This is important to men and women all across the country, and it is important to me personally. I am the father of four children, two boys and two girls. I want to make sure that my daughters have the same hope, the same opportunity, the same vision as my sons. NANCY PELOSI will guarantee that. We all congratulate NANCY PELOSI; and I say thank you for including us all at the table, from left to right, region to region, persuasion to persuasion, but most of all thank you for your years of hard work, your dedication and your preparation in earning this leadership position.

The country will be better for the leadership of NANCY PELOSI.

STAY THE COURSE ON TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, when Congress makes a commitment to give Americans tax relief, it should honor that commitment. To put it plainly, Americans should get the tax cuts that they have been promised. Americans should have the tax relief that they desperately need.

Passage of President Bush's tax cut late last year was a historic bipartisan achievement. Only three times since World War II have we had an across-the-board tax cut: President Kennedy's tax cut in the 1960s, President Reagan's tax cut in the 1980s, and now President George W. Bush's tax cut. But now some want to break the agreement.

Some argue that we should repeal or delay the tax cuts. The gentleman from Illinois who addressed the House a few minutes ago and I believe that this is a debate worthy of having. If Members of Congress truly believe we should raise taxes, our resolution gives them an opportunity to record their votes in favor of a tax increase. Our resolution states, the tax cuts should not be repealed or delayed. If they want to raise taxes, they need to vote against the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois and me. Every American deserves to know where their Representative and Senators stand on this important issue.

Some in Congress, Mr. Speaker, lately have tried to maneuver and scheme for political advantage by blaming the President's tax relief package for the deficit and recession. They are not telling the truth. These tax supporters try to sell the myth that we must increase taxes just 6 months after we promised Americans they would start receiving their rebate income tax checks in the mail. The ink on the new tax relief package has barely dried. Now they want to repeal it or, as they say, delay or postpone it. They said the same thing about the economic stimulus package: let's take a long look. Let's delay it a week. Let's postpone it a month. Today they killed it, which really killed the chances that many of my constituents and their companies have to rebound from this recession.

As the chart I prepared shows, economic conditions account for 72 percent of projected 2002 deficits. Spending accounts for 16 percent. Tax relief only contributed 12 percent. Yet there is a growing cry to delay or postpone, we know in Washington that means kill, the tax cuts.

We have got to revitalize our economy. Tax cuts spur economic growth and create jobs. The bottom line for President Bush and this Congress ought to be jobs, preserving jobs and creating good jobs. Senate inaction on the economic stimulus plan cost us 800,000 jobs. The House passed a stimulus many months ago; but it is not only stuck in the Senate, it is dead in the Senate today. Now these same obstructionists want to repeal the tax cuts we have passed last year.

Our resolution reaffirms that promise to the American people. It reaffirms the tax relief. It reaffirms the tax cuts. We cut taxes because it is the right thing to do, it is the fair thing to do, it is the compassionate thing to do for families struggling from paycheck to paycheck.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois has so adequately said, our choice is simple. Do we leave the money in the pockets of the American workers and families, or do we bring it up here and spend it as we see fit?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to refrain from characterizing the action or inaction of the Senate.

 TRIBUTE TO NANCY PELOSI

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in celebration of the official swearing-in of the Democratic whip, my colleague and friend, NANCY PELOSI.

Today, we celebrate a historic event. NANCY PELOSI is the highest-ranking woman ever to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. Her success is also a tribute to the women who came before her. From the election of Representative Jeanette Rankin to the House in 1916, to today, when a record number of 75 women serve in the 107th Congress, women Members of Congress have made significant contributions to the legislative accomplishments of the House and Senate. They have served with distinction as chairs of committees and subcommittees, members of our most powerful committees, and in leadership positions within the Democratic caucus and the Republican conference.

But, today is notable because NANCY has been elevated by her peers to one of the top two positions that the history books recognize as the key party leadership posts. So it is fitting that we gather today to recognize the leadership exemplified by our new Democratic whip, NANCY PELOSI, and to celebrate the accomplishments that have earned this great distinction.

NANCY was a leader in California and in the California Democratic party for many years before her election to Congress in 1987. In many ways, her political experience provided a model for me in becoming the first Mexican-American woman to be elected to Congress, and I have appreciated the many ways she has supported me both before and after I joined her here in the House in 1993.

She has also provided additional leadership to me as I have followed her to the House Appropriations Committee. I believe it is NANCY's service on that committee that demonstrated her leadership abilities to the members of our caucus. First, NANCY serves on the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee, which may recognize as the most problematic appropriations bill passed by Congress each year. The bill's long list of worthy programs necessitate hard work and numerous, bipartisan compromises in order to produce the final version that is enacted into law. NANCY's contribution to that process each year has been essential in protecting health and education programs that benefit millions of Americans.

In addition, as ranking Democrat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, NANCY has been the Democratic floor manager for that bill since 1995. From that position, she has been instrumental in advocating our caucus's position with regard to programs that address global poverty, international family planning, and global environmental issues while working with her Republic chairman to fashion a com-

promise bill that can withstand scrutiny by the House. She has worked uncomplainingly in the spirit of compromise each year to produce legislation the House can support.

NANCY's race for whip pitted her against one of the Democratic Caucus' most active and distinguished members, our colleague STENY HOYER, who has been one of my mentors on the Appropriations Committee. STENY's outstanding credentials as our former caucus chair, as a chairman and now ranking member of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Subcommittee, and as chief recruiter for our party of congressional challengers, made the race for whip a difficult decision for everyone in our caucus. But we all recognized that with choices such as NANCY and STENY for this coveted leadership position, the Democratic Caucus, as well as the entire House, would be well-served by the victor. NANCY's tough but successful race against STENY represented another example of leadership—not just of her ability to mobilize the diverse elements of our caucus, but also her ability to organize in the systematic manner essential to the success of any party's whip.

As Californians and as members of the Appropriations Committee, NANCY and I share many experiences. But we also share a distinction enjoyed by only a handful of women Members of Congress over the history of Congress because each of our fathers served in the House before us. NANCY's father, Representative Thomas D'Alesandro, served in the House from Maryland from 1939 to 1947. My father, Representative Edward Roybal, served an area of Los Angeles near my current district from 1963 to 1993. I know that the model of public service provided by our fathers was essential to each of us as we decided upon the course of our careers.

I congratulate NANCY PELOSI as she officially assumes her leadership duties today. She takes her place today among a long line of outstanding Democratic whips that go before her in the House's history, including Representative DAVID BONIOR, whom she succeeds. I pledge to work with her and our other Democratic leaders, indeed all the leaders of the House, in going forward with our work in a manner that best reflects the American people and that always strives to make the House of Representatives truly "the people's House."

 CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI ON HER ELECTION TO MINORITY WHIP

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, and the fact that so many remain here this evening to laud our newly elected whip, NANCY PELOSI, is testimony to the fact that she will be a strong and forceful voice for our party. She is good news for my special passion in Congress, for she understands better than anybody I have met here that the Federal Government can be a better partner to make our communities more livable, to make our families safe, healthy and more economically secure.

