



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2002

No. 17

## House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 26, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

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

Lord God Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and every wonderful thing under the heavens, as the House of Representatives comes to order for legislative business today, we are mindful of our Jewish brothers and sisters as they "gather together with joy and happiness" for the feast of Purim.

The ancient prayer of Esther echoes in our prayer because of the circumstances surrounding our Nation now:

"Lord, our King, You alone are God. Help us. At times we feel alone and have no help but You. As children we learned from the people of this land and our founders that You, O Lord, chose us from among all peoples, and that You would fulfill all Your promises to them.

"Be mindful of us, O Lord, and manifest Yourself in this time of distress and give us courage.

"King of gods and ruler of every power, put in our mouths persuasive words. O God, more powerful than all, hear the voice of Your people in need. Save us from the power of the wicked and deliver us from all our fears."

In the end, Lord, You granted Your people victory and they rejoice to this very day. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PITTS 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.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3699. An act to revise certain grants for continuum of care assistance for homeless individual and families.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2646. An act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2646) "An Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

thereon, and appoints Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. HELMS, and Mr. COCHRAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 980. An act to provide for the improvement of the safety of child restraints in passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation.

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 14, 2002, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to represent the House of Representatives at wreath-laying ceremonies at the Washington Monument for the observance of George Washington's birthday held on Friday, February 22, 2002:

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

### PERMISSION TO INSERT PROGRAM AND REMARKS OF MEMBER REPRESENTING THE HOUSE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY CEREMONIES

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the program and the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), the Member representing the House of Representatives at the wreath-laying ceremony at

□ 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.

H525

the Washington Monument for the observance of George Washington's birthday on Friday, February 22, 2002, be inserted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON—THE 270TH  
CELEBRATION OF HIS BIRTH  
OPENING

Arnold Goldstein, Superintendent, National Capital Parks—Central, National Park Service.

PRESENTATION OF COLORS

Armed Forces Color Guard.

TO THE COLOR

The Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Arnold Goldstein.

RETIREMENT OF THE COLORS

WELCOME

Terry Carlstrom, Regional Director, National Park Service.

MUSICAL SELECTION

The Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps.

REMARKS

Fran Mainella, Director, National Park Service.

Honorable Roscoe G. Bartlett, Sixth District, Maryland, U.S. House of Representatives.

Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, Delegate, District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives.

James Symington, First Vice President, Washington National Monument Society.

PRESENTATION OF THE WREATHS

The Wreath of the U.S. House of Representatives, Honorable Roscoe Bartlett, Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton.

The Wreath of the Washington National Monument Society, James Symington, Terry Carlstrom.

The Wreath of the National Park Service, Director Fran Mainella, Arnold Goldstein.

TAPS

CONGRESSMAN ROSCOE G. BARTLETT (R-MD), CEREMONY IN HONOR OF THE BIRTHDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 22, 2002

I am honored to have the privilege of representing my colleagues in the Congress at this commemoration of the 270th anniversary of the birth of George Washington on February 22, 1732 on the grounds of the Washington Monument in Washington, DC.

When I was growing up and for many years after, George Washington was popularly known as the Father of Our Country. Our young people in school and each new influx of immigrants to our country were taught that to understand American ideals, American government and what made America a great country, you had to begin by learning about the character, the conduct and the contributions of George Washington. Among the many giants of our nation's founders, George Washington was the single most, indeed the dispensable individual who was both most responsible for an who personified the ideals of the radically new form of government—a democratic republic—for a new and fragile nation, the United States of America.

There would have been no Declaration of Independence—if George Washington had not led the successful effort to break the British siege of Boston in the Spring of 1767.

The American Revolution would not have succeeded without George Washington lead-

ing a ragtag Continental Army through eight arduous and harrowing years against the most powerful military in the world, that of Great Britain.

There would have been no Constitutional Convention and no Constitution—without George Washington leading it as its President and inspiration.

Our nation is being ably led by our 43rd President, George W. Bush. However, there would be no Presidency at all without George Washington is the only President of the United States ever elected unanimously—not just once, but twice.

There's an old saying that what's everybody's business is nobody's business.

In place of the study of George Washington and the celebration of "Washington's Birthday" has emerged the concept of "Presidents' Day."

Use of the term Presidents' Day insults the memory and ignores the contributions of George Washington. That is a disservice to all Americans, but especially to our young people and to the immigrants who come to America.

H.R. 420, a bill introduced by myself and my colleague, Tom Tancredo (R-CO), would require all federal government entities to refer to the federal holiday that falls on the third Monday in February by its legal name, Washington's birthday. The bill also calls upon the President to issue a proclamation each year recognizing the anniversary of the birthday of President Abraham Lincoln.

I would like to share a statement by Congressman Tancredo:

"America has been blessed with many great presidents, and none greater than George Washington. The framers of the Constitution may have created the office of the President, but George Washington created the presidency, and infused it with the power to stand as a symbol of America's awesome potential."

"This February 22nd marks the 270th anniversary of our first president's birth, and our bill will help ensure that the true meaning of the holiday our nation observes in February is not lost. H.R. 420 simply mandates that officials and publications of the United States Government refer to this holiday by its proper legal name—Washington's Birthday.

"Lastly, it urges the president to issue a proclamation each year officially recognizing the anniversary of the birth of another great American president—Abraham Lincoln".

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF  
MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE  
BOB SCHAFFER, MEMBER OF  
CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brandi Graham, Chief of Staff to the Honorable Bob SCHAFFER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 14, 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 of Representatives, that I have been served with a second civil subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

BRANDI GRAHAM,  
Chief of Staff to Congressman Bob Schaffer.

DANIEL PEARL

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, on the day we found out that Daniel Pearl was dead, the editors of the Wall Street Journal said, "His murder is an act of barbarism that makes a mockery of everything that Danny's kidnappers claimed to believe in.

"They claimed to be Pakistani nationalists, but their actions most surely bring shame to all true Pakistani patriots."

I think the editors of the Journal got it exactly right. Murder is never an act of patriotism, no matter what country one comes from.

Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf is doing everything he can to track down Mr. Pearl's killers. Our own President says he is confident that Pervez Musharraf is doing everything possible to find them.

Pervez Musharraf has proven that he is a reliable ally in our war on terrorism. He has proven it by tracking down terrorists, even when they are citizens of his own country.

Daniel Pearl, another totally innocent victim in this war on terrorism, died seeking the truth. Let us make sure he did not die in vain. Let us help Pervez Musharraf find his killers, stop terrorism, and bring peace and democracy to the struggling nations of this world.

CONVEYING SYMPATHY TO THE  
FAMILY OF DANIEL PEARL

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Chaplain this afternoon prayed that we might have persuasive words. Might I add my voice of outrage to the tragic and heinous killing of Daniel Pearl.

My sympathies to his family, my acknowledgment of his pregnant wife, and, as well, my sympathies to those of us who covet and love freedom.

Daniel Pearl died an outrageous and heinous and horrific and cruel death, and we must never forget that he stands for the expression of truth and the seeking of reconciliation. For that reason, we must bring the perpetrators of this violence to justice; and I would join with the administration, and I ask the Congress to join, as well, to ask that those who perpetrated this terrible act will be brought to justice in the United States of America.

Let us applaud the leadership of Pakistan, that they will pursue those to the very end. Let us not forget the message of Daniel Pearl and his wife, that reconciliation and peace, espousing freedom and justice throughout the world, is a valid value for the United States of America.

## AGRICULTURAL REFORM

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, the Senate recently passed their farm bill. In that farm bill, they had payment limitations that I think is the kind of farm policy we should have in this country.

I ask all my colleagues in this Chamber to support the idea of some kind of payment limitations, whether it be \$200,000 or \$300,000 or a half a million dollars, but something so that the megafarms and the megacorporations that own 50,000, 60,000, 80,000 acres are not capturing so much of the proceeds of our farm program payments.

Madam Speaker, there are some people who say that there are payment limits for price supports. There are no payment limits for price supports. They can do an end-run.

Let me just demonstrate the top five recipients of farm program payments for 1996 through 2000, according to the Environmental Working Group's Web site: Riceland Foods, \$49 million; Farmers Rice Co-op, \$38 million; Harvest States Co-op, \$28 million; Tyler Farms, \$23 million; and Producers Rice Mill, \$19 million.

It is reasonable to have farm policy that helps most of the farmers in this country. We can argue about what a family farm is, but what we cannot argue about is farm policy that gives most of the money to the megafarms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on each motion 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 postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6:30 p.m. today.

FAMILY SPONSOR IMMIGRATION  
ACT OF 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the acceptance of an affidavit of support from another eligible sponsor if the original sponsor has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that the original sponsor's classification petition should not be revoked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:  
Page 3, line 4, after "law," insert "sister-in-law, brother-in-law,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1892, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1892, the Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001, was introduced by the two gentlemen from California (Mr. CALVERT) and (Mr. ISSA).

I want to thank them for bringing to our attention an unintended quirk in the Immigration and Nationality Act that needlessly keeps families separated. I also want to thank them as well for developing this bill, which corrects the problem.

Each year, the United States provides hundreds of thousands of immigrant visas for spouses and other family members of U.S. citizens and permanent residents. Tragically, each year a number of these U.S. citizens and permanent residents petitioning for their family members will die before the immigration process is complete.

Generally, INS regulations provide for automatic revocation of a petition when the petitioner dies. The consequences are severe for a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has adjusted status or received an immigrant visa. If no other relative can qualify as a petitioner, then the beneficiary would lose the opportunity to become a permanent resident.

For instance, if a petition is revoked because a widowed citizen-father dies after petitioning for an adult unmarried daughter, the daughter would have no living mother to file a new petition. If another relative can file an immigrant visa petition for the beneficiary, that beneficiary would still go to the end of the line if the visa category was numerically limited.

For instance, if the daughter's mother was alive, she could file a new first family-preference petition. However, the daughter would lose her priority date based on the time her father's petition had been filed with the INS and would receive a later priority date based upon the filing date of her mother's petition.

Because of the severe consequences of the revocation of a visa petition, INS regulations do allow the Attorney Gen-

eral, in his or her discretion, to determine that, for humanitarian reasons, revocation would be inappropriate, and thus complete the unification of a family.

However, there is a complication. The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 requires that when a family member petitions for a relative to receive an immigrant visa, the visa can only be granted if the petitioner signs a legally-binding affidavit of support promising to provide support of the immigrant.

If the petitioner has died, obviously he or she cannot sign the affidavit. Thus even in cases where the Attorney General feels a humanitarian waiver of the revocation of the visa petition is warranted, under current law a permanent resident visa cannot be granted because the affidavit requirement is unfulfilled.

H.R. 1892 solves this dilemma. It simply provides that in cases where the petitioner has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that revocation of the petition would be inappropriate, a close family other than the petitioner would be allowed to sign the necessary affidavit of support.

Eligible family members in H.R. 1892, as it passed the House last July, would include spouses, parents, grandparents, mothers- and fathers-in-law, siblings, adult sons and daughters, adult sons and daughters-in-law, and grandchildren. Legal guardians would also be eligible.

The Senate passed a minor amendment to the bill to add brothers- and sisters-in-law, and this is the motion to concur in the amendment that is before the House today.

□ 1415

H.R. 1892 is humanitarian and pro-family. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1892 and thank the co-sponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT); and as well I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his astuteness and commitment to this legislation, having spearheaded its movement through the House the last time we were able to vote on it. I as well thank the ranking member for his commitment to these issues.

I believe that this is a legislative initiative that is extremely important because it speaks to the cornerstone of immigration policy in this Nation, and that is family reunification. In spite of all the tragedies that we have faced in the last year and reminding ourselves of the tragedy of September 11, I believe this Nation should never stray

away from the honest need to reunite families who legally want to access the opportunities of citizenship in this country.

Last July I supported this measure as it passed the House and the Senate. The Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001 is a very important immigration bill with a bipartisan support. We are correcting a glitch in the immigration law. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I was pleased to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the chairman of that subcommittee, on that legislation along with the original sponsor of this legislation as well. Again, I thank them for their service and their leadership.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act requires that the same person that petitions for the admission of an immigrant must be the same person who signs the affidavit of support. That person is called a sponsor. So if the sponsor dies, current law does not allow someone else to sign the affidavit of support, although they are a legitimate person, although there is no attempt to commit fraud; and that person is unable to adjust his or her status to receive an immigrant visa even though they have been waiting in a line, have a very procedurally correct manner, and adhering to laws of our Nation. There lies the problem. There lies the complete loss of your opportunity to seek citizenship in a legal manner.

Such consequence of the law toward a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has a chance to adjust status or receive an immigrant visa has been and continues to be harsh and only creates a pool of individuals that remain illegally in this country.

H.R. 1892 will amend the Immigration Nationality Act to allow an alternative sponsor, a close family member; and with the Senate amendment, a close family member can be a sister now or a brother-in-law.

Additionally, I am pleased that we were able to work out an agreement last July that further allows alternative sponsors to be a spouse, a parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sibling, child if at least 18 years of age, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, grandparent or grandchildren and now a brother-in-law or sister-in-law of a sponsored alien or legal guardian of a sponsored alien all with the idea of reunifying a family.

I am grateful to all of the members of the subcommittee, Democrats and Republicans, who saw fit to ensure that families can stay together. This bill, H.R. 1892, which has bipartisan support, is important because in the event of death of a sponsor, the beneficiary's application will now be able to have someone else sign the affidavit of support and the beneficiary's application for permanent residency can move forward without losing the beneficiary's

priority date, in essence, not having them go to the back of the line and, therefore, delaying them being reunited with their family.

Just think of moms and dads whose children are here, young children are here or the father and children are here or the mother and children are here and they want to reunite with that mother or father.

Madam Speaker, I believe this is an important initiative that we have done in a bipartisan way, and it speaks loudly to the fact that the United States will craft a very legitimate immigration policy that addresses the question that we are a country of laws, but we are also a country of immigrants.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1892, and I believe that it is a legislative initiative that speaks to the cornerstone of immigration policy in this Nation: family reunification. Last July I supported this measure as it passed the House and the Senate. The Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001 is a very important immigration bill. With bipartisan support, we are correcting a glitch in the immigration law. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I was pleased to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the chairman of the subcommittee, on this legislation, along with the original sponsors of this legislation as well, and I thank them for their service and leadership.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act requires that the same person that petitions for the admission of an immigrant must be the same person who signs the affidavit of support: the sponsor, that person is called. So, if the sponsor dies, current law does not allow someone else to sign the affidavit of support, although they are a legitimate person, although there is no attempt to commit fraud, and that person is unable to adjust his or her status to receive an immigrant visa, even though they have been waiting in a line in a very procedurally correct manner and adhering to the laws of our Nation. Such consequences of the law toward a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has a chance to adjust status or receive an immigrant visa, has been and continues to be too harsh.

H.R. 1892 will amend the Immigration Nationality Act to allow an alternative sponsor, a close family member, and with the Senate amendment a close family member can be a sister or brother-in-law.

Additionally, I am very pleased that we were able to work out an agreement last July that further allows alternative sponsors to be a spouse, parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sibling, child, if at least 18 years of age, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, grandparent or grandchild, and now a brother or sister-in-law of a sponsored alien or legal guardians of a sponsored alien, all with the idea of reunifying a family.

This bill, H.R. 1892, which has bipartisan support, is important because in the event of the death of the sponsor the beneficiary's application will now be able to have someone else sign the affidavit of support and the beneficiary's application for permanent residency can move forward without losing the beneficiary's priority date, in essence, not having

them go to the back of the line and, therefore, delaying them being reunited with their family.

Madam Speaker, I believe this is an important initiative that we have done in a bipartisan way, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1892, Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001, as amended in the Senate. I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER); our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS); the leadership on both sides of the aisle that worked diligently to bring a fuller and more complete reform to the floor here today.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is not on the committee but who has constituents that were faced with exactly this problem and brought it to our attention, only to find that I had constituents with this exact same problem, thus creating the need for the bill.

Last I would like to thank Senator FEINSTEIN who has taken time out of her busy schedule on the Senate side to research this and to make those amendments which, in fact, make this a more thorough bill and less likely to need to be revisited.

Lastly, rather than speaking of the merits of this bill, I would like to go down on record as saying that the Family Sponsor Immigration Reform Act is just another example of how we work together on a bipartisan basis to find the legal alternatives to immigration, and to encourage those who play by the rules, those who go through the hoops, sometimes a decade, to get their legal status should be rewarded.

At a time when we are saying to those who come here illegally that we will not tolerate it any more, I hope this is the first of many reforms that allows us to say we have an open door if you want to come through the front door, and we are closing and locking the back door.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude by again acknowledging my support, but also raising two important points that I would like to acknowledge. I might say that the chairman of the full committee has expressed a great interest in this, and I want to thank him for his support on these issues.

I hope that we can finally bring some rest to the passage of 245-i which is another legislative initiative that deals with the reuniting of families. I know that our committee worked very hard on that legislation.

Then I think, again, in the shadow of the tragedies that we faced this past September, it is important that we

move consistently with a purpose to re-order our immigration policies by means of restructuring the INS with an assistant attorney general for immigration affairs so that we can share data and information. Intelligence is clearly a key element of what we need to reform our immigration policies and to fight terrorism, two dual issues which I think we can do.

Immigration does not equate to terrorism. I hope we have an opportunity to debate those legislative initiatives, get them passed, and begin on a pathway of formulating a very comprehensive immigration policy for the United States of America. I offer my support for this legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, today I support and applaud the House's final passage of the "Family Immigration Sponsor Act." And, I thank my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, for his work on this issue.

A family in my district, with a tragic story, has become a well-known example of why this bill's passage is necessary. Mrs. Zhenfu Ge, a 73-year-old Chinese national, came to the United States in 1998 to help care for her dying daughter and her daughter's children. Her daughter—my constituent Yanyu Wong—requested that her mother be allowed to stay in America to take care of her grandchildren. Following the rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), my constituent immediately submitted the appropriate paperwork to sponsor her mother's petition for a green card so she could stay in the United States.

Sadly, on April 15, 2001, Yanyu Wong lost her fight against cancer. This was only 11 days before the INS was scheduled to grant Mrs. Ge's permanent resident status. In a desperate attempt to keep his mother-in-law in the country, my constituent's husband petitioned to be Mrs. Ge's new sponsor. However, INS law mandates the sponsor be another adult blood relative. Without an adult blood relative left alive to sponsor her, Mrs. Ge was told that she must go back to China and restart the visa process.

Realizing the devastating results of these circumstances, I introduced H.R. 2011, a private bill to allow Mrs. Ge to remain legally in the United States while she completed the process to attain legal status. Forcing Mrs. Ge to abandon her family during this time would only add to the family tragedy. Enabling Mrs. Ge to stay in the country could give the children a living link to their mother, and her culture, something they would be denied forever if Mrs. Ge is deported.

With the passage of Representative CALVERT's Family Immigration Sponsor Act, Mrs. Ge will be able to stay in America and take care of her grandchildren, while she completes the immigration process. With the passage of this bill, Mrs. Ge can keep her promise to her daughter.

There's no doubt that the Family Immigration Sponsor Act will be able to assist other families in situations similar to Mrs. Ge's. Passing H.R. 1892 is the smart way for this country to help encourage families to stay intact.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1892, the Family Sponsor Immigration Act, introduced by my colleague Representative KEN CALVERT.

Our government plays a key role in shaping the lives of thousands of immigrants. It is our duty to ensure that our system is fair to aspiring residents.

Under our current law, someone applying to become a permanent U.S. resident must be sponsored by a family member who assumes financial responsibility for that person. However, if the sponsor dies before U.S. permanent residency is granted, the applicant must find another sponsor and start the process all over again. This process can take as long as 7 years.

This must change.

As an immigrant, I understand the difficulties of the immigration process. One should not have to wait another 7 years if the sponsor dies. H.R. 1892 addresses this issue. It would allow for substitute sponsors. More importantly, it will help unite families that have been separated.

I applaud Representative CALVERT for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my fellow colleagues to join in support of this bill which will ensure a fair process for those seeking U.S. residency.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1892.

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. Madam 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.

#### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2002

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1206) to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1206

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

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2002".

##### SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

(a) THIS ACT.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) to ensure that the people and businesses of the Appalachian region have the knowledge, skills, and access to telecommunication and technology services necessary to compete in the knowledge-based economy of the United States.

(b) APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.—Section 2 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the third sentence the following: "Consistent with the goal described in the preceding sentence, the Appalachian region should be able to take advantage of eco-industrial development, which promotes both employment and economic growth and the preservation of natural resources."; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting "including eco-industrial development technologies" before the semicolon.

##### SEC. 3. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

Section 102(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by inserting "and support," after "formation of";

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(9) encourage the use of eco-industrial development technologies and approaches; and  
 "(10) seek to coordinate the economic development activities of, and the use of economic development resources by, Federal agencies in the region."

##### SEC. 4. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON APPALACHIA.

Section 104 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking "The President" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—The President"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON APPALACHIA.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall establish an interagency council to be known as the 'Interagency Coordinating Council on Appalachia'.

"(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall be composed of—

"(A) the Federal Cochairman, who shall serve as Chairperson of the Council; and

"(B) representatives of Federal agencies that carry out economic development programs in the region."

##### SEC. 5. TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.

Title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after section 202 the following:

##### "SEC. 203. TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may provide technical assistance, make grants, enter into contracts, or otherwise provide funds to persons or entities in the region for projects—

"(1) to increase affordable access to advanced telecommunications, entrepreneurship, and management technologies or applications in the region;

"(2) to provide education and training in the use of telecommunications and technology;

"(3) to develop programs to increase the readiness of industry groups and businesses in the region to engage in electronic commerce; or

“(4) to support entrepreneurial opportunities for businesses in the information technology sector.

“(b) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this section may be provided—

“(A) exclusively from amounts made available to carry out this section; or

“(B) from amounts made available to carry out this section in combination with amounts made available under any other Federal program or from any other source.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN OTHER LAWS.—Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share under any other Federal program, amounts made available to carry out this section may be used to increase that Federal share, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

“(c) COST SHARING FOR GRANTS.—Not more than 50 percent (or 80 percent in the case of a project to be carried out in a county for which a distressed county designation is in effect under section 226) of the costs of any activity eligible for a grant under this section may be provided from funds appropriated to carry out this section.”

#### SEC. 6. ENTREPRENEURSHIP INITIATIVE.

Title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after section 203 (as added by section 5) the following:

##### “SEC. 204. ENTREPRENEURSHIP INITIATIVE.

“(a) DEFINITION OF BUSINESS INCUBATOR SERVICE.—In this section, the term ‘business incubator service’ means a professional or technical service necessary for the initiation and initial sustainment of the operations of a newly established business, including a service such as—

“(1) a legal service, including aid in preparing a corporate charter, partnership agreement, or basic contract;

“(2) a service in support of the protection of intellectual property through a patent, a trademark, or any other means;

“(3) a service in support of the acquisition and use of advanced technology, including the use of Internet services and Web-based services; and

“(4) consultation on strategic planning, marketing, or advertising.

“(b) PROJECTS TO BE ASSISTED.—The Commission may provide technical assistance, make grants, enter into contracts, or otherwise provide funds to persons or entities in the region for projects—

“(1) to support the advancement of, and provide, entrepreneurial training and education for youths, students, and businesspersons;

“(2) to improve access to debt and equity capital by such means as facilitating the establishment of development venture capital funds;

“(3) to aid communities in identifying, developing, and implementing development strategies for various sectors of the economy; and

“(4)(A) to develop a working network of business incubators; and

“(B) to support entities that provide business incubator services.

“(c) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this section may be provided—

“(A) exclusively from amounts made available to carry out this section; or

“(B) from amounts made available to carry out this section in combination with amounts made available under any other Federal program or from any other source.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN OTHER LAWS.—Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share under any other Federal program, amounts made available to carry out this section may

be used to increase that Federal share, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

“(d) COST SHARING FOR GRANTS.—Not more than 50 percent (or 80 percent in the case of a project to be carried out in a county for which a distressed county designation is in effect under section 226) of the costs of any activity eligible for a grant under this section may be provided from funds appropriated to carry out this section.”

#### SEC. 7. REGIONAL SKILLS PARTNERSHIPS.

Title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after section 204 (as added by section 6) the following:

##### “SEC. 205. REGIONAL SKILLS PARTNERSHIPS.

“(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a consortium that—

“(1) is established to serve 1 or more industries in a specified geographic area; and

“(2) consists of representatives of—

“(A) businesses (or a nonprofit organization that represents businesses);

“(B) labor organizations;

“(C) State and local governments; or

“(D) educational institutions.

“(b) PROJECTS TO BE ASSISTED.—The Commission may provide technical assistance, make grants, enter into contracts, or otherwise provide funds to eligible entities in the region for projects to improve the job skills of workers for a specified industry, including projects for—

“(1) the assessment of training and job skill needs for the industry;

“(2) the development of curricula and training methods, including, in appropriate cases, electronic learning or technology-based training;

“(3)(A) the identification of training providers; and

“(B) the development of partnerships between the industry and educational institutions, including community colleges;

“(4) the development of apprenticeship programs;

“(5) the development of training programs for workers, including dislocated workers; and

“(6) the development of training plans for businesses.

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—An eligible entity may use not more than 10 percent of the funds made available to the eligible entity under subsection (b) to pay administrative costs associated with the projects described in subsection (b).

“(d) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Assistance under this section may be provided—

“(A) exclusively from amounts made available to carry out this section; or

“(B) from amounts made available to carry out this section in combination with amounts made available under any other Federal program or from any other source.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN OTHER LAWS.—Notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the Federal share under any other Federal program, amounts made available to carry out this section may be used to increase that Federal share, as the Commission determines to be appropriate.

“(e) COST SHARING FOR GRANTS.—Not more than 50 percent (or 80 percent in the case of a project to be carried out in a county for which a distressed county designation is in effect under section 226) of the costs of any activity eligible for a grant under this section may be provided from funds appropriated to carry out this section.”

#### SEC. 8. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA.

(a) ELIMINATION OF GROWTH CENTER CRITERIA.—Section 224(a)(1) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “in an area de-

termined by the State have a significant potential for growth or”.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO DISTRESSED COUNTIES AND AREAS.—Section 224 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) ASSISTANCE TO DISTRESSED COUNTIES AND AREAS.—For fiscal year 2003 and each fiscal year thereafter, not less than 50 percent of the amount of grant expenditures approved by the Commission shall support activities or projects that benefit severely and persistently distressed counties and areas.”

#### SEC. 9. GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS.

Section 302(a)(1)(A)(i) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting “(or, at the discretion of the Commission, 75 percent of such expenses in the case of a local development district that has a charter or authority that includes the economic development of a county or part of a county for which a distressed county designation is in effect under section 226)” after “such expenses”.

#### SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 401 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts authorized by section 201 and other amounts made available for the Appalachian development highway system program, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out this Act—

“(1) \$88,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004;

“(2) \$90,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and

“(3) \$92,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

“(b) TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.—Of the amounts made available under subsection (a), the following amounts may be made available to carry out section 203:

“(1) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

“(2) \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

“(3) \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2006.

“(c) AVAILABILITY.—Sums made available under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.”

#### SEC. 11. ADDITION OF COUNTIES TO APPALACHIAN REGION.

Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the third undesignated paragraph (relating to Kentucky)—

(A) by inserting “Edmonson,” after “Cumberland,”;

(B) by inserting “Hart,” after “Harlan,”; and

(C) by striking “Montgomery,” and inserting “Montgomery,”; and

(2) in the fifth undesignated paragraph (relating to Mississippi)—

(A) by inserting “Montgomery,” after “Monroe,”; and

(B) by inserting “Panola,” after “Oktibbeha.”

#### SEC. 12. TERMINATION.

Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “2001” and inserting “2006”.

#### SEC. 13. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 101(b) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the third sentence by striking “implementing investment program” and inserting “strategy statement”.

(b) Section 106(7) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C.

App.) is amended by striking "expiring no later than September 30, 2001".

(c) Sections 202, 214, and 302(a)(1)(C) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) are amended by striking "grant-in-aid programs" each place it appears and inserting "grant programs".

(d) Section 202(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the second sentence by striking "title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291-291o), the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (77 Stat. 282)," and inserting "title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291 et seq.), the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15001 et seq.)."

(e) Section 207(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "section 221 of the National Housing Act, section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949," and inserting "section 221 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715f), section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f), section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485)."

(f) Section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "GRANT-IN-AID" and inserting "GRANT";

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "grant-in-aid Act" each place it appears and inserting "Act";

(B) in the first sentence, by striking "grant-in-aid Acts" and inserting "Acts";

(C) by striking "grant-in-aid program" each place it appears and inserting "grant program"; and

(D) by striking the third sentence;

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'Federal grant program' means any Federal grant program authorized by this Act or any other Act that provides assistance for—

"(A) the acquisition or development of land;

"(B) the construction or equipment of facilities; or

"(C) any other community or economic development or economic adjustment activity.

"(2) INCLUSIONS.—In this section, the term 'Federal grant program' includes a Federal grant program such as a Federal grant program authorized by—

"(A) the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.);

"(B) the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.);

"(C) the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

"(D) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.);

"(E) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

"(F) title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291 et seq.);

"(G) sections 201 and 209 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141, 3149);

"(H) title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

"(I) part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390 et seq.).

"(3) EXCLUSIONS.—In this section, the term 'Federal grant program' does not include—

"(A) the program for construction of the Appalachian development highway system authorized by section 201;

"(B) any program relating to highway or road construction authorized by title 23, United States Code; or

"(C) any other program under this Act or any other Act to the extent that a form of financial assistance other than a grant is authorized."; and

(4) by striking subsection (d).

(g) Section 224(a)(2) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "relative per capita income" and inserting "per capita market income".

(h) Section 225 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.)—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking "development program" and inserting "development strategies"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking "development programs" and inserting "development strategies".

(i) Section 303 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "INVESTMENT PROGRAMS" and inserting "STRATEGY STATEMENTS";

(2) in the first sentence, by striking "implementing investments programs" and inserting "strategy statements"; and

(3) by striking "implementing investment program" each place it appears and inserting "strategy statement".

(j) Section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the next-to-last undesignated paragraph by striking "Committee on Public Works and Transportation" and inserting "Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, we are back here today to consider legislation that reauthorizes the Appalachian Regional Commission. On August 2 of last year, the House unanimously passed H.R. 2501, the Appalachian Regional Development Reauthorization Act of 2001. The legislation we are considering today, S. 1206, is very similar to the previously passed House bill with a few minor exceptions.

Both the House and the Senate legislation recognize the diligent efforts of the Appalachian Regional Commission to implement reforms required by the 1998 reauthorization that authorized the commission for 5 years.

The Appalachian Regional Commission includes 406 counties in 13 States; 117 of those counties are considered to be distressed under ARC's definition of economic conditions. This means the 117 counties have a 3-year unemployment rate of at least 150 percent of the national average, a per capita market income of no more than two-thirds the national average, and a poverty rate of at least 150 percent of the national rate.

Historically, the Appalachian region has faced high levels of poverty and economic distress resulting from geo-

graphic isolation and inadequate infrastructure. Since 1965, through its unique Federal, State, local and private partnerships, the ARC has worked to improve economic and living conditions through area-development programs. ARC funds are directed to locally developed projects that address basic water and sewer infrastructure needs, business and entrepreneurial development, education and workforce training, and improved health.

These programs provide technical assistance and capacity-building as well as improving telecommunications and information technology to foster sustainable economic development.

ARC's assistance continues to be a crucial part of the region's economy and has enabled it to adjust to the elimination of major industries by identifying alternatives to provide jobs and attract outside investment.

Like the previously passed House bill, S. 1206 assists ARC in completing its important mission by requiring 50 percent of ARC project funds go to distressed counties and areas by creating a council to coordinate Federal economic development assistance in the region by assisting affordable access to technology and telecommunications through a new program initiative and by lowering the administrative costs for local development districts that include a distressed county.

The committee has worked very closely with the administration and the other body to produce a bipartisan and widely supported bill.

On that note, Madam Speaker, I want to extend personal thanks to Senator VOINOVICH of Ohio and his staff in the other body for working with us as we attempted to resolve the differences between the House-passed bill and the Senate bill that we are considering today.