But the best news, Mr. Speaker, is for the American people and for this

Chamber. It seems that at times we have forgotten how to work together to solve problems here in this House. But the gentlewoman from California's special skills not only as the only Westerner in leadership, not only as the first and only woman in either party to reach this exalted level but as somebody who embodies what it means to be a legislator, her insight, intelligence, grace and tenacity will help us do our job better for the American public.

□ 2015

We all welcome this gift from California and the Pelosi family, and I hope we are equal to the challenge.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged and honored to join my colleagues on the House floor to mark an historic day for this body, for Democrats, for women and for America. Tomorrow, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) will be sworn in as the Democratic whip. This occasion is cause for celebration and is a sign of great progress.

The gentlewoman from California's election to whip is an historic landmark in the evolution of our great democracy. She will now emerge more fully as a leading voice on the national stage for the Democratic Party and for the Congress, and she will motivate women of all ages, because of her eloquence, her competence, her confidence and her passion, to strive for new heights and to participate more fully and completely in politics and policy.

We are witnessing a shift in the national political landscape. It is a movement. Women do not want to just be at the table, we want to be at the head of the table. Because of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), we are energized and empowered. Our new Democratic whip was not elected because she was a woman. That she is one is a real benefit, and she will send a strong message as an inspiration for aspiring women throughout the country.

Her election is a demonstration of the reality that the Democratic Party is a party of diversity, inclusion and opportunity. She has made great efforts to reach out to members from all parts of the Democratic Party and is committed to the needs and values of this caucus and our diverse constituencies.

But to me she is not just the whip; she is an inspiration, a mentor, a dear friend and a true leader in every sense of the word. I look forward to following her to advance an agenda we can all be proud of. I join my colleagues in congratulating her and wishing her well.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), these words come to mind: N, never

fearing to move; A, aggressively; N and C, sensitive to needed causes; Y, yielding a great foresight; P, progressive; E, energizing; L, loving; O, overwhelmingly; S, spelling; and I, intellect. That is our "NANCY PELOSI."

I am so happy to be from the State of California that produced this woman that will guide this country in the future. I salute the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our newest whip.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, while she's already been on the job for about three weeks now, tomorrow my colleagues, my fellow Californian, my friend, NANCY PELOSI will be sworn in to her new post as the democratic whip, and it's going to be a big day for America.

NANCY is the highest-ranking woman in the United States Congress . . . ever! As a Hispanic member of Congress, I can not be prouder of this moment. When the barriers of achievement and opportunity fall for one, they fall for all of us.

NANCY has her work cut out for her. She has dedicated herself to tackling the tough issues facing our economy. There are going to be some rough battles, but NANCY's unique blend of grace and determination will serve her well in the Whip post.

It's hard not to admire NANCY PELOSI. She is a gracious, engaging woman who has raised five children, Chaired the California Democratic Party, served eight terms in Congress, doggedly advocated increased funding for healthcare and breast cancer research, and fought for human rights at home and abroad.

It was her courageous fight against PNTR and for human fights in China, that first introduced me to NANCY when I came to Congress two years ago. I fought along side NANCY as she championed U.S. global leadership for human rights and sustainable development.

NANCY is a loyal friend. I'll never forget how NANCY stepped forward on my behalf during my bid for a position on the rules committee. NANCY PELOSI is always willing to go to bat for her friends. This is the NANCY I know! NANCY has been going to bat for the people of California for 16 years and now she is going to bat for the Democratic Party and the entire nation.

I look forward to NANCY's truly groundbreaking leadership as she leads our party and our nation into the twenty-first century.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a Member of the House, whom I consider not only a gifted leader but a dear friend. History is being made as NANCY PELOSI is officially sworn in as the new Democratic Whip.

But history will ultimately cite not only the election of the highest-ranking women in the U.S. House of Representatives, it will sit in judgment of the effectiveness of her tenure as Whip. The work has only just begun. And I have every confidence that history will judge this election not only as a landmark event in American history, but a turning point for the Democratic Party and democratic principles. The reason for my optimism is pretty simple. NANCY is a born leader. A lot can be said of her skills, her knack for organizing, her perseverance, and her personal commitment to excellence. But of all the positive things that can be said on her skills and talent, one word al-

ways comes to mind when you think of NANCY PELOSI: leadership. NANCY is a leader when she speaks out for the underprivileged and the disenfranchised. NANCY is a leader in the way she brings people and causes together in a collective and collaborative process. NANCY's leadership drives her to focus on goals and results.

Integrity, honesty, and hard work are the pillars of her success. And I know that she will work tirelessly to forward democratic causes. And working with the Democratic Leader—DICK GEPHARDT—have every confidence that the Democratic Caucus and Party are on the cusp of a new and exciting era.

So to NANCY PELOSI I say you have my every confidence and my total support. Now—let's get to work. Congratulations!

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we are all here today to honor our colleague and friend NANCY PELOSI. As a fellow Californian and a friend, it is hard for me to hide my delight at NANCY's election as Democratic Whip. For nearly fifteen years, NANCY has done a wonderful job representing the city of San Francisco in Congress. From education, health care, housing, and the economy, she has worked to improve the quality of life for Californians—and all Americans.

On October 10, 2001, the Democratic Caucus made history. We made history by electing NANCY to the highest position ever held by a woman in Congress. Electing a woman to a leadership position was long overdue. And while the Democratic Party continues to be the party of progress, our work is not yet complete.

NANCY, with your election as House Democratic Whip, we made history, we've made progress, and now we will work together to improve American government and to better the lives of the American people. Thank you NANCY for your leadership and your friendship. Congratulations!

RESPONDING TO HUGE TAX BREAKS GIVEN TO AMERICA'S RICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and wish her the very best, but the issue that I want to focus on is a very important piece of legislation which is going to surface tomorrow, and that is the issue of how Congress responds to the huge tax breaks that the President and the Republican leadership have given to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population.

Mr. Speaker, this country has a \$6 trillion national debt, and, for the first time now in several years, we are running a deficit.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of the great speeches here about lockboxes and our great love for Social Security, everybody understands that Congress is now dipping into and raiding the Social Security fund.

Further, Mr. Speaker, most people in this country understand that we have

many enormous social needs. In my State of Vermont, every week when I go out and speak to senior citizens, they demand of me that Congress do something about the outrageously high cost of prescription drugs and the fact that we do not have a strong prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, what the issue tomorrow is going to be about is do we give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country? Forty percent of the President's tax breaks go to the wealthiest 1 percent, people who have a minimum income of \$370,000 a year and average over \$1 million a year in income. So the choice that Congress faces is, do you give huge tax breaks in the future to those people, or do you provide a strong prescription drug benefit under Medicare?