I am happy to say that the passage of S. 1206 today will clear the measure to be sent to the President for his signature. I support the bill. I do want to commend and thank the leadership of our full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member; also the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), who is not with us today but an outstanding ranking member of our subcommittee. We are honored to have our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) with us today.

On the majority side, there are two Members who really contributed mightily to the effort as this bill moved through the House and now as we consider the Senate bill: first, a new member of our committee and our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), who came to me very early in her term and early in this session of Congress and indicated that the reauthorization of the Appalachian Regional Commission was one of her top, if not her top, legislative priority in this Congress. She has

been instrumental in making sure that this bill has gotten to where it is today. I want to publicly thank her.

Also to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), who had additional counties that he sought to have represented by ARC, and he was like the proverbial tick on a dog making sure that that language withstood the discussions between the House and the Senate, and today S. 1206 bears the fruit of the gentleman's endeavors, and we are appreciative of his work as well.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would first like to commend my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his diligence in moving this legislation through the House. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, who provided invaluable help and assistance in advancing the bill through the legislative process.

Madam Speaker, S. 1206, the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2002, authorizes appropriations for the Appalachian Regional Commission for 5 years.

The commission works to ensure the people and businesses of the Appalachian region have the knowledge, skills, and access to telecommunications and technology services necessary to compete in the knowledge-based economy of the United States.

The bill authorizes the President to establish an interagency coordinating council on Appalachia. Further, it establishes a telecommunications and technology initiative and an entrepreneurship initiative. These two initiatives are geared toward increasing access to not only telecommunications and technology, but also to providing access to business incubator services and to initiate sustainable businesses.

□ 1430

The bill also promotes regional skills partnerships.

In June, 2000, the Appalachian Regional Commission issued a report that documented the return the American taxpayer gets for its investment in the Appalachian region. \$32.4 million in ARC funding for infrastructure produced 23,777 direct jobs and an estimated 20,954 indirect jobs. This same investment produced \$576.9 million in wages and \$14.3 million in State income taxes.

In my congressional district, the ARC approved a grant totaling \$350,000 to the Schuylkill Economic Development Corporation for improvements to the Schuylkill Highbridge Business

Park that is expected to result in the creating of 600 new jobs and the generation of over \$40 million in private sector investment.

Just as it has done since its inception, the ARC has proven it provides a fair return, both socially and economically, for the Federal Government's investment.

Madam Speaker, the Appalachian Regional Commission works. It has built a successful business strategy on a regional approach and serves as a model for other Federal, State and regional development partnerships.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill and urge my colleagues to join me in passing S. 1206.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield as much time as she might consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), who was instrumental in crafting this legislation.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1206, and I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN), for their whole-hearted support not only of my efforts in seeing this come to the floor today but in bringing it to the floor.

As a native of West Virginia, the only State that falls entirely within the bounds of the Appalachian Regional Commission's borders, I stand here today to recognize and applaud the tremendous work this economic development body performs to enhance Appalachia's economic landscape and to foster job growth.

America's investment in the ARC has accomplished great things in my home State of West Virginia to improve infrastructure and diversify local economies. These efforts will continue to foster better health care, workforce training, telecommunications and job creation.

Additionally, it has been shown that completed ARC projects generate higher than expected tax revenues for local and State economies. And with ARC reauthorization, these programs will have the added stability and long-term financial security that will bring about expanded economic development for our future.

Recent reports have indicated that every dollar of Federal funding for ARC leverages about \$58 more in private investment and traditional financing through local, State and Federal partnerships. But my support for the ARC is not only based on documented statistics. It is also based on my own personal experience working with the various regional development groups.

Just last year, the town of Wardensville, West Virginia, contacted me regarding the need for immediate assistance with the damaged sewer system. I contacted the ARC and was able to secure the necessary emergency funding which allowed the town to re-

pair the damage almost immediately. This is merely one example that typifies the numerous and diverse ways in which the ARC assists local communities.

As a side note, I would like to say 11 of the 20 counties that I represent in West Virginia are considered distressed economies in ARC's terminologies.

Whether it is building new roads, providing employee training or assisting local communities with flood damage, the ARC has proven itself to be a tremendous asset for West Virginia and the rest of the region.

I am especially grateful to the ARC for its commitment to improving the lives of my fellow West Virginians. As Congress seeks ways to enhance the livelihoods of not only West Virginians but also of all people of Appalachia, we must recognize the contributions of the ARC and immediately reauthorize it.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1206, the measure that we are considering at present.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation.

I know that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) wanted to be here to speak on this bill. I again, for the purposes of the RECORD, one of the county's names that escapes me, but I know that every time I saw the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) he wanted Edmondson County, Edmondson County, Edmondson County included in this piece of legislation. It is included in this legislation thanks to his efforts, and the folks in Edmondson County should be thankful for his endeavors.

With that, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that the House will pass S. 1206, the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2002" today. This bill is nearly identical to HR 2501, a bill to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) that we passed in the House on August 2, 2001. The ARC gives grants to build highways, water and sewer systems, industrial parks and to develop health care programs and educational workforce training in distressed areas.

I am pleased that HR 2501 originated in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, of which I am a Member. I am also pleased that my constituent, Mike Whitt, the Executive Director of the Mingo County, West Virginia, Redevelopment Authority, testified on June 20, 2001, before the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management.

Mr. Whitt gave case studies of how ARC programs make a positive difference in the

lives of the people of West Virginia. When Mike Whitt testified, he told of how the ARC gave financial help to create the James H. Buck Harless Wood Products Industrial Park that was developed on a reclaimed strip mine site. This created 90 new jobs for my constituents to manufacture value added wood products.

In addition, the ARC gave Mingo County a big boost by helping its people get in to the aquaculture industry.

In the mid-90s, ARC funded a study conducted by the Freshwater Institute of abandoned mine waters in West Virginia. Mingo County and neighboring Logan County were identified as having water with enough volume and quality to generate 25–30 million pounds of arctic char—a fish belonging to the salmon family.

Mingo County has begun hatching fish in these mine waters. Then they ship the minnows to a grow-out farm in Logan County. This project has created nine new jobs so far for local residents, and Mr. Whitt projects about 40 additional new jobs will be created in the aquaculture industry for local residents.

Best of all, Mingo and Logan Counties are the only counties in West Virginia that will ship fresh arctic char to Boston's seafood market—and the ARC study of abandoned mine waters gave them their start.

Finally, regarding tourism, Mike Whitt was able to help to develop the Hatfield-McCoy Trails Recreation Project with the help of a \$100,000 grant from the ARC.

The Hatfield-McCoy Trail has become really popular with hikers. It has boosted travel and tourism in Mingo County. Motels that never had guests over the weekend are now filling up on weekends. Again, the ARC seed money for the project gave the Hatfield-McCoy Trail help with its development.

So we have an industrial park, aquaculture and tourism coming to Mingo County, thanks to ARC's helping hand, when previously Mingo County's residents relied almost solely on the coal mines for a job.

Mingo County is still on the ARC's list of distressed counties. The ARC is helping Mingo County to diversify, with funds to back up projects, and working hand-in-hand with good people like Mike Whitt, whose goal is to take Mingo County off the ARC distressed counties list.

The entire state of West Virginia is included in the ARC jurisdiction, along with parts of 12 other states ranging from the far North of the Deep South: New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi.

Today's bill will authorize \$446 million for ARC programs from fiscal years 2002–2006. Because two of my goals in Congress are to bridge the digital divide and to create jobs, I am pleased that the bill includes a Telecommunications and Information Technology Initiative and an emphasis on boosting job skills.

First of all, the Telecommunications and Information Technology initiative is authorized for \$33 million from fiscal years 2002–2006 in order to develop the telecommunications infrastructure in Appalachia, so that rural and small towns will not be left behind in the Information Age.

This means that students in West Virginia, and all of Appalachia, will have remote access to course materials that previously were only available in more affluent, urban areas.

For job creation, S. 1206 provides that the ARC can enter into partnerships with educational institutions, non-for-profit organizations, state and local governments and unions to provide job training to boost the local economy in West Virginia and throughout Appalachia.

Finally, S. 1206 contains an "Entrepreneurship Regional Initiative" to help local entrepreneurs throughout Appalachia to start and expand local businesses. This will be done by providing local business persons with more capital and education and training.

Madam Speaker, the ARC is a true example of results and has been a model for developing other organizations to help citizens like the Delta Regional Authority which serves 236 counties in federal-state partnerships in eight states: Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri and Tennessee.

The reason the ARC has been used as a model is because, through its programs, the ARC has helped people to help themselves by giving them a start in health care, education, business development, and in building highways and water and sewer infrastructures, along with bridging the digital divide, which is so vital in today's world.

I could not be more pleased that the House will pass this bill today, and I look forward to the seeing the president sign the bill expeditiously.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1206.

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.

#### EXPRESSING SYMPATHY TO PEOPLE OF DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 304) expressing sympathy to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who were tragically affected by the eruption of the Nyiragongo volcano on January 17, 2002, and supporting an increase in the amount of assistance provided by the United States to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 304

Whereas on January 17, 2002, the Nyiragongo volcano, which stands 11,380 feet high and is located 6 miles north of the city of Goma in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, began to erupt without warning;

Whereas 147 people lost their lives and 150,000 people have been displaced as a result of the recent Nyiragongo eruption;

Whereas the recent Nyiragongo eruption is the most destructive volcanic eruption to occur in Africa during the last 25 years;

Whereas the lava flow from the recent Nyiragongo eruption was a mile wide in

places and destroyed the cathedral and water plant of Goma and countless villages and buildings;

Whereas dangers from fires, toxic fumes, reoccurring tremors, and natural methane gas under Lake Kivu continue to plague the Goma region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Whereas the recent Nyiragongo eruption destroyed crops and contaminated the main water supply of Goma;

Whereas the suddenness of the recent Nyiragongo eruption resulted in the separation of many children from their parents;

Whereas the United States has provided assistance valued at \$4,400,000 for food, water, sanitation, and town planning to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo affected by the recent Nyiragongo eruption;

Whereas the Office of United States Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has made available additional funds for assistance to the people affected by the recent Nyiragongo eruption; and

Whereas the Governments of the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Belgium have also offered assistance to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That Congress expresses its deepest sympathies and condolences to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who were tragically affected by the eruption of the Nyiragongo volcano on January 17, 2002.

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

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

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

This resolution is sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), two Members of the House Subcommittee on Africa which I chair, and this expression of support deserves the support of the House.

On January 17, the Nyiragongo volcano erupted and spewed white-hot lava on Goma, a city on the shores of Lake Kivu in eastern Congo; and that eruption disrupted the lives of one-half million people. Over 100 people lost their lives in the initial stage, 150,000 were displaced by the lava flow, and that lava flow was a mile wide in some places. Then the eruption destroyed the water plant, the homes, part of the airport, the crops and an important part of the business district. This natural catastrophe increased the already dire humanitarian situation of a people

suffering from the impact of the war that started in Goma on August 2, 1988, and then spread throughout the country.

The United States moved quickly to aid the people affected by the volcanic eruption, the most devastating eruption in Africa in more than a quarter century. We have provided over \$4 million in assistance. This includes food, sanitation, town planning and seismographic analysis to determine if there was any danger of another volcanic eruption.

The U.S. contribution was part of an international response that included coordinated support from the United Kingdom, from Germany, from France and Belgium. This resolution supports this aid.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First, I want to thank our subcommittee chair, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for his leadership and his support on all the issues which we deal with as it relates to Africa; and I would like to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for introducing this very important and very compassionate resolution; and I urge all of our colleagues here today to support its passage.

This resolution offers our condolences to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who were tragically affected by the eruption of the Nyiragongo volcano on January 17.

Madam Speaker, before dawn on January 17, the volcano, located 60 miles north of the city of Goma in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, began to erupt without warning. This volcano, the eruption was really the most destructive to occur in Africa during the last 25 years. The lava flow from the eruption was a mile wide in places and destroyed a major cathedral, the water plant of Goma and countless buildings and surrounding villages.

Dangers from fires, toxic fumes, reoccurring tremors and natural methane gas under Lake Kivu plagued Goma after the first tremors ceased.

Madam Speaker, according to the United States Agency for International Development and the United Nations, a total of 400,000 Goma residents, 400,000, were affected by this eruption; 147 people died and more than 150,000 residents lost their homes.

The eruption destroyed crops and contaminated the main water supply which threatened to trigger a cholera epidemic.

The suddenness of the recent Nyiragongo eruption also resulted in the separation of many children from their parents. This is really a humanitarian disaster of enormous potential.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. Dieudonne Wafula, a Congolese volcanologist, who predicted the

volcano's eruption and actually sent e-mails to experts around the world, including to our own country, one week before the lava began flowing on January 17. His work was very integral to setting up an international survey team to monitor the behavior of the volcano after the major eruption, thereby avoiding a further calamity to the residents of Goma.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to commend the United States Agency for International Development for its very swift response to this crisis. Monetary support, relief commodities, including blankets, water jugs, water stations, dust masks, seismographic equipment and emergency food aid, were among the relief support provided by our government. The total value of that assistance to date is near \$4.4 million.

We have responded in a good way to the crisis suffered by the people of Goma. Many residents in that poor region live on less than \$1 per day and really had no way to deal with the immediate tragedy caused by the volcano. I am pleased that the United States government, through our development agency, was there to help.

Madam Speaker, now the immediate crisis has passed, but the lingering effects may require further cooperation between the United States, USAID and the United Nations and other government agencies. So I trust that we will be willing to step up to the plate should the need exist and we are called upon to help.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 304; and, Madam Speaker, I want to once again commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for bringing this to the attention not only of this body but of the entire country.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the congressman who has introduced this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank first of all the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express concern, sorrow and sympathy for the victims of the volcanic eruption in Goma, Congo, on January 17, 2002.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), an original cosponsor, for their support and efforts in getting this resolution to the floor.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), also an original cosponsor, for their constant support and assistance on this resolution and other issues concerning the people of Africa.

In the early hours of January 17, 2002, the massive volcano Nyiragongo exploded, creating three deadly lava paths, each estimated to be approximately a mile wide, which instantly destroyed homes, buildings and innocent life that crossed its path.

□ 1445

After the volcanic eruption ended, the dangers did not cease for the people of Goma. Earthquakes followed by tremors and heavy rains extended the misery. Almost a week later, hope began to emerge in the Goma region. The experts announced that the eruption had stopped. The water supply that was feared to be contaminated by volcanic ash was declared safe, although the water distribution system was only up to 50 percent of its capacity. The aid workers, who were forced to wait due to the recurring dangers, were finally able to begin the process of delivering food and supplies to the distraught.

I agree with President Bush that the United States should and will help the victims of Goma to rebuild their town and their lives. I am very pleased that the United States has allocated up to \$3 million for relief efforts to date, which will become more than \$4 million in total aid, for the homes and lives that were taken within seconds will take years to rebuild.

America, Madam Speaker, is at her best when we come to the aid of others in great need. So again I want to thank all of those who have shown support for this resolution.

I also commend and thank Mr. Franz Stuppard, a Congressional Fellow on my staff, and Jennifer Luciano for their work on this resolution. This happens to be Franz's last week of his fellowship, and I want to thank him for his service as he returns to the General Services Administration, which is his regular workstation. I wish that we could keep him, because he has done such an outstanding job, but I know that GSA is awaiting his return.

I again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for their support, and I urge passage of this resolution.

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

In closing, I want to urge my colleagues once again to support this resolution, and I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for bringing this to the attention of this body and of the entire country. I know that our country will continue to rise to the occasion in addressing the great humanitarian crises that the people of the Republic of the Congo are facing.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time; and I would again like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Madam Speaker, as we pass this resolution in support of the people of Goma in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, there is at this time, today, an important meeting under way. And in

this meeting are representatives of the Congolese opposition political parties, the armed rebel movements, civil society, and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. They are meeting in South Africa as part of the Inter-Congolese Dialogue. We urge them to put the interests of the nation over their parochial concerns.

This dialogue for peace is mandated by the Lusaka Accords, which provides a blueprint to return peace to the divided Congo. It is intended to map out a new political arrangement that will result in the establishment of a democratic system of government. In addition, all foreign troops are to be withdrawn from Congolese soil. This will provide the resourceful Congolese people with the opportunity to benefit from their own talents and the abundant natural resources with which they have been blessed. We hope they succeed.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 304.