Mr. Speaker, not only is the President and the Republican leadership not going to provide a strong prescription drug benefit under Medicare, in fact in many ways they are going to cut back on Medicare. At a time when we need to strengthen Social Security, at a time that we need to raise the COLA, the President and the Republican leadership are dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, let us get our priorities right. I speak to veterans virtually every week in the State of Vermont. We have many town meetings. What they tell me is when they apply for a benefit it takes 6, 7, 8, 10 months for them to get that benefit processed, and the reason is that in many instances the Veterans Administration is understaffed and is unable to process those claims.

Is it more important to give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, or is it more important to make sure that our veterans get the benefits to which they are entitled?

Mr. Speaker, just this last week, a couple of days ago, there was a front page story in the New York Times which talked about how middle class parents are finding it harder and harder to pay for the college costs of their kids. The average American young person graduating from a 4-year college ends up \$20,000 in debt excluding the debt incurred, and the growing debt incurred, by their parents.

Is it more important to protect the middle class and make sure that the young people of this country can go to the college that they want and do that by significantly expanding Pell grants and other financial aid programs, or is it more important to give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, to people who provide huge campaign contributions to Members of this Congress and the White House?

Mr. Speaker, all over this country we are facing a disaster in terms of child care. Working families are unable to find affordable quality child care. We have people who are paying too much and getting too little, and the children are suffering. Yet the Federal commitment to child care is minimal.

Is it more important that we take care of the youngest children in this society and protect working families who want quality child care for their kids, or is it more important that we give huge tax breaks to the wealthy and the powerful?

Mr. Speaker, in my State and all over this country there is a terrible housing crisis.

The bottom line is let us repeal the tax breaks for the richest 1 percent, let us lower the deficit, and let us take care of the middle class of this country.

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

(Ms. SANCHEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, this evening during this hour the Blue Dog Democrat coalition in the House is

going to talk about the issue of fiscal responsibility, an issue that we think is very important to address tonight in light of the President's recent budget submission to this Congress.

The President and the Congress are united in the war on terrorism. Members on both sides of the aisle stand together in our commitment to defeat the terrorists and to do whatever is necessary and pay whatever price may be required to preserve our national security and to ensure that we protect the homeland.

There is no division that the current tax cuts that we have enjoyed in the form of the rebates have been important to the American people, and there is no suggestion, contrary to some on the Republican side tonight, that there should be any tax increase in the time of a recession, because we firmly believe that the recession needs to be addressed by this Congress in a responsible way, and tax cuts, tax cuts which have already been given and which already are being implemented in this current recession, are important to the recovery.

So when we debate the resolution on the floor of the House tomorrow, let there be no misunderstanding: Democrats understand that in a recession it would be wrong to increase taxes.

We passed a record tax decrease in June. The tax rebates were good for the American people. But back in June the Congressional Budget Office projected a 10-year surplus of over \$5 billion. Just 7 months later, these projections of a surplus are gone. We find that as a result of the tax cut, as a result of the recession, as a result of the war, we no longer are able to project future surpluses, and, in fact, we can only project future deficits.

We are once again confronted with a pattern of spending that was engaged in for over 30 years by this Congress that was ended in 1996-1997 when this Congress voted for the Balanced Budget Act, an act that put us on the road to fiscal responsibility, that resulted in 3 years of surpluses at the Federal level.

But once again we now see the President of the United States submitting a budget to this Congress that will return us to deficit spending. We believe as Blue Dog Democrats that we can win the war against terrorism, we can protect our homeland, without raiding the Social Security Trust Fund and increasing the national debt that we pass on to our children.

We notice in the President's budget submission of today that the national debt, which was projected back in April of last year to actually disappear over the 10-year period, in fact turn to a surplus, has now evaporated, and, based on the projections now contained in the President's budget, we will once again see \$2.7 trillion in debt by the year 2011.

□ 2030

So in just 7 short months, we went from projections of a surplus over the

next 10 years to ever-increasing national debt. These figures show the debt that will be held by the public, the debt that we owe to people who buy those Treasury bills and Treasury bonds, a large portion of which are owned by foreign investors, moving from a surplus to a debt of \$2.7 trillion.

Just look at the interest costs that this new debt will bring to the American people. We projected that over the next 10 years, back in April, that we could eliminate our debt and, over the period of 10 years, we would have to pay \$709 billion in interest. With the new President's budget, we now see that these interest payments will equal 1.8, almost \$1.8 trillion. That is just in interest that we will have to pay over the next 10 years. That is an increase in interest payments alone of about \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Now, to put that in perspective, what could we do with \$1.1 trillion in interest costs if we could simply return to the surpluses that we had anticipated back last April? Mr. Speaker, \$1.1 trillion will fund the President's defense budget request for not just one year, but for 3 years. Mr. Speaker, \$1.1 trillion would fund the President's budget request for defense for 3 years. That is why we need to be sure that we do not go back deeper into deficit spending, increase that national debt, and waste the resources of our taxpayers on interest servicing our national debt.

We know as Democrats that raiding Social Security is the wrong thing to do. Raiding Social Security will result in debts that will fall on the backs of our children. The American people know or deserve to know the truth. They understand that raiding Social Security and increasing our national debt will ultimately result in higher taxes for our children.

We have called on young men and women who wear the uniform of our great Nation to sacrifice, even to risk their lives in the defense of freedom. We all know that we are at war, but no one has told the American people that each of us must be willing to sacrifice as well. We have been told that we can have it all. We have been told that we can win the war, we can increase spending, we can have our taxes cut, that it will all be possible.

During World War II, every American sacrificed. During World War II, every American did their part. In the current war, we have been led to believe that we do not have to sacrifice. By doing so, we are entering, once again, into a period of deficit spending and growing national debt that, after 3 short years of fiscal responsibility, we will pass on to our children the cost of paying for this war.

I believe that is wrong. Blue Dog Democrats believe that is wrong. We believe that it is important to be honest with the American people about our finances in Washington. We believe it is important to preserve the principle that was voted on repeatedly on the floor of this House to lock box the So-

cial Security trust funds. We, once again, under the President's budget, will be spending Social Security money to operate the rest of the government. Our children will pay the price of our fiscal irresponsibility. We believe as Blue Dogs it is time to get our house in order and to be honest with the American people.

We have several members of the Blue Dog Coalition who are here with us tonight who will address these issues. The first member of the coalition is the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF). The gentleman has been very active in fighting for fiscal responsibility, for paying down the debt; and I am happy to yield to him to speak on this subject tonight.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Tonight I join my colleagues in expressing my concern about the President's budget proposal. We applaud the President for outlining the priorities of beefing up homeland security and strengthening our national defense. What our troops have done halfway around the world in Afghanistan is nothing short of miraculous, and it is our obligation and our responsibility to make sure that the men and women in uniform have every tool at their disposal to win the war on terrorism and win it convincingly.