Before I was elected to my first term in the Congress I was stationed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as a Regional Medical Officer for the Foreign Service, so I am very familiar with this wondrous yet volatile area.

The eruption of Mount Nyiragongo is the latest in a line of tragedies suffered by the Congolese people. Since the attempted coup of the late President Laurent Kabila in August 1998 the Republic has been embattled in a bitter civil war between the government and opposition rebel groups.

Now, with the eruption of Mount Nyiragongo, the Congolese people are witnessing a new level of suffering. The results of the eruption are staggering. 46 people were initially killed, according to The International Federation of Red Cross Societies. 10,000 people are left homeless in the city of Goma.

Hundreds of thousands are out of work as a reported 13% of the city was destroyed from the 110 million cubic yards of lava erupted from the volcano. Further complicating things is a cholera outbreak that is hindering humanitarian groups from reaching the 35,000 people in need of food.

Yet despair occasionally brings hope. This most recent disaster has cast attention on the war-torn nation, and this week, at the urging of President Thabo Mbeki, South Africa is holding a summit in an effort to bring peace back to the Republic.

We can only hope that in the wake of this tragedy the warring factions can set aside their differences, begin forming a transitional government, and set a date for future elections that will bring unity and peace to the Congolese people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res 304, 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. ROYCE. Madam 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.

#### 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 2 o'clock and 50 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.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on International Relations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 19, 2002.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House,  
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective February 19, 2002, I hereby resign from the House Committee on International Relations.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BURR,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 349) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 349

*Resolved*, That the following Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

International Relations: Mr. Green of Wisconsin.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL URBAN AIR TOXICS RESEARCH CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Board of Directors of the National Urban Air Toxics Research Center to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. Hans P. Blaschek, Champaign, Illinois.

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 1, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a civil subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. BRAD SHERMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRAD SHERMAN, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 26, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with civil subpoenas for documents and testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of California in a civil case pending there. The testimony and documents sought relate in part to the official functions of the House.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether it is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House to comply with the subpoenas, to the extent that they seek testimony and documents that relate to the official functions of the House.

Sincerely,

BRAD SHERMAN.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of 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:

Concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1892, by the yeas and nays; and H. Con. Res. 304, by the yeas and nays.

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

**FAMILY SPONSOR IMMIGRATION ACT OF 2001**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1892.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1892, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 3, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]  
YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Carson (IN)	Eshoo
Aderholt	Carson (OK)	Etheridge
Akin	Castle	Evans
Allen	Chabot	Everett
Andrews	Chambliss	Farr
Army	Clay	Fattah
Baca	Clayton	Ferguson
Baird	Clement	Filner
Baker	Clyburn	Flake
Baldwin	Coble	Fletcher
Ballenger	Collins	Foley
Barcia	Combest	Forbes
Barr	Conyers	Ford
Barrett	Cooksey	Fossella
Bartlett	Cox	Frank
Bass	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Becerra	Cramer	Frost
Bereuter	Crane	Galleghy
Berkley	Crenshaw	Ganske
Berman	Crowley	Gekas
Berry	Cubin	Gephardt
Biggert	Culberson	Gibbons
Bilirakis	Cummings	Gilchrest
Bishop	Cunningham	Gillmor
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boehner	Davis, Jo Ann	Goss
Bonilla	Davis, Tom	Graham
Bono	Deal	Granger
Boozman	DeFazio	Graves
Borski	DeGette	Green (TX)
Boswell	Delahunt	Green (WI)
Boucher	DeLauro	Greenwood
Boyd	DeLay	Grucci
Brady (PA)	DeMint	Gutierrez
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Gutknecht
Brown (OH)	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Brown (SC)	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bryant	Dingell	Hansen
Burr	Doggett	Harman
Burton	Dooley	Hart
Buyer	Doyle	Hastings (FL)
Callahan	Dreier	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Duncan	Hayes
Camp	Dunn	Hayworth
Cannon	Edwards	Hefley
Cantor	Ehlers	Heger
Capito	Ehrlich	Hill
Capps	Emerson	Hilliard
Capuano	Engel	Hinchev
Cardin	English	Hinojosa

Hobson	McInnis	Saxton
Hoeffel	McIntyre	Schaffer
Hoekstra	McKeon	Schakowsky
Holden	McKinney	Schiff
Holt	McNulty	Schrock
Honda	Meehan	Scott
Hooley	Meek (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Horn	Meeks (NY)	Serrano
Hostettler	Menendez	Sessions
Houghton	Mica	Shadegg
Hoyer	Millender-	Shaw
Hulshof	McDonald	Shays
Hunter	Miller, Dan	Sherman
Hyde	Miller, Gary	Sherwood
Inslee	Miller, George	Shimkus
Isakson	Miller, Jeff	Shows
Israel	Mink	Shuster
Issa	Mollohan	Simmons
Istook	Moore	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Skeen
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Skelton
(TX)	Morella	Slaughter
Jefferson	Myrick	Smith (MI)
John	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Napolitano	Smith (TX)
Johnson (IL)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nethercutt	Snyder
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Solis
Jones (NC)	Northup	Souder
Jones (OH)	Norwood	Spratt
Kanjorski	Nussle	Stark
Kaptur	Oberstar	Stearns
Keller	Obey	Stenholm
Kelly	Olver	Strickland
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Stupak
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Sununu
Kerns	Ose	Sweeney
Kildee	Otter	Tanner
Kilpatrick	Owens	Tauscher
Kind (WI)	Oxley	Tauzin
King (NY)	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Kingston	Pascrell	Taylor (NC)
Kirk	Pastor	Terry
Kleczka	Paul	Thomas
Knollenberg	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Kolbe	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Thornberry
LaFalce	Peterson (PA)	Thune
LaHood	Petri	Thurman
Lampson	Pickering	Tiahrt
Langevin	Pitts	Tiberi
Lantos	Platts	Tierney
Larsen (WA)	Pombo	Toomey
Larsen (CT)	Pomeroy	Towns
Latham	Portman	Turner
LaTourrette	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Udall (NM)
Lee	Putnam	Upton
Levin	Quinn	Velazquez
Lewis (CA)	Radanovich	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Vitter
Lewis (KY)	Ramstad	Walden
Linder	Rangel	Walsh
Lipinski	Regula	Wamp
LoBiondo	Rehberg	Watkins (OK)
Lofgren	Reynolds	Watson (CA)
Lowe	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Lucas (KY)	Lucas (KY)	Waxman
Lucas (OK)	Roemer	Weldon (FL)
Luther	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (PA)
Maloney (CT)	Rogers (MI)	Weller
Maloney (NY)	Rohrabacher	Wexler
Manullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Markey	Ross	Wicker
Mascara	Rothman	Wilson (NM)
Matheson	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (SC)
Matsui	Royce	Wolf
McCarthy (MO)	Ryan (WI)	Woolsey
McCarthy (NY)	Ryun (KS)	Wu
McCollum	Sabo	Wynn
McCrery	Sanchez	Young (AK)
McDermott	Sanders	Young (FL)
McGovern	Sandlin	
McHugh	Sawyer	

NAYS—3

Goode	Stump	Tancredo
Ackerman	Costello	Reyes
Bachus	Doolittle	Riley
Baldacci	Gilman	Roukema
Barton	Hillery	Rush
Bentsen	Jenkins	Trafigant
Blagojevich	Lynch	Waters
Bonior	Murtha	Watts (OK)
Brown (FL)	Payne	Weiner
Condit	Phelps	

NOT VOTING—26

□ 1857

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

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8, 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.

**EXPRESSING SYMPATHY TO PEOPLE OF DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 304, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 304, as amended, 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 405, nays 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]  
YEAS—405

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

Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heger  
Hill  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Insole  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
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  
Klecza  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)

Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-Hill  
McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reynolds  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Sha's  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Ackerman  
Bachus  
Baldacci  
Barton  
Bentsen  
Blagojevich  
Bonior  
Brown (FL)  
Condit

NAYS—1  
Paul  
NOT VOTING—27  
Costello  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Gilman  
Hilleary  
Jenkins  
Lynch  
Murtha  
Payne

Phelps  
Reyes  
Riley  
Roukema  
Rush  
Traficant  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Weiner

□ 1906

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution expressing sympathy to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who were tragically affected by the eruption of the Nyiragongo volcano on January 17, 2002."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in Oklahoma earlier today on family business and missed votes on H.R. 1892 and S. 1206. I respectfully request that the RECORD reflect that, had I been here, I would have voted "yea" on each of these votes.

CONSIDERING MEMBER AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2714

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 2714, a bill originally introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT), for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). 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.

CONGRESSIONAL WAR POWER

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the war drums are beating, louder and louder. Iraq, Iran, and North Korea have been forewarned. Plans have been laid and, for all we know, already initiated for the overthrow and assassination of Saddam Hussein.

There has been talk of sabotage, psychological warfare, arming domestic rebels, killing Hussein and even an outright invasion of Iraq with hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops. All we hear about in the biased media is the need to eliminate Saddam Hussein, with little regard of how this, in itself, might totally destabilize the entire Middle East and Central Asia. It could, in fact, make the Iraqi problem much worse.

The assumption is that, with our success in Afghanistan, we should now pursue this same policy against any country we choose, no matter how flimsy the justification. It hardly can be argued that it is because authoritarian governments deserve our wrath, considering the number of current and past such governments that we have not only tolerated but subsidized.

Protestations from our Arab allies are silenced by our dumping more American taxpayers' dollars on them.

European criticism that the U.S. is now following a unilateral approach is brushed off by the United States, which only causes more apprehension in the European Community. Widespread support from the eager media pumps the public to support the warmongers in the administration.

The pros and cons of how dangerous Saddam Hussein actually is are legitimate. However, it is rarely pointed out that the CIA has found no evidence whatsoever that Iraq was involved in the terrorist attacks of 9-11.

Rarely do we hear that Iraq has never committed any aggression against the United States. No one in the media questions our aggression against Iraq for the past 12 years by continuous bombing and imposed sanctions responsible for the death of hundreds of thousands of children in Iraq.

The Iraqis' defense of their homeland can hardly be characterized as aggression against those who rain bombs down on them. We had to go over 6,000 miles to pick this fight against a Third-World nation with little ability to defend itself.

Our policies have actually served to generate support for Saddam Hussein, in spite of his brutal control of the Iraqi people. He is as strong today, if not stronger, as he was prior to the Persian Gulf War 12 years ago.

Even today, our jingoism ironically is driving a closer alliance between Iraq and Iran, long-time, bitter enemies.

While we trade with and subsidize to the hilt the questionable government of China, we place sanctions on and refuse to trade with Iran and Iraq, which only causes greater antagonism. But if the warmongers' goal is to have a war regardless of international law and the Constitution, current policy serves their interests.

Could it be that only by war and removal of certain governments we can maintain control of the oil in this region? Could it be all about oil and have nothing to do with U.S. national security?

Too often when we dictate who will lead another country, we only replace one group of thugs with another, as we just did in Afghanistan, with the only difference being that the thugs who we support are expected to be puppet-like and remain loyal to the United States, or else.

Although bits and pieces of the administration's plans to wage war against Iraq and possibly Iran and North Korea are garnered, we never hear any mention of the authority to do so. It seems that Tony Blair's approval is more important than the approval of the American people.

Congress never complains about its lost prerogatives to be the sole declarer of war. Astoundingly, Congress is only too eager to give war powers to our presidents through the back door by the use of some fuzzy resolution that the president can use as his justification. Once the hostilities begin, the money always follows, because Congress fears criticism for not "supporting the troops." But putting troops in harm's way without proper authority and unnecessarily can hardly be the way to "support the troops."

Let it be clearly understood: There is no authority to wage war against Iraq without the Congress passing a Declaration of War. H.J. Res. 65, passed in the aftermath of 9-11, does not even suggest that this authority exists. A U.N. resolution authorizing an Iraqi invasion, even if it were to come, cannot replace the legal process for the United States going to war as precisely defined in the Constitution. We must remember, a covert war is no more justifiable and is even more reprehensible.

Only tyrants can take a nation to war without the consent of the people. The planned war against Iraq without a declaration of war is illegal. It is unwise because of the many unforeseen consequences that are likely to result. It is immoral and unjust, because it has nothing to do with U.S. security and because Iraq has not initiated aggression against us.

Besides, the American people become less secure when we risk a major conflict driven by commercial interests and not authorized in a proper manner by the Congress. Victory under these circumstances is always elusive, and unintended consequences are inevitable.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will ap-

pear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.)

□ 1915

#### REGARDING THE NATIONAL AVIATION CAPACITY EXPANSION ACT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about the National Aviation Capacity Expansion Act, a bill that will help end 20 years of aviation gridlock at the most important crossroads of American aviation.

This measure would codify a historical agreement between Mayor Daley and Governor Ryan that will expand and modernize O'Hare International Airport, take steps to construct a new south suburban airport, and keep Chicago's downtown general aviation airport open for 25 years.

It is necessary to codify this agreement into Federal law because the city and the State do not want to move forward with this \$6 billion project only to have a future governor rescind the agreement, thereby throwing billions of dollars down the drain.

The agreement reached December 5 by the Governor and Mayor is good news for our national aviation transportation system and for air travelers. O'Hare modernization is perhaps the most important action Congress and the Federal Government can take to alleviate system-wide congestion.

Chicago O'Hare is a vital economic engine in Chicago, the State of Illinois, the Midwest, and the entire Nation. It is among the world's busiest airports and serves as the only dual hub with United and American Airlines basing significant equipment, employees, and assets at the facility.

O'Hare serves more than 190,000 travelers per day, nearly 73 million in the year 2000. This is the Nation's busiest airport in number of passengers. Forty-eight States have direct access to O'Hare, as it serves communities large and small.

But O'Hare needs to be redesigned to meet the demands of today's marketplace. Designed in the 1950s, the airport has intersecting runways and a layout designed for smaller aircraft. By simply reconfiguring the airport layout, many weather-related delays could be avoided. By replacing old runways with safer, parallel configurations, delays and cancellations would be greatly reduced, eliminating delays that often ripple throughout the entire Nation.

Ninety percent of O'Hare's modernization will be paid for by airline and airport guaranteed funds, including passenger facility charges, landing fees, concessions, and bonds. The rest of the funds will come through the regular FAA process for airport construction, and my legislation is very clear on this issue.

This agreement also moves forward with a south suburban airport near Peotone. Common sense dictates that we need the capacity in the near future, and with this airport at Peotone we will have it. But just expanding O'Hare does not eliminate the need for a third airport, as I mentioned before. Building Peotone will not replace O'Hare modernization. They are not mutually exclusive. Both are needed to address serious aviation capacity problems in the region and the Nation.

This agreement also addresses traffic congestion along O'Hare's northwest corridor, including western airport access, and maintains the quality of life for residents near these airports. Clearly, the environment and airport noise should not be afterthoughts, as this agreement will reduce by half the number of people impacted by noise, and it includes \$450 million in funds for soundproofing. In addition, as the U.S. aviation system completes its move to quieter Stage 4 aircraft, airport noise will be reduced.

The FAA is and will continue to be the final arbiter of safety. Safety is our number one priority, and the legislation maintains the FAA's safety role.

Some might call my legislation unprecedented, but it is clear that the Chicago situation is unprecedented and unique. When the House Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the issue in August, no other similar situation could be found where a State has an arbitrary veto power over a city's airport or runways. In addition, since Chicago is the crossroads of aviation, it is vitally important to codify this agreement into Federal law.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 3479, the Aviation Capacity Expansion Act. No other bill in this Congress will do more to end the aviation gridlock that plagues the American flying public.

#### IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATIONS WILL HIGHLIGHT THE TRUTH

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I have introduced this evening legislation that calls for a special prosecutor to be named to look into the whole Enron mess.

Sure, this is a business scandal, and congressional committees are looking into reforms of our auditing practices of public corporations and the safety of employee pension plans. But this is a scandal that goes far beyond that. This

is a scandal that shows the pervasive corruption in American politics.

My legislation asks for a special prosecutor to look into the relationship between Enron and the manipulation of the stock market and its value per share; to look into the relationship between contributions by Enron to the President, the Vice President, Cabinet officers, other administration officials, and congresspeople.

I am asking the prosecutor to look into the influence of Enron on Federal and State legislation, including, in particular, the effort to deregulate energy markets, both in States and in the Nation as a whole.