But the President has also proposed in his budget new levels of domestic spending and more than half a trillion dollars of additional tax cuts. One critical issue has been left out of this budget and that is, how do we pay for all of this? So many American families are facing the challenge of making ends meet, especially during this recession. American families are struggling to live within their means, and it is our responsibility as the Federal Government to do the same. We must find a way to balance the budget and remain steadfast in our commitment to fiscal discipline.

The new budget reports indicate that the government will return to deficit spending and raid all of the Medicare surplus and further raid the Social Security trust fund by more than \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. This should be cause for great concern for our Nation's long-term economic well-being.

We are, I fear, at risk of making the same mistakes we made 2 decades ago when we began a vicious cycle of deficit spending and burdened ourselves with terrible debt and crushing debt service. We are at risk of ignoring the lessons of our protracted climb out of debt during the 1980s and 1990s and the enormous economic benefits that the return to fiscal responsibility brought this Nation. Having failed to learn from that history, we are now perilously close to repeating it.

Even now, credible voices within the administration are saying that debt simply does not matter. How soon we forget. During the debate last year, Congress and the President agreed that the Social Security trust fund surplus

would be put in a lock box and saved to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers. The new projections show that this promise will not be kept. Unfortunately, the new projections show return of budget deficits, of borrowing from Social Security, and a rapidly increasing national debt. Soon, very soon, the administration will be before this Congress asking us to raise the limit on the national debt; for permission, in effect, to open the Social Security lock box and throw away the key until one day, too far in the haze of our tomorrows to see now, we may find that key again.

Now, it is reasonable and appropriate to run temporary deficits during a recession and wartime, and we all fully support the President's efforts in this war on terrorism. However, under responsible fiscal policy, the temporary deficits incurred during a period of economic weakness and war must be offset by a return to budget surpluses when conditions improve. The government is projected to run on budget deficits that will require the government to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds for the rest of the decade, even before, even before additional spending increases for defense and homeland security are even counted.

We need a plan for the long-term budget that brings us back to fiscal responsibility. We are spending money now faster than it is coming in; and in doing so, we are risking the long-term solvency of the Federal budget and, worse, we are simply mortgaging our children's future.

Because our great Nation is faced with the challenges of protecting our national security, both at home and abroad during this time of war, we need to make tough choices in addressing the budget outlook. We need simply a wartime budget, one that meets our national defense and homeland security needs, and one, like in past wars, that calls on Americans for something they are willing to give, if asked; something they, in fact, yearn to be asked for in plain and candid terms, and that is sacrifice. Yet, this administration and this Congress has not called on the American people for sacrifice; not yet. Not with a budget that says we can have our cake and eat it too. We must keep our Nation strong, and we will; but we should not force our children to pay for it.

The price of freedom is high, as President Kennedy once said; and Americans have always been willing to pay it. We pay it still. We must sacrifice now for our children's future so we do not mortgage that future. While we stand in support of the President's efforts in this war on terrorism, we also must challenge our colleagues in Congress and in the administration to effectively address these economic circumstances and, working together in a bipartisan way, to return to a balanced budget, responsible fiscal discipline, and keep that Social Security trust fund sacred.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his remarks. Another member of the Blue Dog Democrat Coalition who has been an outstanding leader in trying to urge this Congress to maintain and stay the course of fiscal responsibility has been the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS). We are proud to have him on the floor tonight to share his thoughts with us.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), a vibrant leader of our caucus; and we appreciate his leadership in every way in trying to bring out the truth in honest budgeting, and that is truly what we need here in Washington.

I join my fellow Blue Dog colleagues in voicing my concerns with the President's budget. I support the President's outline for handling the war on terrorism, but I have concerns that the domestic priorities are being somewhat ignored. We can strike a fair balance and reasonable balance between our commitment to deal with terrorism and recognizing our needs for the economy.

Under the President's budget policies, the 10-year budget surplus is reduced by almost \$5 trillion from what was expected a year ago. No doubt some of this is caused by the war on terrorism and the economic downturn. However, the President's budget cuts critical domestic funding for education, health care, and farmers for this year in order to reward corporate interests down the road. Even more, in order to avoid reporting deficits, the budget dips into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, something he agreed during the election would not happen. As we Blue Dogs feared, this budget will start the public debt to rise again after reductions over the past 4 years and, as we expected, has already resulted in a request by the administration to raise the statutory debt ceiling.

In my congressional district of central and southern Illinois, domestic priorities such as creating jobs, providing affordable health care, improving schools and helping farmers are critical, especially during a recession. I am concerned that if we shortchange these critical domestic needs while running deficits and increasing the national debt, we will jeopardize our long-term fiscal health and will hamper our ability to meet future obligations to Social Security and Medicare, as well as our ability to pay for the next unforeseeable crisis our Nation might encounter.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity, and I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I appreciate the leadership that he has given to our Blue Dog group as we work on these and other issues in this Congress.

I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR). The gentleman has been a leader in

strengthening our military, serving as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Committee on Armed Services. But while working to strengthen defense, he has also been an outspoken advocate of fiscal responsibility. I am proud to yield to a fellow Blue Dog Democrat, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

□ 2045

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for this opportunity to speak to the American people tonight. I would ask Members to try to remember back a year ago. A year ago right now the President of the United States was saying that we were going to have surpluses as far as the eye could see, that nothing that could happen in Washington could keep that from happening, and, doggone it, there ought to be tax breaks because we have all these surpluses.

Washington is awash in money. His words, not mine. Back then I said it was not true. I knew it was not true then. It is certainly not true now.

A year ago in August, just think back to August, the President wanted to give 3 million illegal aliens amnesty coming to the country. Now he is on the right track saying we need to tighten our borders. I want to commend him for that.

A year ago the President had waited until the last day of July to submit his budget for defense to the Committee on Armed Services. Most Presidents, including President Clinton who was never accused of being pro-defense, would do it in February so we would have a chance to look at it, to scrub it, to try to make it better.

President Bush chose to make it his lowest priority, I am sorry to say. I want to commend him when this year he makes it his highest priority. I want to commend him for getting right on tightening our borders and not letting illegal aliens in and giving them amnesty.

There is one thing that the President continues to do that I need to point out and say, Mr. President, you have changed your tune on two things for the better; I am hoping you will change your tune on the third.

Mr. President, after some soul searching a couple of years ago I voted to impeach a guy who I felt lied under oath. We do not need to get into the details of that, but I felt like he lied under oath and he did not deserve to be President anymore. When someone talks about non-existent surpluses, it is probably just as good you did not say that under oath. When somebody talks about that we can go back temporarily to deficit spending, it is okay, it is probably just as good you did not say that under oath because I do not think that is true.

You see, Mr. President, what you totally ignored a year ago, and you cannot ignore now is right now, as we

speak, our Nation owes the men and women of America, the working people that we all profess to represent, \$1,210,000,000,000.

Let us remember a million is a thousand thousand. A billion is a thousand million. A trillion is a thousand billion. It is pretty mind boggling. We have a tendency here in Washington to think of something as 1.2 apples. No, it is 1 trillion, 200 billion, hundreds of millions of dollars that right now hard-working Americans have had taken out of their paychecks since the 1980's and even before with the promise as recently as the Reagan administration when Social Security taxes were increased with a Democratic House, a Republican Senate, a Republican President. They raised the amount that was taken out of people's paychecks for Social Security with a solemn promise that that money would be set aside to use for nothing but Social Security.

The much-discussed lock box on this House floor, if you could get to that lock box and open it up, all you would find is an IOU for 1 trillion, 210 billion, hundreds of millions of dollars. They did the same thing with Medicare. Again, the taxes went up on individuals. The taxes went up on employers. This happened during a Republican President, Reagan, a Democratic House, a Republican Senate, with the promise that that money would be set aside to pay nothing but Medicare bills for when people get 65 years old and when they get sick and need some help.

If you were to find that nonexistent lock box, all you would find is an IOU for \$249,700,000,000. It is not there, not one penny of it.

We take money out of the folks who work for our Nation, not just the folks here on this House floor but the folks who are out there every day being park rangers, the folks being border policemen, INS agents, Customs Service agents. A little bit of money is taken out of their paycheck every month with the promise that it is set aside for their retirement. They have been doing it for a long time. If you would finally go through the hoops and find that account and open up that box, all you would find is an IOU for \$537,500,000,000. There is nothing there.

For our military retirees it is a little bit different. They invest with their lives. They invest with their time away from their families. They invest with the thought that they could be killed any day at any moment, even in so-called safe places like the Pentagon, which we learned tragically in September are not safe places for America's military personnel.

So although they do not pay directly out of their paychecks, there is a line in the defense budget every year that contributes money to their retirement account, again, with the promise that it is going to be set aside and used for no other purpose but to pay their retirement. If you were to find that account all you would find is an IOU for \$173,700,000,000.

So when the President and the talking heads in the media and other folks last year were talking about Washington being awash in money, I think they were fibbing to the American people. Either they did not know the truth, or they were misleading the American people. And that is not a good thing for either one of them to do. That is why a group of us said last year is it not more important to honor the promises, now that we have finally broke even and started having small surpluses, to pay those bills back?

That is why a group of us last year initiated the effort to increase defense spending. It started with the Blue Dog Coalition. Thank goodness the President got on the right side of that issue later in the year. But I certainly feel like we helped steer him in the right direction.

Remember, even with the increases in last year's defense budget, the procurement accounts were short-changed again. They were no better than under Bill Clinton; and as a matter of fact, the Bush budget asked for fewer ships for the United States Navy than even Bill Clinton did. Once again, this year the Bush budget despite the huge increases asked for even fewer ships than last year. The Bush budget only asked for five ships for the U.S. Navy. The typical life expectancy of a U.S. Navy ship is 30 years. Quick math, 150-ship Navy.

Just a few years ago Ronald Regan was trying to get us to a 600-ship Navy. Just a few years ago we had a 400-ship Navy. Today our Naval fleet is 318 ships and only 100 of them are combatants. If we accept the Bush budget, we will have a Navy fleet in short order of only 150 ships.

I do not think those are good priorities. I think the priority ought to be honesty to the American people. Remember all the talk about Washington is awash in money? Please, someone, explain to me if Washington is awash in money, the debt this year compared to the debt last year has increased by \$281 billion in 12 months.

Now, folks will say September 11 threw us out of whack. I will remind you that our Nation's budget runs from the first of October to the end of September. The events of September 11 took place exactly 20 days before the end of the fiscal year. No one on Earth with a straight face is going to tell you that almost a \$100 billion deficit occurred in the last 20 days of the year, because it did not.

One of the things I will encourage the American people to do, because a lot of the numbers get thrown around in Washington, I want you to check my numbers. I want you to check my sources. I hope you look at <http://www.publicdebt.treasury.gov/>. You can look it up on your computer. They track it by the month. You can see on September 1 our Nation was well on its way to about a \$90 billion annual operating deficit. It got bigger each month of the year. That is the truth to the American people.

Please check my figures because very few people in Washington will encourage you to do so. That is one of the reasons why tomorrow, when people say, if you vote against this motion tomorrow you voted for a tax increase, you know what, if that guy said that under oath, I would have to impeach him because that is a lie. It is not a tax increase. It is a tax decrease that has not taken place yet. It is a tax decrease that those people who voted for it knew automatically sunsets 5 years from now. They all go away. All the taxes that were in place 18 months ago come right back.

So using their line of thought, those people who voted for it, voted for a tax increase because they all come back in 9 years.

The much talk about the estate tax relief that they make mention of does not really kick in until the ninth year and goes away entirely. That means it comes back the tenth year. Are we going to encourage people to commit suicide the ninth year because that is the only year that has meaningful change?

We propose giving people \$4 million in their estate tax free. That is a heck of a lot of money in Mississippi. Even in Texas that is a lot of money. That is a lot of money in Florida. That is a lot of money in Illinois. I think that is fair. Because remember, a guy who is out there earning \$40,000 paid taxes on everything he earns. Why does it have to be so magical about money you are given?

In fact, some of the most conservative commentators in America said it is really not conservative to tell people that a gift ought to be tax exempt when earnings are not. Why should earnings be taxed higher than things you are given, things that you have earned?

I want to encourage people to work. I want people to have faith that when they go to work and pay their Social Security taxes, that it really will be set aside for their Social Security; when they pay their Medicare taxes, it really will be set aside for that. For folks who work for us here, who work for the INS, the Customs Service, Federal firefighters on our military bases, I want them to know that their retirement is going to be there.

If we continue along this path of deficit after deficit, there is no guarantee it will be there. In fact, the chances are that it will not. I will remind people the most common question asked of me is Where does the money go? And their jaws hit their chest when they say the biggest expense of this Nation is not welfare. It is not foreign aid. It is not health care. It is not taking care of kids. It is not building roads. The biggest expense to this Nation on an annual operating basis is interest on the national debt, and it is \$1 billion a day. The war against terrorism is \$1 billion a month. The cost of incompetence in spending money we do not have is \$1 billion a day. It continues and only

gets worse as long as we continue to borrow money.

Mr. President, two things I think you ought to know. We are approaching the \$5,950,000,000,000, mark which the law says is the Federal debt limit. You are rapidly getting there. This Member will not vote to raise the debt limit. If we have to tweak other budgets, if we have to suspend some of the tax breaks that have not taken place yet in order to fund the war on terror, I will help you do that. But I will not ask my kids and your kids and our grandkids that have yet to have been born to pay our bills, because no other generation of Americans has done that, and this generation of America cannot start that bad trend.

All the way from George Washington through the Carter presidency, this Nation only borrowed \$1 trillion. That doubled in the 8 years of the Democratic House, Republican Senate and Ronald Reagan was President. Look where it is now.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) jokingly says, Confucius says, "When you find yourself in a hole, quit digging." It is time for our Nation to quit digging. It is time for our Nation to get serious about paying our bills. It is time for your generation and my generation to get serious about paying our bills.