Finally, I ask for the prosecutor to look into the relationship between Enron and our whole Federal and State regulatory system.

When we went through the energy crisis in California in the summer of 2000 and since, many of us claimed that this was not a supply and demand crisis but a crisis of manipulation of our market; and, in fact, that criminal manipulation resulted in the theft of anywhere between \$20 billion and \$40 billion from California ratepayers.

Enron and a small group of its friends in the energy industry were the perpetrators of this crime. We took evidence of that crime, many of us in California, to our supposed protector, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. They investigated, or so they say, the situation, and they found no wrongdoing.

In fact, now that the spotlight is burning brightly on Enron, FERC has suddenly announced that they are going to look into this matter again. Why, after an investigation which was smoke and mirrors, do they say, "Let us look again"? I think this FERC, what I call the Federal Enron Rubber-Stamping Commission, wants to preempt other investigations and stop a real look into the relationship between Enron and the crimes that were committed in the electricity market in California.

So we cannot let FERC, the Federal Enron Rubber-stamping Commission, take over this investigation. We must give this to an independent and thorough investigation by a special prosecutor.

We have to go beyond the congressional investigations into the business practices of Enron and the problems that they caused, the tragedies they caused, because this is a bigger problem, and the American people should not allow this investigation to stop with only a few business reforms instituted and maybe one or two folks thrown into jail. They must demand the investigation of the whole corruption of our political system.

We know about the contributions to both administrations in recent history. We know about the contributions to congresspeople. We know about the separate meetings Enron had with the Vice President and the energy task force of the White House over an 8-

month period to determine the energy policy of this Nation.

We know that the seventh biggest company in the United States, with revenues of over \$100 billion, was making our energy policy. We know that Cabinet members came from Enron right into this administration. We know that the CEO of Enron, Ken Lay, personally submitted names and interviewed candidates to be members of our Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

We know the connections, close connections, between this administration and Enron. It was those connections that caused this scandal, and it was the connections between Enron and State legislatures and State legislators and State regulatory commissions and Federal regulatory commissions that caused their success.

Not only the failure of Enron is what ought to be investigated but why they flew so high for so long and allowed the stealing of so many billions from so many people.

So we have to look at Enron with a neutral, unbiased look. It seems to me that neither the administration nor this Congress can do that, so that is why I am calling for a special prosecutor. Enron must be fully examined so the American people can understand why and how our political system has been hijacked.

---

#### GOVERNORS' RESOLUTION ON GENERIC DRUGS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to bring attention to the Governors' resolution on generic drugs that is going to be offered by Governor Dean of Vermont at the National Governors Association conference taking place this week in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, after all is said and done, the high cost of prescription drugs still remains one of the most pressing health care issues confronting our country's senior citizens, employers, managed care plans, and State and Federal drug programs. It also remains clear that generic competition can have a dramatic impact on reducing pharmaceutical costs.

There is a need, in my opinion, for statutory or legislative initiatives that allow timely access and availability of generic drugs. Frankly, Madam Speaker, Congress has been dragging its feet. Congress has been so negligent in ensuring proper entry of generics to the market that States are beginning to act on their own, as we see with the Governors' resolution.

The Governors' resolution expresses concern about the 1984 Hatch-Waxman Act. Part of the intent of the Hatch-Waxman Act was to lawfully improve consumer access to lower-priced generic drugs. The problem, Madam

Speaker, is that loopholes within the Hatch-Waxman Act are being taken advantage of and preventing the availability of generic drugs to enter the market. Brand name companies have become proficient in manipulating the Hatch-Waxman law and launching campaigns to block or delay generic alternatives from reaching the market.

The Governors are concerned in their resolution that these elements within the Hatch-Waxman Act may actually be contributing to the rising costs of prescription drugs, and the resolution asks Congress to explore this issue.

In addition, the Governors raised the valid point that during this time of tight State budgets, a national deficit, and an economic recession States are burdened by Medicaid costs which are on the rise due to the soaring costs of prescription drugs. With prescription drug costs rising at a rate of up to 18 percent annually, States' Medicaid drug costs represent the fastest-growing health care expense for States, employers, and consumers across the Nation.

USA Today reported that the Business for Affordable Medicine, a coalition of governors, business, and labor unions, stated that certain reforms to the Hatch-Waxman Act could save State Medicaid programs \$600 million in prescription drug costs over the next 3 years. According to the coalition, States spent about \$1.2 billion in 2001 on 17 drugs, including the allergy medicine Claritin, the asthma drug Flovent, and the cancer treatment Lupron. The coalition said that the \$600 million figure is the amount of savings that would occur if these 17 drugs were replaced by generic alternatives that would be allowed to enter the market.

Madam Speaker, the inclusion of generic alternatives in the marketplace is great for consumers, employers, and government purchasers because generic competition provides access to less expensive, therapeutically equivalent generic versions of brand-name drugs.

I fully support the Governor's resolution and the intent to improve access to generic drugs, and I encourage my colleagues in Congress to take the lead of the Governors here in Washington, D.C., and to pursue this important issue.

---

#### THE PRESIDENT'S AXIS OF EVIL AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MIS- SILE DEFENSE

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

Mr. McINNIS. Madam Speaker, this evening I would like to cover a couple of subjects. The first subject that I would like to spend some time on is on the President's axis of evil. I really do not want to focus entirely on that particular subject, but I want to talk more specifically as kind of a jump from

that subject on to missile defense, the importance of missile defense for the United States of America; in fact, the absolute necessity for the United States to deploy as soon as possible a missile defense to secure our borders against future attempts, either accidental or intentional, to cause harm.

To lay a basis for this, I have just returned from NATO meetings. Our NATO delegation here out of the House of Representatives is chaired by the very able gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

□ 1930

We went to our NATO meetings and then after our NATO meetings went and joined another group with the British American parliamentary assembly which was chaired by our very capable Member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI). And from these meetings, it was very interesting to go to these meetings. First of all, let me state that it amazes me, it absolutely amazes me that we do not have to get very far from September 11 before the old European criticism of the United States starts to rear its ugly head.

Now that said, let me tell you that I think it is somewhat out of proportion this criticism. Mind you, it is the criticism that gets played up by the world media. It is not the things that are going right. And I can state a lot of relationships are probably more solid today with some of our European allies, for example, the British, than they have ever been in the history of relationships between these two countries.

Let me compliment the United Kingdom. The Brits have been with us from the moment those planes hit the Pentagon and targeted New York City. And they have not faltered, they have not weakened, they have not backed off one inch. My compliments to the British people. Unfortunately, that strong commitment to the goodness of what our societies represent, not the United States alone, the United States is not standing alone. The United States is willing to go it alone, but the United States wants help from its allies. That is why you have allies. But unfortunately, in my view, not all Europeans, specifically the French, the Germans, even Luxembourg, I was a little discouraged by some of the comments I heard at some of these meetings about the United States, that the United States being the only super-world power is kind of pushing unilateralism.

That is not what is happening out there. The United States of America is without question the only superpower in the world. But the United States of America is not arrogant about this. The United States of America has never ignored its friends. The United States of America does everything that it can to have a strong alliance with its natural allies. And the United States of America reaches out more than any country in the history of the world, more than any country in the history

of the world. The United States of America reaches out to help other countries. It reaches out to give individual freedoms throughout the world. It reaches out and, sure, we talk and try and use education to tell people how the goodness of individual freedoms and individual rights and how it makes a country stronger and not weaker.

We are not sensitive to criticism, unless the criticism is a little unjust. It was interesting over the weekend, there was an editorial in one of the London newspapers. And they remembered the quote that Lyndon Johnson had back in the de Gaulle days when de Gaulle said to Lyndon Johnson that he wanted the American troops, the United States troops off European soil. And President Johnson immediately replied, does that include the American troops buried beneath your soil?

Twice in the last century the United States at the expense of many thousands of lives went to the defense of Europe. And I feel very confident that if Europe were challenged tomorrow, the United States would once again find itself in battle on behalf of the Europeans. The United States thinks very highly of the European nations. The United States of America thinks it is very important that we have friendships that are strong into the future. But let me tell you something about a friendship. You have got to be willing to help that friend of yours that might need some help.

Now, the United States of America through the leadership of our fine President has committed to eliminate, to the extent possible, terrorism throughout the world. Not just terrorism focused on the United States of America, but terrorism focused wherever it raises its ugly head; and it has asked for assistance from other countries, other countries in Europe. Now, that is not acting as if you were arrogant. That is not going forward on some kind of unilateral message or unilateral path. The United States of America does not accept arrogance as its policy of moving forward.

What the United States of America accepts as its policy is strength, strength through the ability to negotiate, strength through military might, strength through doing whatever you can to assist countries rebuilding themselves.

Take a look at Afghanistan. It is our obligation, we feel in this country, we feel an obligation to help build that country, to have text books in those schools, to build those schools, to allow women the rights they have never seen in that country before, all individuals in that country to begin to exercise individual rights. And the United States of America is willing to step forward not only with its military might, but with its economic might as well, as well as its compassion, whether it is the Peace Corps or whether it is the thousands and thousands of items that have been contributed throughout this

Nation, whether it be jackets or school books, or whatever, sent to the country of Afghanistan.

I think it is a mistake, a deep mistake for our European allies, not all of them but for some of those European allies, to think that for some reason because the United States of America has the guts and, frankly, I think the obligation to stand up toe to toe with these terrorists, and destroy them where possible, do whatever we can to overcome the fear in the hearts of the American people and the people of this world that these terrorists have put there. And the United States is willing to be the first one out of the foxhole.

But it is a little interesting when some of the people still back in the foxhole have enough malfeasance, in my opinion, of their professional responsibilities to criticize the United States because it is the first one out of the foxhole, because the United States of America is willing to take on this terrorism, not only for our Nation's security but for the world's security. And the President has made that very clear. The Secretary of State has made that very clear.

We are not out to rid the world of terrorists that only attack the United States of America. We are out to contain and destroy to the extent possible the terrorists that rain their terror upon anywhere in the world. And we have asked some of our European allies, all of our allies to join us. It amazes me, it discourages me, it disappoints me that we have some of the countries in Europe who are speaking ill of the United States.

It was surprising to hear how often I heard criticism of President Bush's axis of evil, the three countries that President Bush highlighted as direct threats, evil countries. It reminded me of the days when President Reagan had enough guts to stand up and call Russia the Evil Empire. You know what bothered a lot of people? The fact that he was right. And here President Bush is right.

Sure, you can sugar-coat it. You can decorate your language, try and hide it, try and kind of through statesman negotiations, I guess, not really call these countries what they are. But what would you call North Korea? I asked some of my European friends, What is it that you would describe North Korea with? You want to get a Webster's dictionary and find me another word in the dictionary that would fit North Korea more appropriately than axis of evil or a combination of evil? Take a look at the suppression that North Korea does with its own citizens. How can you justify calling North Korea anything but evil when they starve their citizens to feed their military?

Then you can move on to Iraq. When we talk about biochemical warfare, do you know what country in the history of the world has used it on its own citizens? Iraq. Do you think somewhere in Webster's dictionary you could find a

definition other than the word of evil to fit the nation of Iraq? The people, the masses of Iraq deserve more than they are getting from that leadership.

Saddam Hussein is evil and his leadership regime is evil. The country, the people of North Korea, the people of Iraq, and to a lesser extent the people of Iran, are all begging for some kind of new leadership out there. And Iran is no guardian angel. Iran seems to have at least some momentum moving towards reform in their country. But the fact is right now the three primary threats to the free world are Iraq, number one, North Korea, number two, and Iran, number three.

So we have got a President that has enough gumption to be the first one out of the foxhole, to say it as it is, to talk about it in terms that are necessary for it to be talked about. And that is that these evil empires are doing not only injustices to their own people, but they threaten tremendous injustices to other nations in the world. That is what this President is standing up for. And that is what I hope our European allies understand, that the United States is not trying to snub, has made no attempt whatsoever to snub its allies anywhere in the world.

In fact, it is the United States coming out of that foxhole not only for itself, not only for our Nation, but for all nations of this world, to rid this world of a terrible, terrible cancer. And there is no other way to describe the acts of these terrorists, whether it is the kidnapping of a Wall Street Journal reporter, whether it is flying a plane into the World Trade Center or flying a plane into the Pentagon or unleashing any other act of terror. Somebody has got to have enough guts to face up to them.

Let me say, and I want to make it very carefully said that throughout my remarks the one sole strong exception standing so solid out there in the European continent is the United Kingdom. We have some other allies in the European continent that are standing with us, but the strongest out there are the British. And I want to commend my colleagues in Britain for standing with the United States of America. And I want to encourage the other European continent to join us in this battle. Not join us just in soft talk. Join us in strong action. That is what it is going to take.

This cancer that we have discovered, this cancer that we discovered through the horrible events of September 11 is not just going to disappear on its own. In fact, every day that goes by that cancer begins to spread.

Now, we took a pretty good whack out of that cancer with our military action in Afghanistan. And thanks to a lot of European allies who have helped us with intelligence, who have helped us with the money racketeering going on out there, we have been able to crawl somewhat into the cellars of some of these terrorist headquarters

and begin to destroy that cancer. But the fact is cancer still exists. We cannot pray it off us, although that may help. We cannot wish it off us. Wishing is something for a dream, but it is not going to get rid of that cancer. You cannot love it off. You cannot talk it off. You have got to get in there, and you have got to take it away.

Now in my opinion several of our European allies agree that the cancer needs to be taken away. But they want it done with the absolute opportunity of, I guess you would say, anesthesia for the patient. Get the best anesthesia that you can get and deliver and put it into the patient before you begin to remove the cancer. Frankly, I agree with that. Make the patient as comfortable as you can. But the problem is the patient and the cancer are here today. The anesthesia of which these people, the European allies, some of them, are referring to, we do not have it in the operating room. We need to go after that cancer now. We cannot wait for that anesthesia to arrive because if we do, it may be too late for the patient.

So in an idealistic world, while we would like to have all of the anesthesia we need right there for that patient, in the realistic world, not the idealistic world, but the realistic world, we may have to go after that cancer before we have the kind of anesthesia that we would like to have. Those are the facts. And it is not because we are being egotistical. It is not because we want to act in a unilateral method. It is because we are saying that our fellow doctors in that operating room, look, we have got to get that cancer. Everybody agrees, right? Right. We have got to do it now. Yeah, we need to do it. We need to do it now. Somebody in that operating room has to take charge. And the United States of America is willing to lead.

In fact, as Vice President CHENEY has said, the United States of America today in the world is the only one who has the capabilities from all angles in a broad statement to take on this terrorism. We want our allies with us. We want to protect our allies. That is a natural. Of course you want to protect your friends.

So I would have expected when I went to Europe to find many of my friends from Germany or find many of my friends from France, although the French are tough to bring along in most cases, find our friends from Luxembourg, find our friends from some of these other countries jumping up and saying, hey, we are ready to get out of the foxhole. We are firmly committed behind your Nation.

I happen to believe that most of the people in Europe agree with the United States of America in that the number one issue out there is security and that we have got to somehow repeal this horrible cancer that has stricken the world.

□ 1945

Granted, on September 11, it hit the United States of America, but I am

telling my colleagues it is not long before it hits somewhere else in the world. That is why it is our obligation, all of us, all of us, to get out of that foxhole, under the leadership of the United States of America, and take it on.

I saw an excellent editorial in today's Wall Street Journal. I do not like to read into the RECORD, but this is an important editorial, and so I want to read. It is not a long editorial, but I ask my colleagues to listen very carefully to the words, because the Wall Street Journal editorial I think covers very precisely the type of feeling that I had at the NATO meetings that I was in attendance.

Again, dated February 26, title of the editorial is Axis of Allies.

To read the papers these days, you'd think Europe and the United States were headed for a giant fall over President Bush's "axis of evil" policy. Certainly European critics have earned all of the headlines. But there's another side to this story, which is that much of Europe actually supports Mr. Bush.

We certainly would not call it a silent majority. But it includes some very big names, starting, for example, with the Spanish Prime Minister. Since you won't read about it anywhere else, we thought we'd tell you what he said.

"I think that the position Bush has taken is of historic dimensions," the Prime Minister said last week in an interview with European journalists. "It is comparable to the choice made by Truman, who in the postwar took a strong position against the Russians, and to the declaration that Reagan made at the beginning of the 1980s which defined the Soviet Union as the evil empire."

The Spanish Prime Minister added that, "I believe that today it is more important than ever that Europe strengthen its ties with the United States: Alone we Europeans will be able to do nothing, not only on the international scene but also even inside our own continent, as the crisis in the Balkans demonstrated. There are those who want to make an impression by lining up against the U.S., but I do not agree with this attitude."

"Also largely unreported was the comment last week of" the European Union "foreign policy chief, who spoke of 'overstatements of differences' with Washington." The policy chief's "remarks were widely taken as a slap in the face of Chris Patten, the EU external affairs commissioner who warned, in widely quoted comments, that Mr. Bush was in 'unilateralist overdrive.'"

"Something is clearly getting lost in translation of how Europeans view America right now. When a French Foreign Minister calls U.S. foreign policy 'simplistic' or the German Foreign Minister Fischer accuses the United States of treating European nations as 'satellites,' their remarks make news on both sides of the Atlantic. But when a European leader speaks pointedly in support of America, he is shouting into the wind.

“The real story is the battle in Europe between the new politics and the old. It is no accident that those dowagers of the old socialism, France and Germany, tend to produce the U.S. critics, while exponents of a new centrist or center-right politics, primarily British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and Mr. Aznar, support Mr. Bush.

“The internal debate in Europe is about its role in the world and the future shape of the European Union. Specifically, it focuses on the politics of European integration in which a French-led bloc wants to create a more integrated (and socialist) Europe. The issues will come up in elections in France and Germany this year.

“Both France and Germany also had business ties with Iraq that they are eager to resume; that won't be politically correct as long as Iraq is part of the 'axis of evil.' A campaign (with tacit or explicit government support) to indict Western sanctions as the cause of Iraqi misery has also succeeded with the European public, making it that much harder for Paris or Berlin to support military action against Iraq.

“France and Germany are important countries, but they aren't all of Europe any more than America is Washington and New York. And even they may ultimately find a way to support American action in Iraq and elsewhere. In the meantime, President Bush can count on backing” of Aznar, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Prime Minister of Italy, “though they too will face political hurdles at home.

“A part of Europe sees eye to eye with the U.S. on economic liberalization and a foreign policy that attempts to rid the world of threats to peace and stability. Another part of Europe disagrees. Why do only the grumblers make news?”

I think it is an important piece, and I would urge my colleagues, if they have an opportunity, clip it out of the Wall Street Journal. Europe is very important for the future of our country. We need a strong relationship with the European countries, and we have a strong relationship.

Twice in the last century, the United States of America took its boys, young men and women, overseas to fight for the Europeans, to fight on the European continent, and we would be willing to do it again tomorrow. But let me tell my colleagues, within the family, the criticism, while any good family allows for constructive criticism, it should always be somewhat justified criticism, and I think Germany or France or some of the leaders of these various countries of the European Union, some of those leaders that criticize the United States of America as acting in a unilateral fashion, have got it all wrong.

The United States of America wants to act in a partnership. The United States of America wants Germany and

France acting as strongly with us as Great Britain has. This problem of terrorism is not unique to the United States of America. They know that. The people and the officials of the European Union know that. The citizens of Europe know that.

Let us form a team, as Powell said, our Secretary of State Colin Powell last week, that the Europeans, every time they pound on the United States, they ought to do a little pounding on Iraq.

This is exactly what the terrorists want to occur. They want some kind of division to begin to pop up between the Europeans and America. Why? Because they know it is a lot tougher to take on two people coming out of that foxhole than it is to take on one coming out of that foxhole.

So the United States of America wants our European allies with us as we come out of the foxhole. We are not asking our allies in Europe to be the first ones out of the foxhole. We are willing to do it. This Nation has the capability. It has the commitment. It has got the military strength and technology to be the first one out of that foxhole, but if you ain't going to fight, do not complain, and if you are going to fight, get out of the foxhole.

This moves me on to the issue that I wanted to focus a little more on tonight, and that is the necessity for a missile defense in this country. I think the biggest weakness that the entire world faces are missiles, not just nuclear missiles. Obviously, we all fear the utilization of nuclear missiles, but ballistic missiles carrying conventional missile heads.

Can my colleagues imagine what North Korea, the kinds of havoc that North Korea could wreak on South Korea, on Seoul, South Korea? Seoul, the Nation's capital of South Korea, is only 38 miles away from North Korean missiles. Can my colleagues imagine the protection and the leverage that we would be able to take away from North Korea if we could provide our ally, South Korea, with the missile defense?

A missile defense is absolutely essential for the United States, for the security of our citizens and for the world, for the security of its citizens, any of our allies throughout the world.

I had the opportunity several years ago, I think to the best of my recollection about 3 years ago, to be in Vail at the AEI's world forum that was hosted by a former President, Gerald Ford, and Margaret Thatcher was there. I cannot quote from memory exactly what the former Prime Minister of Britain said, but I can give it pretty darn close.

I remember very distinctly that there was the current Secretary of Defense, Bill Cohen, and Margaret Thatcher stood and addressed Bill Cohen. As my colleagues know, the Clinton administration was very reluctant to commit, they certainly did not give any kind of commitment the likes of which we have seen from the Bush

administration, in regards to a defensive missile system for this Nation. They kind of halfway, lukewarm supported it.

Margaret Thatcher stood up, took a look at the Secretary of Defense in the United States and her words were similar to this. Mr. Secretary, she says, you have an inherent responsibility to provide the citizens of your Nation with a missile defense. Any failure to do so would be nothing short of gross neglect.

Now, again, those words are very close to what she said. My colleagues could have heard a pin drop in that room. Why? Because Margaret Thatcher was right. We need a missile defense in this country; and, fortunately, we have a President who is absolutely committed and moving forward at full speed at providing a missile defense for our Nation.

Remember, there are lots of threats out there, and the threats are not necessarily an intentional missile launch against the United States. In fact, we could very easily have an accidental missile launch against the United States, and do not think accidental missile launches are something that just are nightmares of the future. It has already happened.

Not long after September 11, about 6 months ago, a Russian airliner was flying I think over the Black Sea, and the Ukrainian military was doing military exercises with their navy, and they fired a missile by accident at a commercial airliner, a Russian airliner, and they blew the Russian airliner out of the sky. They killed 70 or 80 people. They blew it to smithereens.

Accidents can happen. An accidental launch against the United States of America could happen, and it could lead to consequences much, much more serious than just one missile being launched across the ocean. If that missile was launched and, one, we did not know it was accidental; two, we did not have the capability to stop it, the United States may end up in a response of a retaliatory fashion. So missile defense is important not only against an intentional launch against our country but the possibility of an accidental launch.

As my colleagues know, years ago, back in about 1972, the United States entered into an agreement with Russia called the anti-ballistic missile treaty. To the President's credit, President Bush has abrogated that treaty pursuant to the terms of the treaty. The treaty itself, the basics of the treaty or the philosophy behind the treaty was that one nation would not defend itself against the missile attack, nor would the other nation. In other words, the United States of America would agree not to defend itself against Russian missiles if Russia agreed not to defend itself against United States missiles, the theory being that the United States would not dare attack Russia because they could not defend themselves against a retaliatory attack and vice versa.

I think it is crazy, but that was the thinking and the philosophy in 1972 when this agreement was signed. In 1972, when this agreement was signed, keep in mind that only two nations in the world had the capability of delivering intercontinental ballistic missiles into the territory of the other, Russia and the United States.

Clearly, since then, many, many other countries throughout the world have developed that technology, and that technology is much more readily available than it was 30 years ago. We have had dramatic changes in the world scene today in regards to missiles, missile technology and the capability to launch a missile into the territory of another country.

That 30-year-old treaty was outdated within a few short years after it was signed, and today, with all of the countries in the world that have the capability of striking the United States, and we discovered unfortunately on September 11 that we can be hit within our borders, of all of the countries that have that capability, why were we reluctant the last 8 years under the Clinton administration, for example, to go full speed ahead on building a defensive mechanism? These are not offensive missiles. This is a defensive missile system for our Nation to protect the people of this Nation.

□ 2000

As Margaret Thatcher said, anything short of a full missile defense system is gross neglect, gross neglect of our fiduciary duties to our citizens.

Take a look at the treaty. Now, by the way, as many of my colleagues know, the President has given notice, under the four corners of the treaty, that the United States is withdrawing from the treaty and that the United States of America intends to proceed full speed ahead to provide a missile defense for its citizens.

Let us look at the agreement that allows us to withdraw from the treaty. The treaty is obviously of unlimited duration; but as I mentioned earlier, it is now about 30 years old. At the time the treaty was signed, again just so we have a little historical basis here, there were only two nations in the world, Russia, the U.S.S.R., and the United States that were capable of delivering missiles to the other country. That changed within a very few short years after this treaty was signed.

In my opinion, the minute a third country entered the picture, they should have either been brought into the agreement or this agreement should have been abrogated. President Bush is the first one, though it took 30 years, but President Bush had the gumption to step up and exercise section two. Section two, it has been highlighted for my colleagues' benefit, states that each party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty. A right. It is a right within this treaty, if it decides that extraordinary events

related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests.

It goes on to talk about the 6-month notice in this paragraph. That notice has already been given. And it says that the notice shall contain within it the extraordinary events, notifying the party regarding which jeopardizes our supreme interest.

Now, have extraordinary events occurred which jeopardize the national sovereign interests of the United States of America? Of course they have. I cannot understand how anybody in these Chambers, any of my colleagues, would do anything but acknowledge the necessity for a military missile defense system in this country. And I do not know any of my colleagues that could stand up and tell me that extraordinary events have not occurred over the last 30 years. Obviously, they have occurred.

Let us start with the first one, and I am just going to go through a few "extraordinary events" that have occurred that, in my opinion, giving us justification to go full speed ahead. The first one, again being repetitive, is that we are no longer talking about two countries. This treaty was between the U.S.S.R., which technically does not even exist any more, and the United States of America. Since then, let us take a look at what has happened.

Number one, we have multiple countries that have missile technology and the capability to deliver those missiles into the territory of other countries. Number two, take a look in the last 30 years at what has happened with nuclear proliferation. These are countries. Now, the red countries have nuclear weapons. The green countries are countries that we are confident have or are concerned enough that we think they have the capability. We believe North Korea could easily have a nuclear missile or some nuclear missiles, Iran, Libya and Iraq.

Now, looking at my pointer here, in 1970, it used to be just the United States and Russia. Here is what leads to those extraordinary events. Watch my left hand. First, we pick up India, Israel, Pakistan, Britain, China, France. Look at that list. That is an extraordinary event, not of a positive sense but of a realistic sense. There are multiple nations in the world that have nuclear missiles, and they are capable of launching those missiles. Our Nation must defend itself and its allies against that type of an attack.

Let us go a little further. In the last 30 years, since the time this treaty was signed, look at what has happened with ballistic missile proliferation and countries that possess ballistic missiles. Look at them. One, two, three, four, five, six. Go across here. One, two, three, four, five, six. Roughly 36. Not exactly, but roughly 36 additional countries since 1972 have developed or now have missile technology capable of firing a missile against the United States of America or against another country within their territory.

Now, what can we do with missile defense? Is the threat real? Here is the threat that we face today. Look at this chart. Weapons of mass destruction among 20 Third World countries that have or are in the process of developing weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear weapons. Iran, we think has them, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Syria. Chemical weapons. Again, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Syria. Biological weapons, Iran, Iraq, North Korea. Advanced technology for missiles. All of the countries.

I believe there are serious threats outside the borders of the United States of America, and we have an opportunity to lead the world once again in a way to neutralize that threat. And the best way to neutralize that threat is to obtain the technology, and we are very close. The United States is very close to achieving the technological breakthroughs that are necessary to destroy a missile on its launching pad, to take a missile that has been fired against the United States and, somewhere along its route, destroy that missile, to minimize the casualties that that missile would create if it successfully landed on its target area.

So the key here is this: the United States and our President, under our current leadership, is moving forward, and so is the United States Congress with financial commitments and financial backing for our President to build for the citizens of this Nation a security blanket, a capability to stop somebody from a ruthless attack or even an accidental mistake against this country.

The United States is also going to be the first country to step forward with this technology and to hand it over to its friends. We will offer protection for South Korea. What is North Korea going to do when the leverage of their missiles is taken away? Maybe we will get a unified Korea, as we all hope in the future will occur. What will happen with some of these terrorist organizations or countries like Libya or Iran or Iraq when the missiles they have would not be capable of destroying or bestowing horrible destruction upon allies or the United States of America itself?

My colleagues, we have an incumbent fiduciary obligation to our citizens to provide a security blanket for the protection of this Nation, and that obligation exists not only for the current generation, for the current people, but for future generations of this country. Today, we must develop that technology. We must put into position a missile defensive system.

In my opinion, and I know sometimes I stand here and preach until I am blue in the face about the threat of a missile attack against this country, but all of a sudden on September 11 we all became a little more awake as to the fact that the United States of America could be a target too. We did not think on September 10 that action against this Nation was coming as quickly as it did. And who knows what the future

holds? But I think we would be safe in assuming that the future holds further attacks against our country. I think we would be safe to assume that there are terrorist pockets out there that will do whatever it takes. They will destroy our children. Remember, in New York City, when they hit those World Trade Center towers, they killed the citizens of 80 separate countries. What we want to do is give those different countries the capability to defend themselves against these terrorists.

Now, some might say, well, the United States of America should not have a missile defensive system. The United States should somehow feel guilty because of their military strength. The United States should become apologetic because they are so powerful. The United States should feel badly about leading the world in military technology. What a bunch of rubbish. The United States of America has the capability to lead the world in missile defense.

And I could not more strongly compliment George W. Bush on his commitment for the security of this Nation. He understands, in his leadership team down there, whether it is the Vice President, whether it is Colin Powell, our Secretary of State, whether it is Condoleezza Rice, they have a clear understanding of their mission. And I think, colleagues, that we have an obligation to have a clear vision of our mission, and that is the security and the protection of the people of this country.

I cannot think of anything more important that the leaders of a country have as far as their responsibility to its citizens than a national defense. I cannot think of anything more important. Obviously, there are a lot of important things out there, but what good is anything if we cannot protect our citizens? If we as leaders cannot protect this Nation, at least to the utmost of our capabilities, what good are the benefits of anything else that we could give this Nation?

And protection, by the way of a nation, is not just necessarily a military missile defense, a strong military in regards to its capability to attack or in regards to its capability with technological advancement. I believe that the strength of a nation is displayed through its capabilities of negotiation, through its capabilities of helping other countries, through its capabilities of things like the Peace Corps and other efforts that we make like this, in foreign aid and foreign assistance with other countries. And the United States of America has no reason to apologize for any of this. The United States of America has led the world. There is no other country in the history of the world that has done more for other countries than the United States of America in regards to foreign assistance, in regards to educational benefits, in regards to open borders, in regards to opportunities.

Now, that is not to say that I think the United States has got it all right.

Many times we find out that we have made a mistake, but we learn from them. And basically, when we take a look at it, no one could classify the United States of America as anything but good, in my opinion.

But to bring us back to this defense, we face very challenging times in the near future and in the distant future; and it is our responsibility as the leaders of this country, number one, to support our President and his team in their effort to provide the protection and the security that this country needs; and, two, to support our President and the President's team to provide the kind of security that our allies need.

We need people to know throughout this world that the United States of America will protect itself, it will eliminate to the extent it can any threats against this country, and it will reach out to its friends to assist its friends and to protect its friends from those kinds of attacks.

So as kind of a conclusion of this set of my remarks this evening, my colleagues, let me just summarize a couple of things. Number one, I say to our friends in Europe, our friends in France, our friends in Germany, our friends in the European Union, that the United States of America wants a partnership with you. We have had a partnership that has been tested through the loss of lives, hundreds of thousands of lives in the last century. Twice in the last century our partnership was threatened, and both times the United States of America contributed to the partnership and so did you. But this partnership must continue into the future.

Europe is important for the United States, and the United States is important for Europe. But this is not the time for our friends in Europe to be shy about their support for this President. This is not the time for our friends in Europe to somehow give credibility to regimes like that of Saddam Hussein and the country of Iraq. This is the time, instead, for friends and partners and allies to stand in unison against the common enemy and to do what is necessary to eliminate the threats of that common enemy.