Mr. President, if you send us a budget that is not in balance, that does not pay for this year's needs with this year's revenues, I cannot support it. We know how to balance the budget. You know how to balance the budget. This war is only costing one-twentieth of what we are squandering on interest on the national debt. It is not the reason the budget is out of balance

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). Members are reminded that the remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair. It is not in order to direct remarks directly to the President.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) for his presentation. The gentleman has been one of the foremost advocates of fiscal responsibility, balancing the budget and paying down the debt, and we are grateful for his membership in the Blue Dog Democratic Coalition.

Another Member who has been very active in leading the Blue Dogs and serves as a co-chair of the coalition is our friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD). It is my pleasure to yield time to him.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for organizing this Special Order to give the members of the Blue Dog Coalition a chance to talk a bit about fiscal responsibility.

I also want to thank the previous speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR). He has been a forceful and long-time advocate for a strong national defense and also for fiscal responsibility. So we appreciate the

gentleman's long work here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I have a feeling inside somewhat like I had about 13 years ago. Before I entered elected public service, I was a business person running a family business that I had spent 25 years in. I was extremely concerned about the future economic health and viability of our Nation.

Let me remind the Members about where we were in 1988. We had annual deficits, annual deficits running in the hundreds of billions of dollars. That means that the government was spending hundreds of billions of dollars on an annual basis more than it was taking in in revenue. And that deficit was only counted after you spent all of the Social Security money, after you spent all the Social Security money which was supposed to be set aside for future retirees. Our accounting practices were really messed up. We did not count a deficit until we spent everything, what we call the operating money, off-budget money, and then all of the Social Security money too.

□ 2100

In 1992, President George Bush was running for reelection. This country that fiscal year had a \$290 billion deficit. President Bush, if my colleagues will remember where we were back then, we had just come out of the Desert Storm, the Persian Gulf conflict in which the Iraqi government had threatened some neighbors and America came to their defense and again showed us leadership around the world and doing what was right.

President Bush did a great job prosecuting that war. That happened I think in 1990 or so, but the election in 1992 really became about the economy and the fact that we had a \$290 billion annual deficit, even after spending all the Social Security surpluses; and unemployment was high, interest rates were high, jobs were not being created. The economy was generally fairly stagnant.

That election, as I said, was much about the economy; and of course, President Bush lost that election, and in the next 8 or 10 years the administration, in concert with the Congress, I think because the country demanded it, began to work together to solve the economic problem, to solve this deficit problem that we had in this country.

I ran in 1996 for the U.S. House of Representatives, and I remember the cornerstone of that campaign was about the economy, was about the deficit, the fact that this country was not able to balance its books. So a lot of that conversation and debate that we had during the 1996 campaign was about that.

When I got to Washington I was anxious to become part of a group that was interested in fiscal responsibility, and so that is why I joined the Blue Dogs; and as my colleagues know, the leadership of the United States Congress, which was Republican in both the

House and the Senate, and working in a bipartisan way with President Clinton's administration, developed a plan, actually it was a seven year plan in 1997, which would take our Nation out of deficit spending and carry us back into fiscal responsibility. I think the Blue Dogs played a very important role in that debate or that deal that was cut, and it just showed what can happen when the country comes together. We have a problem, we figure out a way to solve it, set aside our partisan differences and work together.

That plan was really a pretty simple plan, if put in place. Spending caps, it required that we ratchet down our spending as we went along and that if the economy would continue to grow we would be able to get in a surplus situation.

Guess what happened. The business community had great confidence that the government was doing its part, that we were doing our best to hold down spending and that in the long run we would get out of that deficit situation. As a result, the business community began to invest. The economy began to boom. We had a lot of people who had capital who were willing to risk that capital in new ideas and creative ideas. Next thing we know interest rates begin to go down. Employment was higher. New job creation. We had rising markets everywhere.

Of course, everybody knows that in 1992 the stock market was in the 3,000 range and maybe even below, and it went up in 2000, 2001 era, went up to 11,000.

When we got to balance, there was a lot of talk about lock boxes. This Congress had many debates. I know we have taken numerous votes on the lock boxes. That was a good idea; and that idea was simply this, that we use whatever surplus money we had to pay off the Federal debt. The Federal debt was running in the five and a half trillion dollar range. That Federal debt, to service it, was costing us, as my colleagues heard the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) say, the largest single expense item of the Federal budget, costing us in the neighborhood of \$325 to \$350 billion.

My contention is, as a businessperson, that a debt that is of that high percentage of an annual budget, it was in the neighborhood of 15 to 16 percent I believe, would really drag us down over a period of time, and we had to figure out a way to reduce that debt. So the lock box idea was a very good idea, which we would be forced to put Social Security surpluses into reducing Federal debt and any other surpluses that we might have into reducing Federal debt.

2000 Presidential election came along. OMB and CBO and others were forecasting just a year ago that we would have a \$5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years, a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Given the current laws that we are operating on, the current expected spending or revenues that we are going

to get in and the spending requirements we have, we were looking at about a \$5.6 trillion dollar surplus over the next 10 years, and if we had that kind of surplus we could almost pay off the total Federal debt. That was 1 year ago, January 2001.

What is that projection or forecast today about surpluses? Four billion dollars of that surplus has disappeared over the last year, projected surplus, \$4 billion. There are lots of reasons for that. We all know what they are. Some have to do with the natural downturn in the economy that happened, some have to do with the September 11 tragedy and the effect it has had on our economy, and certainly a portion has to do with the economic policy that this Congress and administration put in place a year ago.

I would submit to my colleagues that there are three very good reasons not to go back to deficit spending. Number one is, and I think they are all equally important, but number one, the best way to continue our economic prosperity or economic boom that we experienced in the 1990s is to continue to run a surplus and to continue to pay down our Federal debt. Take pressure off the capital markets, interest rates stay low. The investment community, people who have money to invest will continue to have confidence that the economy is going to continue to be good and they will invest in it.

Secondly, I think the second reason is and certainly one some others have spoken about very eloquently is that when we borrow money to pay for programs that we want today, we are just mortgaging the future of our children and that is not fair. That really is an unfair thing to do.

Thirdly, certainly a situation that those of us here in Washington have been unable to face squarely is the Social Security issue. We all know that we are running surpluses in the Social Security trust fund now on an annual basis, but soon that will change. Within about 10 years we will not run an annual surplus in the Social Security trust fund. We will begin to draw out of that IOU that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) talked about that is in that box, and we know the box is not locked by now. We do.

We expect the baby boomers to retire, and our economists and forecasters tell us that there is going to be a tremendous amount of pressure on our Federal Treasury to meet the requirements under the current Social Security and Medicare law. We have to prepare that, and we have not done a good job of that. One of the things that I hope this administration and this Congress can do this year is begin to address the long-term Social Security reform.