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, we have got the United States of America willing to be the first one out of the foxhole. We can lead. We are willing to put the money, the defensive resources. We are willing to do what it takes, but we want the European alliance to be right there with us. There is no other way that we want it to happen.

Again, I summarize, the United States is prepared to come out of that foxhole by itself. The United States of America is prepared to go it on its own, but that is not our preference. This Nation has built its greatness through partnerships, partnerships of our citizens. And as we reach around the world to our allies and we once again are

reaching out for this partnership and our friends in Europe, for example, Tony Blair in Great Britain, but some of our friends are pounding more on us than they are on the evil regimes of North Korea and Iraq.

Remember, that cancer that we find in North Korea and Iraq cannot be denied. No serious assessment of either of those countries, or Iran, frankly, could justify what those nations have done to their own citizens or could justify in any way whatsoever what those nations intend to do to the rest of the world.

There is no question in my mind or in the mind of anybody who has studied this, anybody of any consequence who has studied this at any length, that Iraq would utilize whatever weapon it had at its disposal, whether it was a chemical weapon, whether it was a nuclear warhead, whether it was the arm of terrorism, they will use whatever is necessary for an attack upon the free world. We must go against that.

Let me also say that the United States of America feels very strongly about the religion of Islam, very strongly about the Muslims who are United States citizens and the Muslims throughout the world who are not United States citizens. The evilness of the terrorist acts of September 11 do not represent that religion. Even in that religion where there is an exception for violence in a jihad, the definitions of a jihad do not fit the acts of September 11.

This Nation reaches out to all people of all colors, and we say we want individual rights, and we can come together as a team. There is a cancer that we have discovered. We must destroy that cancer, and we as a team can do it.

Finally, let me say that again, I cannot stress it strong enough, and I am saying this from the center of my heart, our President has made absolutely the right decision to go full speed ahead, to provide the citizens of this country with a defense against missiles of other countries, with a missile defensive system.

Right now many of our citizens believe that if a missile was fired against the United States of America that somehow we could defend against it. Our only defense at this point is a retaliatory strike. Is a retaliatory strike the best response? In my opinion, most of the time a retaliatory strike is not the best response. The best response is to neutralize the weapons being utilized against our citizens. We have an opportunity to neutralize one of the horrible weapons that could be used against the citizens of the United States and our friends.

Madam Speaker, I commend the President and my colleagues who are supportive of the missile defensive system, and I beg those few Members who oppose the missile defensive system to reconsider. We need your support. We need to give this President the budgetary support that is necessary; and,

frankly, I am confident that we will from both sides of the aisle. We will give this President the financial tools that are necessary to defend the interests of the United States

#### AMERICA NEEDS A WARTIME BUDGET

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, this evening the Blue Dog Democratic Coalition in the House will discuss the administration's request that Congress raise the Federal debt limit, an issue that we must address tonight in light of our current fiscal situation.

Simply put, America needs a wartime budget. We need a budget that will provide the resources necessary to win the war on terrorism, but not a dollar of wasted spending, that will stimulate our economy without aggravating our long-term deficits and that will protect and reform Social Security and Medicare but not finance the war out of its trust funds.

In sum, our country needs a budget that will call on the American people to make sacrifices to win, sacrifices they are willing to make if only their leaders will have the courage to ask and speak plainly.

The President's budget is not there yet. The budget calls for the most significant increase in military spending in more than 2 decades, and most of that increase will enjoy broad bipartisan support. We will do everything necessary to protect this country and our armed forces.

The budget also proposes more than \$500 billion in additional tax cuts, and it also proposes some additional domestic spending.

And the budget requires sacrifice. There is only one problem. It is not we who are being asked to sacrifice, it is our children. America will win the war on terrorism whether we have a wartime budget or not. Such is the resolve of the American people. But if we do not manage our Federal budget properly during this time of war, we will have precious little for anything less, schools, roads, health care, our future, our kids. In our victory, it will be our children who have borne the full cost of the battle. Not only are they the ones who will do most of the fighting, but the war will have been financed from their retirement, from their Social Security, out of their Medicare, and from their GI bill.

Because we are in a two-front war, after all. We are in a war around the world in more than 60 countries that harbor terrorists like al Qaeda, non-traditional foes that do not wear army uniforms, do not carry a national flag and do not have any qualms about the deliberate killing of innocent civilians.

And we are in a second war on another very large front called the United

States where we must guard our civilian aircraft, our water supply, nuclear power plants, and a thousand other possible targets, and winning this war will be costly under the best of circumstances.

Every generation of Americans can be the greatest generation. Courage, patriotism, love of freedom and love of country course through American veins. That spirit did not die out among the generations of World War II, Korea, or Vietnam. We saw that clearly after September 11. But there is one virtue we have yet to demonstrate before we can take our rightful place among the greatest generations: the willingness to sacrifice.

The price of freedom is high, and Americans have always paid it, President Kennedy said. We must pay it still. We should not, we must not, make our children pay it for us.

America has always been willing to sacrifice. She still is. But she must be asked by leaders who are willing to speak candidly about what is at stake and what it will take to win. She must be asked by leaders with faith in the essential generosity of the American people and who will not tell us that we can have our cake and eat it, too.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition have always believed in crafting a budget in a balanced and thoughtful way that maintains our fiscal discipline, continues to pay down our national debt and does not rely on rosy or unrealistic long-term projections. That has been a hallmark of this group's legacy in Congress. A central component to fiscal discipline is putting forth a budget that is responsible and honest.

The administration has come to Congress and has asked this body to approve raising the debt limit so our country can continue to operate. We agree that this action is necessary, but we urge the administration to work with us to establish a long-term plan that is based on a realistic budget proposal. Only with an honest account of our economic outlook can we responsibly plan for the future of this Nation.

As we craft a budget for fiscal year 2003, we need to understand fully what our Nation requires and we need to use real numbers. We must accurately account for every tax reduction, and we need to include government expenditures that are virtually certain to occur.

Unfortunately, many costs have been left out of the administration's budget calculations. The budget is not balanced, and I would encourage my colleagues to take a closer look at some of the calculations used in this year's budget proposal. Here are a few examples:

First, the budget makes recently proposed and enacted tax cuts permanent. However, it does not include the cost of extending the individual Alternative Minimum Tax beyond 2004, which is almost certain to occur. The budget assumes that there will be 39 million taxpayers subject to the AMT by 2012, but

there is almost no possibility that that will be allowed to take place. In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the cost of addressing this problem alone amounts to several hundred billion dollars over the next 10 years, a cost which the administration budget leaves out.

Second, the administration's budget extends certain popular tax credits for only 2 years, while it is almost certain that they will be extended for the full 10 years. Research and development tax credits, for example, have been in place since 1981 and have been instrumental in our Nation's ability to develop technology, biomedical research, and scientific breakthroughs. We cannot realistically expect that these tax credits will be phased out in 2 years. But the administration's budget proposal only includes them for 2 years instead of 10.

Finally, the budget proposal also underestimates the costs of all the new proposed tax cuts by phasing them in very slowly so that their full cost will not appear until late in the decade. For example, the proposed deduction for charitable contributions would not become fully effective until the year 2012.

The budget that came from the White House estimates its tax cut proposals as costing \$665 billion between 2003 and 2012. In reality, the cost would be much higher. The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities estimates the true cost is closer to \$1 trillion over the next 10-year period, and that is not all.

Under the House-passed economic stimulus bill, huge retroactive tax relief would be provided to some of America's largest corporations. Enron itself would have been the beneficiary of more than \$250 million in tax benefits, all at a time when we are spending the Social Security surplus.

The President, as well as the House leadership, must rethink the magnitude of these new tax cuts which have been proposed. Some tax cuts are desirable. They have a stimulative impact on the economy if they are designed to affect current spending, and they empower the taxpayer to control more of his or her own financial choices and destiny.

When we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus and no war, we could afford a substantial tax cut, and I supported the President. But now we are at war. We have no surplus, and we are spending the Social Security trust fund.

While I would not blame the President for the recession and none can fault him for the war that has been thrust upon us, the fact remains that we now have both and we cannot shrink from the consequences. We need a plan for the long-term budget that brings us back to a time of fiscal responsibility. We are spending money faster than it is coming in and, in doing so, we are risking the long-term solvency of our Federal budget and, worse, we are mortgaging our children's future. We must come together to offer an honest budget for the American people, one without gimmicks

that disguise short-term costs and inhibit long-term stability.

We must work together in Congress and with the administration to resurrect a balanced budget, applying accurate economic and fiscal assumptions and without using the Social Security surplus.

□ 2030

Madam Speaker, we have several members of the Blue Dog Coalition here this evening to address these issues, and the first Member I would like to introduce is from the State of Indiana (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) has used his experience and financial background to make great contributions to the budget debate in Congress and has been a leader on the issue of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Federal Government is up to its eyeballs in debt once again. Now the administration is asking Congress to throw it a life preserver so it can, in the words of the Treasury Secretary, "restore the American economy to the path of long-term growth and ensure the premier status of the Federal Government's debt obligations."

Now, what is the price tag for accomplishing these aims? Three-quarters of a trillion dollars; three-quarters of a trillion dollars in additional debt, three-quarters of a trillion dollars more debt for our kids and our grandchildren.

Now, let me be clear: I am committed to making sure the United States Government can meet all of its fiscal obligations. We Blue Dogs are not down here this evening to propose that Congress should let the Federal Government drown in its own debt. But let me also be clear that it makes no sense for Congress to toss Treasury a 24-karat-gold life preserver, when the administration has not explained how it will put us back on the path of fiscal responsibility.

Being back home in southern Indiana the last 11 days gave me the opportunity to listen to Hoosiers and their concerns. Without exception, the people I heard from know what it means to be fiscally responsible. They understand you cannot spend more than you take in. They understand that if for some reason you are in debt, you need to plan to get out of debt. They understand planning from week to week and month to month will require them to make some tough choices.

Our constituents deserve nothing less from us. I am prepared, my Blue Dog colleagues are prepared, and we all must be prepared to make the tough choices here in Congress.

Tonight we are asking the President to take the lead and show us the way back to a balanced budget that does not use the Social Security surplus. The President's proposed budget makes clear that there is much work to be

done in order to achieve this goal. In fact, it projects deficits financed by borrowing the Social Security surplus through the year 2009.

Times have certainly changed. In 1999 and 2000, the entire Social Security surplus was available to pay down the national debt. By contrast, this year and next the Federal Government will spend every single dime of the Social Security surplus on everything but Social Security and paying down the debt. As a consequence, the national debt is now expected to be roughly \$2.75 trillion larger than was estimated just a year ago.

It should come as no surprise, Madam Speaker, that Hoosiers also understand how this increased debt burden can make their already-tough choices even tougher. With the Federal Government again borrowing from the public, long-term interest rates almost certainly will not come down. In fact, they probably will rise. As long as these rates are static, or, worse, on the rise, small business people, credit card users and home buyers will get pinched.

Plain and simple: the size of the national debt matters, not only to those who make their living crunching numbers and working in think-tanks.

The President has performed admirably while prosecuting the war on terrorism. Tonight, Madam Speaker, we are asking that he exhibit the same leadership by proposing a way to get the country's budget back on track, and that means balanced budgets and hands-off on Social Security surpluses.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments this evening and his leadership on this issue.

The gentleman talked about the impact of a deficit-spending pattern on long-term interest rates, and when we talk about a mortgage on our children's future, this is not simply rhetorical; it really is literally a mortgage. As we have seen over the last several months, as the Federal has lowered short-term interest rates it has had very little effect on long-term interest rates. Why is that? Because, over the long term, given the budget that we have, there is the expectation that the government will continue to borrow and borrow more and borrow more, and those long-term rates are remaining stubbornly where they are.

What does that mean for our children and for ourselves? It means that many people will be priced out of a home and that others that have a home will have that home with a mortgage that is far higher and they will be paying more for it.

There is no free lunch here with deficit spending. We pay for it, and we pay for it in the form of higher interest rates and sacrifices we make to our children's future.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) talked about the reason why we are here tonight, the Secretary's request for \$750 billion in new authorization for new debt. Where does that

come from? Why does the administration come to Congress to ask for the authorization of new debt?

Congress has always played a vital role in managing the national debt. Prior to 1917, Congress approved each issuance of debt, including determining its interest rate and term. Then Congress passed the second Liberty Bond Act of 1917, which allows the Treasury to borrow as necessary to finance Federal activities up to a specified legislatively adopted limit.

That law was initially adopted to facilitate wartime planning during World War I and to accommodate the Treasury's need for flexibility in financing growing government activities. It also freed Congress from having to legislate each issuance of government debt.

The limit persisted after World War I and has been raised periodically as government debt has increased, which leads us to where we are today. The administration has come to Congress asking us to raise the debt limit a full 7 years earlier than it predicted when the budget was submitted only last year.

Of course, we all recognize much has changed in the past year. We acknowledge the needs of our Nation during a time of war and recession, and we agree that the debt limit should be raised in order to avoid a financial crisis. However, we cannot simply write a blank check to increase borrowing authority without safeguarding the American taxpayers from even further increases in the national debt.

The request to raise the debt presents us with an imperative that we examine our long-term budget policies. We must first understand how we got to this point. The national debt is an accumulated IOU that the government owes the people and institutions that have been lending it money for decades. Our current debt stands at nearly \$5.95 trillion. This debt represents the amount borrowed by the public to cover the Federal Government's budget deficits, and the debt held by the government accounts represents the amount of Federal debt issued to specialized Federal accounts, primarily trust funds like Social Security.

Now the administration estimates it will hit this current \$5.95 trillion ceiling by late March, jeopardizing the timely payment of government bills. The Secretary has asked Congress to provide \$750 billion in additional borrowing authority to last until 2004.

It seems ironic that just last year the administration predicted that there would be no need to raise the debt limit until 2008. In fact, if you recall, and it seems quaint today, we were warned about the dangers of paying down the debt too fast.

Certainly it is true that unforeseen circumstances, including the devastating events of September 11, our involvement in the war on terrorism and the downturn in the economy have contributed greatly to this situation, and we all recognize the necessity of

allowing the Federal Government to continue operating by raising the debt limit. But we also recognize the responsibility of Congress to work with the administration and ensure that we have a long-term economic recovery plan.

Let me now introduce my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY). As a pharmacist, he has been active on prescription drug issues, and has been dedicated to paying down our national debt and saving the Social Security Trust Fund and Medicare.

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California, and I particularly appreciate his efforts this evening to address this issue that we are going to be faced with very shortly.

The first year I served in this House, 1997, I think was the last time that we raised the debt ceiling; and I remember for as long as I can remember the talk on this floor was that we had to have a balanced budget, that we should pay off the debt, that it is our job to be fiscally responsible. We have all heard that. I would bet there is not a Member of this House or a Presidential candidate or a Member of the United States Senate that has not sworn their allegiance to that idea, that we have to live within our means.

There are certain times that one never forgets. One of mine is last year, just about this time, the new Director of the Office of Management and Budget came to the Blue Dogs and he made this statement: "My greatest fear is that we will pay off all of the national debt and no one will be able to buy a United States Savings Bond and they won't have a safe place to invest their money."

It is with great regret this evening that I have to tell you that those bonds are going to be available for a long, long time. The bad news is, our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay them off.

We have all heard that we should run government like a business. This is no way to operate. And yet here we are going to be forced to vote to increase the debt. We should not do that until there is a plan in place to deal with this problem.

We have spent all of the Social Security Trust Fund. It is all gone. There is no money left in it, and we are going to borrow a lot more to go with that. Then we are going to turn around and say to our children and grandchildren, we squandered it; we had the chance, and we did not do anything about it. We blew it. We spent it all, and now you deal with it. It is your problem.

That is no way for the greatest Nation in the history of the world to operate. It is irresponsible, and we should not let this happen.

Our Blue Dog Coalition has been dedicated all the time I have been around and before that to fiscal responsibility, and I am proud to be associated with all of the Members that participate in the Blue Dog Coalition be-

cause of their commitment to this one idea, that we can operate within our means, and we should operate within our means.

It is a heartbreaking thing for me to think that we will spend all of the Social Security Trust Fund, and borrow more money than that, and turn around and pass that debt to our children. What responsible person would do that to his children, to his family, and what responsible Congress would do that to their country?