I think the last issue that I would like to talk about is one of the debt lending. I think the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) has addressed it in a very adequate way; but I said on this floor last year, as others did, and

we heard arguments, as we presented our Blue Dog budget, which we thought was a good budget that would have kept us out of this mess that we are in now, some argued against that budget and ultimately defeated it on the basis that we would pay off the Federal debt too quickly, that this United States Government that would pay off, if we went into the surplus and began to pay down some of the debt, that we would pay off the debt too quickly and have to pay some kind of penalty. I wish we could even think that today.

The same folks who may have argued a year ago that we could not pay down the surplus because we might have to pay off the debt too quickly today might ask us to raise the debt ceiling. I have to agree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR). I am not going to vote to raise the Federal debt ceiling until we put a good plan in place. I think we need to go back, like we did in 1997, and the President and the administration and the congressional leaders need to sit together and we need to figure out how to get out of this mess together.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his work. I know that he and others have organized this event tonight; and I want to say to the leadership, the Republican and Democratic leadership, and to the administration, the Blue Dogs stand ready to work in a bipartisan way to help us find the solutions to these problems that we are facing today. We are ready. We have got a lot of good folks who understand that the country has many needs, who understand where its priorities are, and we want to work with the President and the congressional leadership to get those problems solved.

I yield back to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and thank him for allowing me to speak.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's remarks and appreciate his commitment to fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility. It does seem somewhat surprising that in just a year's time or less than a year that our Federal financial picture could have changed so much.

I think one of the most difficult things at work in this Congress today is to acknowledge that the circumstances have changed. There is going to be a resolution on the floor tomorrow. It is not a law. It does not have any effect. It is what we call a sense of the House. It is simply an effort by the Republican leadership to try to put folks on record as to whether or not they are committed to the tax cut that was passed last June.

I was pleased to be one who supported the tax cut last June, but I also understand that since last June we are now at war again. We are now in a posture where we are seeing record projections of deficits rather than surpluses, and I think even though all of us understand that we must not raise taxes

in the current recession, the long term does require an intelligent and a careful discussion of the direction this country has taken; and to blindly follow a path toward fiscal irresponsibility is going to result in debts on the backs of our children that all of us will be ashamed to see.

Our Federal debt, almost \$6 trillion today, is increasing daily because of the deficit spending, and as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) pointed out, the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has asked this Congress to raise the debt ceiling \$700 billion. We were told back last June that it would not be necessary to raise the Federal debt ceiling for at least 6 or 7 years; but all of a sudden, just before the Christmas recess, we were told that we are now going to have to raise the debt ceiling sometime in late February or early March.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), we do not need to vote to increase the national debt of this country, to raise the ceiling of that debt until we have some firm commitments regarding a return to fiscal responsibility. As we said earlier, if we continue along the path of the Republican's budget plans over the next 10 years, based on the best estimates we have from the Congressional Budget Office, we will increase the amount of interest that we pay on our national debt by a trillion dollars, over a trillion dollars.

There is a lot we could do with that trillion dollars. As I said, we could fund the President's defense budget request for 3 years straight if we could save that trillion dollars.

We already spend a billion dollars a day on interest on our Federal debt. We were told earlier that the war is costing us a billion dollars a month, contrast that, and it is very expensive to fight this war, and all of us believe we need to spend every dollar necessary to win this war; and it is currently costing us a billion dollars a day, but we are paying a billion dollars every time, billion dollars every month, but it is costing us a billion dollar every day just to pay the interest on our national debt.

□ 2115

Clearly, our national debt has grown too large. The interest consumes too much of our Federal budget, and we are going in the wrong direction.

If we had a trillion dollars in interest savings by not increasing our national debt, by proceeding on the path we were on and thought we were on last June, where we are not increasing the national debts and in fact were headed towards paying it off, we could take that trillion dollars and save it, and we could pay for 20 years of war at \$1 billion a month.

We are clearly moving back to deficit spending, to raiding Social Security, and toward reckless fiscal policies that our children will have to pay for some-

day. All we are asking of our Republican leaders and of the President is to be honest with the American people; to be sure that they are told the straight story and that they too understand that it is not just the men and women in uniform who are having to sacrifice and risk their lives in fighting this war, but that every American has a role to play and we all have to be willing to sacrifice.

Yes, we need to cut spending in areas where we can cut it. But when we sit down to draw up the Federal budget for the American family, we ought to do it just like we do at home, and that is we ought to measure our revenues and balance those against our expenses. And if we do not have enough income to cover our expenses, we need to cut our expenses and balance our budget. Washington has not learned that. Apparently, even after 3 years of returning to fiscal responsibility and having surpluses in our Federal budget, we once again are turning a blind eye to the importance of balancing our budget.

We believe that the President and the leadership of this House have a responsibility to submit to us a balanced budget and a plan to keep us on the road to fiscal responsibility. That is the only way to preserve the long-term prosperity for the American people. We want to look to the longer term, to be sure our children and grandchildren do not inherit the reckless fiscal policies of the current generation.

I thank the Blue Dog Democrats who have joined me on the floor tonight for this discussion on the importance of fiscal responsibility. I look forward to the opportunity to debate this issue in the days ahead as we continue to work to balance the budget and to pay down our debt and to protect the Social Security trust fund for the future.

In closing tonight, the Blue Dogs would like to close this hour in memory of Darlene Luther, the wife of our friend and colleague, Bill Luther. Both Bill and Darlene have been known throughout the years as public servants, a family that served their constituents, who worked hard together to make America a better place, and our hearts go out tonight to Bill and his family in the loss of Darlene.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of inclement weather and snow conditions canceling his flight.

Mr. HALL of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of airport delays in Dallas.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and February 6 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of weather delay.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the birth of his first child, Elizabeth Anne.

Mr. SHAW (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STARK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. ESHOO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. FARR of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HONDA, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. LOFGREN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. SANCHEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GANSKE, for 5 minutes, February 6 and 7.
 Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, February 6.
 Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, February 6.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BACHUS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on February 5, 2002 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 400. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Ronald Reagan Boyhood Home National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5338. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Capital; Leverage and Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Nonfinancial Equity Investments [Docket No. 02-01] (RIN: 1557-AB14) received January 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5339. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—International Banking Activities: Capital Equivalency Deposits [Docket No. 02-02] (RIN: 1557-AC05) received January 29, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5340. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of Section 112(I) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants and the Chemical Accident Prevention Provisions; Allegheny County; Health Department [PA001-1002; FRL-7135-3] received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5341. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of Section 112(I) Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants; City of Philadelphia; Department of Public Health Air Management Services [PA001-1001; FRL-7134-9] received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5342. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Final Determination that State has Corrected the Deficiencies in

California, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [CA 254-0318c; FRL-7132-1] received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5343. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [CA 254-0318a; FRL-7131-9] received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5344. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; States of Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska [FRL-7134-7] received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5345. A letter from the Associate Chief, Accounting Policy Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Billed Party Preference for InterLATA 0 Calls [CC Docket No. 92-77] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5346. A letter from the Acting Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Services to Support the Introduction of New Advanced Wireless Services, including Third Generation Wireless Systems [ET Docket No. 00-258]; Amendment of the U.S. Table of Frequency Allocations to Designate the 2500-2520/2670-2690 MHz Frequency Bands for the Mobile-Satellite Service [RM-9911] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5347. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 Of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of Paging Systems [WT Docket No. 96-18]; Implementation of Section 309(j) Of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding [PR Docket No. 93-253] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5348. A letter from the Acting Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Authorization and Use of Software Defined Radios [ET Docket No. 00-47] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5349. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Destin, Florida) [MM Docket No. 01-171, RM-10155] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5350. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Calumet, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 01-166, RM-10182] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5351. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau,

Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (New Orleans, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 01-164, RM-10135] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5352. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (International Falls and Chisholm, Minnesota) [MM Docket No. 01-87, RM-10092] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5353. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Nogales, Vail and Patagonia, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00-31, RM-9815, RM-10014, RM-10095] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5354. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Barnwell, South Carolina, and Pembroke, Douglas, Willacoche, Statesboro, Pulaski, East Dublin, Swainsboro and Twin City Georgia) [MM Docket No. 00-18, RM-9790] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5355. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Detroit Lakes and Barnesville, Minnesota, and Enderlin, North Dakota) [MM Docket No. 00-53, RM-9823, RM-9950] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5356. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Paonia and Olathe, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 98-188, RM-9346, RM-9656, RM-9657] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5357. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for *Carex lutea* (Golden Sedge) (RIN: 1018-AF68) received January 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5358. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 101901D] received January 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5359. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 120 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-23-AD; Amendment 39-12524; AD 2001-24-

08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5360. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332C, L, L1, and L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 99-SW-78-AD; Amendment 39-12560; AD 2001-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 24, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5361. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Criminal History Records Checks [Docket No. FAA-2001-10999; Amdt. Nos. 107-14 and 108-19] (RIN: 2120-AH53) received January 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5362. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Diseases Specific to Radiation-Exposed Veterans (RIN: 2900-AK64) received January 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

5363. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, ATF, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hard Cider, Semi-Generic Wine Designations, and Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Signs (97-2523) [T.D. ATF-470 RE: T.D. ATF-398, Notice No. 859, Notice No. 869, T.D. ATF-418, Notice No. 881 and T.D. ATF-430] received January 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 342. Resolution providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 107-356). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 343. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3394) to authorize funding for computer and network security research and development and research fellowship programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-357). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 3673. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to marine sanitation devices; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 3674. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to correct a technical error in the codification of title 36 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CROWLEY,

Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3675. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve the coverage of needy children under the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) and the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mrs. BONO):

H.R. 3676. A bill to amend titles V, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act to promote tobacco use cessation under the medicare program, the Medicare Program, and the maternal and child health program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 3677. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide new protections under applicable fiduciary rules for participants and beneficiaries under 401(k) plans and to provide for 3-year vesting of elective deferrals under such plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H.R. 3678. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act for certain construction engineering and design professionals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 3679. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of junk guns, also known as Saturday Night Specials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 3680. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require persons who make disbursements for certain electioneering communications and certain mass communications to file information with the Federal Election Commission regarding the source of the funds used for the disbursements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 3681. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make volunteer members of the Civil Air Patrol eligible for Public Safety Officer death benefits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3682. A bill to establish a living wage, jobs for all policy for all peoples in the United States and its territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Armed Services, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 3683. A bill to authorize the national Institute of Standards and Technology to assist in the development of reliable and valid tests for banned performance-enhancing substances and to establish a research program on the long-term consequences of the use of such performance-enhancing substances; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMMONS (for himself, Ms. HART, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 3684. A bill to amend the Social Security Act establish an outpatient prescription drug assistance program for low-income Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for educational expenses incurred for each qualifying child of the taxpayer in attending public or private elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. PICKERING, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 3686. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to nonprofit tax-exempt organizations for the purchase of ultrasound equipment to provide free examinations to pregnant women needing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. PENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BUYER, Ms. HART, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KING, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KERNS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. HOSTELLER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. BIGGERT and Mr. ROYCE):

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution recognizing the 91st birthday of Ronald Reagan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr.

WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COX, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. HART, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 312. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the scheduled tax relief provided for by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 passed by a bipartisan majority in Congress should not be suspended or repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CANTOR):

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the crash of Transporte Aereo Militar Ecuatoriano (TAME) Flight 120 on January 28, 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GRUCCI:

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution recognizing the members of AMVETS for their service to the Nation and supporting the goal of AMVETS National Charter Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 154: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 162: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 183: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 394: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 440: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 488: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 632: Ms. KILPATRICK and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 656: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 658: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 664: Mr. VITTER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. NORTHP.
 H.R. 747: Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 774: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 776: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 826: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 854: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 948: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 951: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 952: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 990: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SHOWS.
 H.R. 1172: Mrs. NORTHRUP.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1296: Mr. STUMP and Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 1307: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 1322: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. HOFFFEL.
 H.R. 1354: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1377: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 1421: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. REYES.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. KING, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. SCHAFER.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 1711: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DICKS.
 H.R. 1764: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1779: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1797: Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 1828: Mr. SNYDER.
 H.R. 1841: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 2037: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2074: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2207: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 2340: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2341: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 2484: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 2550: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2629: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 2674: Mr. FRANK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 2695: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2723: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2795: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 2817: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 2820: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 2822: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 2823: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 2824: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 2846: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 2931: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
 H.R. 3058: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3068: Mr. EHRlich.
 H.R. 3113: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. WATSON of CALIFORNIA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 3130: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 3149: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 3192: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr.

CULBERSON, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 3215: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 3229: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 3230: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 3231: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3236: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3238: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr.

LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3250: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3279: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3280: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3289: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3328: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3331: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3337: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3352: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3368: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3414: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 3424: Mr. MICA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3437: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 3450: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DICKS, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3475: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 3498: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3505: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HARMAN, Ms.

LOFGREN, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3524: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3565: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3569: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 3580: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3584: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3618: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3623: Mr. FRANK and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3634: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HART, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3626: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3644: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 3645: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 3661: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3670: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.J. Res. 23: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. PORTMAN.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. OBERSTAR and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 238: Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. COYNE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. BALDACCI.

H. Con. Res. 285: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SABO, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 290: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. McNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 305: Mr. NEY and Ms. DUNN.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 325: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FROST.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3394

OFFERED BY: Mr. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 13. MINORITY PARTICIPATION.

In carrying out the programs authorized by this Act and the amendments made by this Act, the Director and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall ensure that—

(1) at least 10 percent of the fellowships awarded to individuals are awarded to individuals who are a member of an underrepresented minority; and

(2) at least 5 percent of the grants made to institutions of higher education are made to historically black colleges and universities.