I want to thank the gentleman from California again for his leadership in this matter, and thank him for yielding time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his statement this evening. It so clearly mimics, I know, what my family taught my brother and me. It was very important to my parents that they pass on to their children more than what they inherited; that they passed on a safer community, better schools. They wanted for their children more than what they had.

I feel that same commitment. I am a relatively new dad. I have a 3-year-old, and I have a new child on the way; and when I think about what we are going to leave for my children, and I ask myself the question, will they have as good public schools as the ones I went to, will they have a decent health care system, will they live in a safe community and a safe country, what will be set aside for their future? It is times like now that we are put to the test as a generation. What will we leave our children?

Madam Speaker, I would now like to introduce another colleague from the Blue Dog Coalition, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

□ 2045

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is a member of the Committee on the Budget. He has been committed to working in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that the Federal budget is fiscally sound and balanced, and all I can say to the gentleman from Utah is if we could get the budget in as good of shape as the Olympics were run in Utah, we would be in very good shape.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for conducting this session tonight with all of the Blue Dogs to talk about what I think is such a critical issue.

Let us remember why we are here. We are talking about a request that has come in for us to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion. We throw numbers around here all the time, and sometimes they lose a little of their meaning. We should really think about this. This is a lot of money, and it is going to extend the debt limit by a lot.

Think about how this relates to us in the private sector. Before I came here, I worked in the business world. There were times when I used to develop a couple of large projects and I had to go

to a bank because I did have to borrow money to help pay for the project. There are times when one does need to go into debt to borrow money for a project in the business world, to take out a mortgage on a house. But what I had to do when I took that money out for that business project is I had to have a story I could tell to the lender about how I was going to pay that money back over time. When I took out a mortgage on my house, I had to explain to the lender how I was employed, how I had a salary, and how I was going to be able to pay back that mortgage over time.

The problem we have here now as Members of Congress is that we are being asked to take on this new mortgage, \$750 billion, in fact, a pretty big mortgage. The story has not been told about how we are going to get out of this pattern, about how we are going to get out of going back to borrow and borrow, about how we are going to pay this mortgage off. I think that is a relevant question to be asking.

I do not want to force the government into some financial catastrophe by having to be put into a situation where Congress is not willing to ever raise the debt limit, because there are circumstances where sometimes the government is going to have deficit spending: times of war, times of economic recession. We may have some difficulties in certain circumstances.

But the notion, the notion that we should raise this limit by this huge magnitude, \$750 billion, with no story, with no story about how we are going to stop the red ink and how we are going to ultimately pay this off, that is fiscal irresponsibility.

So I call on the President, I call on my fellow Members of Congress. We need to work to articulate a story for how we are going to get out of this mess, get out of the deficit spending pattern; and if we are going to raise the debt limit, \$750 billion is not necessarily what we need to do. Maybe we should look at a lot lower number while we work on a plan to get away from this deficit spending habit.

That is the way it works out in the real world, in the business world when we need to borrow money to finance a business, in one's personal life to borrow money to purchase a car or a home, and Congress should act in much the same way.

So that is the thought that I want to pass on tonight.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for his leadership on this issue and for the bipartisan way he has approached it. In fact, as a member of the freshman class that we share, the gentleman from Utah is the liaison to the Republican freshman class and has endeavored on many, many issues to work together and find common ground, and what more important area to find common ground than this, than the future of our country, than fiscal responsibility, which both parties espouse, but here is

the time where the rubber hits the road.

The gentleman from Utah talked about this mortgage and these interest payments, and I think it is not only a problem because of the interest that we will pay or the debt that we will accumulate but the lost opportunity that that interest represents. The Blue Dog Coalition has always been concerned about the vanishing surplus and what this represents in terms of our lost opportunities.

The new budget reports indicate that the government will return to deficit spending and raid the entire Medicare surplus and further raid Social Security by more than \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. During the budget debate last year, Congress and the President agreed that the Social Security Trust Fund surplus would be put in a lockbox and saved to prepare for the retirement of the baby boomers. The new projections show this promise will not be kept; and, unfortunately, the new projections instead show a return of budget deficits, borrowing from Social Security, and rapidly increasing national debt.

What is so worrisome about raising the debt limit is the effect it will have on the amount of interest we will pay on that national debt. The public debt, that is the debt that is held by public investors, is subject to rising interest costs, and the budgetary effect of that higher debt is obviously higher interest payments. This reveals a major change from last year's budget forecast.

Last year's budget forecast projected net interest payments on the debt of \$1.13 trillion over 10 years, with a payment in 2011 of only \$20 billion. This year's budget projects net interest payments of \$1.79 trillion over the same 10-year period, with a 2011 payment at the whopping sum of \$159 billion. Over \$1 trillion in the next decade will be spent solely to pay interest on our debt, over \$1 trillion that we cannot use productively for Social Security, for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, to facilitate a Patients' Bill of Rights, to improve our schools, to reduce class sizes, to rebuild crumbling infrastructure. That is \$1 trillion in interest payments that cannot be used for anything else.

A close look at the growing interest rates on our national debt reinforces the importance of long-term debt reduction. It is reasonable and appropriate to run temporary deficits during a recession and war, and we support the President's effort in the war on terrorism. However, under a responsible fiscal policy, the temporary deficits incurred must be offset by a return to budget surpluses when conditions improve. The most effective way to achieve economic growth and ensure our country returns to that era of budget surpluses is to increase our national savings, and the most direct way the government can increase national savings is to reduce its debt and thereby free up resources that the private

sector can turn into productive investments.

The last decade has shown the undeniable connection between declining budget deficits and increasing investment. The best way to maintain business investment, productivity growth, and low interest rates is to implement fiscal policy targeted towards reducing the debt. We cannot let all that we gained during the economic boom in the 1990s to be lost in the early years of the 21st century. So while we are confronted with this need to raise the debt ceiling, we must keep in mind, as my colleagues have pointed out, the principal element we must ensure, and that is long-term fiscal discipline and economic growth.

I would now like to yield to an outstanding leader of the Blue Dog Coalition, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). The gentleman from Texas is respected on both sides of the aisle. He has reached across partisan lines to promote fiscal responsibility and has been a leading advocate for years on debt reduction.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I thank him for leading this discussion tonight.

I know that perhaps there are some that are watching tonight and are saying, what is your alternative? Let me remind everyone that just a year ago, the same Blue Dogs stood in the well, stood at this mike, stood at others, and we offered an alternative budget. We at that time pointed out that the so-called surplus of \$5.6 trillion was projected. We did not believe it was the conservative thing to do, to allocate all of that \$5.6 trillion. We suggested paying down the debt with half of it, and then we suggested being very fiscally responsible with the spending as well as the tax cuts.

We lost that vote. Our friends on the other side of the aisle said, thanks, but no thanks. We have the formula, we have the plan, and the surplus is real.

We also pointed out to our friends on the other side of the aisle that, yes, we had a surplus, but many of my constituents were saying, how can we talk about a surplus when we have a debt? We owed \$5.6 trillion last year at this time. That is \$5.6 trillion. We also were completely ignoring the \$20 trillion unfunded liability of the Social Security system. We Blue Dogs said we thought it would have been the prudent thing to do last year to deal with the future of Social Security and Medicare. We said that is what we should have done first.

But no, the leadership of this House, and this is certainly within their prerogative, they said, no, the important thing for us to do is to have a tax cut; and that is what we did.

Well, here we are now, and I want to show this chart here. This was a letter dated February 13, 2002, to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, from Secretary O'Neill. The interesting thing about

this letter is, yes, he talks about the fact that the war has changed things, the economy has changed, and all of us agree to that. There is no question from any of us tonight that we must pay for the war, and there is no question that we are in a recession and that recession started considerably more than just a few months ago.

But the interesting thing about this letter is that in this letter he admits that we were going to have to increase our debt ceiling in 2003. Not 9 years, not 8 years, not any of the other rhetoric that we have heard.

I show this to indicate that, as we will be seeing more and more of us on the floor over the days and weeks ahead, that we really and truly, as the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) said a moment ago, we have a credit card. Most everyone has a credit card today. I have a big mock-up here we will use a little bit later showing one from the Republican National Committee. When we have a credit card, we have a debt limit, we have a borrowing limit, we have a credit limit on what we can borrow; and when we reach that limit, then we have to go to the credit company and convince them that we are worth taking a little additional risk on. We go to the bank. That is true. When you borrow to your limit, then you have to come up with a plan of how you are in fact going to convince your banker that they ought to loan you more money.

That is the most upsetting thing to we Blue Dogs tonight. What we are going to continue to suggest is that raising the limit to \$750 billion in one vote, without a plan, does not make sense, does not make sense to any small businessman or woman, does not make sense to any working man or woman, does not make sense to anyone that finds themselves in a credit difficulty to believe that you can go to your banker and convince them that they ought to loan you \$750 billion until you come with a plan.

That is the problem that we face tonight, giving a blank check to the administration without having a plan. Now, here again, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, what is your plan?

We have a plan. We had a plan. We voted on it last year. We lost. We are perfectly willing, in fact, we pleaded with the other side of the aisle time and time again, where is the meaning of bipartisan? We are ready to reach out and to work with the majority party in coming up with a plan. It is their plan that we are concerned about, and for them to believe that anyone on our side of the aisle would vote for their plan that is going to use all of the Social Security surplus for the next 9 years does not make sense. It does not make sense to me, and I do not believe it makes sense to the American people.

The last two votes to raise the debt limit in this body came at a time when Congress and the President were engaged in bipartisan negotiations on a

balanced budget plan that ultimately led to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The current situation is very different. The President has submitted a budget which projects deficits financed by borrowing the Social Security surplus for the next decade and beyond, without first passing a plan as to how we are going to save Social Security for our children and grandchildren. That is to many a small item; and, yes, there are two small items in my case, and they are my grandsons. I resolved 6½ years ago when the first grandson was born that I did not want him to look back 67 years from that day and say, if only my granddad would have done what in his heart he knew he should have done, we would not be in the mess we are in today.

□ 2100

To raise the debt ceiling and borrow another \$750 billion over the next few years, and then to increase our debt over the next 10 years under the plan that we are now under by \$2.75 trillion, is something I could not do, cannot do, will not do under any circumstances.

We will stand here and we will suggest, and I think the gentleman a moment ago made a good suggestion, let us borrow the amount of money necessary to fight the war. Whatever it takes to make sure that we continue to fund the Federal Government fighting the war, let us do it. But let us continue to have a little discussion on the other aspects of the economic game plan that we are under today. Let us talk about it; let us discuss it.

If there was some reaching out to our side, we would find there would be an agreement. I conclude just as I started: I am sick and tired of hearing my friends on the other side say, "Well, what is your plan?" We had a plan. We put it on the floor last year. They did not like it. They passed their plan. Now they are coming back and saying, oh, by the way, we have to borrow \$750 billion more to implement that plan.

That is not what they said when they stood on the floor last year. In fact, if Members remember, we were worried that we were going to pay down our national debt too quick. We actually had colleagues saying, "Well, we cannot pay down the debt as quick as we are going to pay it down." Would that not have been a wonderful problem? Because last year at this time nobody foresaw 9-11-01. No one foresaw that.

We are not prophetic. All we Blue Dogs said is that there just might be something that would happen, or maybe the stock market might not go up forever, just maybe something is going to happen; and it would have been the conservative thing to do to plan for that. Nobody listened to that.

Well, we had a pretty good vote. If there had been 14 more votes, we would have been here defending our plan tonight. Instead, we are here saying, "Let us rethink borrowing \$750 billion. Let us go to the drawing board. Let us work out the future of Social Security.

Let us work out the future of Medicare. Let us do it within a conservative budget and a conservative principle."

Borrowing money to the rate that the other side is talking about doing is not conservative, in my book. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his leadership on this. I appreciate all of my Blue Dogs.

Members are going to see and hear a lot more of us, and I hope very soon we will be joined by some colleagues on the other side of the aisle as we try to find an answer to this question, other than just borrowing and going further into debt.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. He has long been a clarion call to fiscal responsibility in this House, and I remember like it was yesterday the gentleman from Texas standing on this floor and talking about the unreliability of 10-year projections, how it was simply not prudent to anticipate that only the most rosy scenario would materialize; and indeed, even in August, before the tragic events of September, we could already see the wisdom of the words of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) as we saw those projections already being radically revised downward.

Would that we had more colleagues on this floor listen to those words last year, and we might not be in the fiscal predicament we are in today.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) has put her financial background to use in Congress and has stood out as a leader, both in education and in issues affecting our Armed Forces. The Congresswoman has worked in a bipartisan way to shape policies that benefit the people of Southern California and our country in a fiscally-responsible manner.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California. It has been a pleasure to have him here in the Congress and to work together as Blue Dogs on issues that really affect us.

I always tell my friends who ask me, what do the Blue Dogs do, I tell them, we are sort of like the bean counters, the accountants, the people who really want to set the record straight about what is happening with the money issues of the Congress. We do not want to do a lot of smoke and mirrors; we just want to talk about what it takes to do what we want to do and have a fair vote up and down on what we want.

I was happy to hear my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), talk about the fact that a year ago, as we discussed this large tax cut that was passed mostly with Republican votes and signed by the President, that many of us who have been in the financial industry, and I was an investment banker, many of us said, we need a plan. Whenever we go and look at the future of what is happening, we

have to have an idea of what we are going to do with the money, and if we have overruns, where we are going to get that money. We have to have cushions to what we are doing.

Many of us said to that tax cut that the biggest problem with it was it was done on rosy projections at a time when all of us knew that the economy was stalling on us, and we just knew that those numbers were not going to work.

So here we are today. Last year, no politician, no policymaker, none of us could have imagined that we would be here talking today about raising the statutory debt ceiling. At that time, the administration and the Congressional Budget Office were predicting that no increase was going to be necessary in this until 2008, if at all.

What a difference a year makes, and it was not about 9-11. Yes, we are spending a little more on defense and on home security, but that is not what this is about. This is about raising the debt ceiling and raising it without a plan in place.

When I used to issue debt for agencies or for companies, when I would put bonds out there, one of the things that we had to do was write a prospectus and talk about what we were going to do with the money, why we were borrowing it, how we were going to make the money back, and how we were going to make the payments on that debt in order to bring the debt down. But here, this administration wants a \$750 billion increase, and they do not even have a plan.

So I agree with the rest of the Blue Dogs here tonight that we need a plan, and we need to keep pushing for a plan. We do not need to increase this to \$6.7 trillion, an increase of \$750 billion.

Since 1940, the debt ceiling has risen by over 12,000 percent, and here we go again. The money right now, \$5.95 trillion, that is the debt ceiling we have right now. It is even hard for people to imagine back home what \$5.59 trillion is. I tell people, if they imagine all the people in the world, and each one of those owed \$1,000, every man, every woman, every child in the world, they would get close to what that debt ceiling is.

So where does it stop, with \$750 billion this day, another \$750 billion the next year? What about the budget that we have from the President right now, the one that says he wants to extend these tax cuts? We are going to have to keep increasing this debt ceiling because our debt is going to keep going up.

One of the problems is, the more debt we get, the more interest we have to pay, the more we add to our debt. Think about those credit cards we have. When we make that minimum payment every month, the interest rate makes it be more the next month, so we keep making payments, but what we owe on the credit card is more and more and more as every month comes along.

That is what we are doing to ourselves when we do not make a plan, a fiscally-responsible plan about how we are going to balance our spending with the revenues that are coming in.

To my colleague, the gentleman from California, I thank him for allowing me to come down here and talk a little bit about how people back home understand how important it is to pay down this debt, not continue to increase it; and how, if they have to go to their bank to get a loan, they need to tell them how they are going to pay it back.

I think most Americans across this great country understand that sometimes, in a time of war, we need to borrow and we need to make sure that we win this war. But they also want that plan. They want us to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement and for her leadership on this issue.

The gentlewoman from California talked about when she was issuing bonds that she required a prospectus. The gentleman from Utah talked about when he went to a banker, he was required to give the banker what he termed a story, something that would account for why he could pay back the debt.

So what is the administration's prospectus? What is the story? What is the plan to get us back to balanced budgets? As I understand it, according to the director of OMB, the plan is, well, if the economy grows at a faster than anticipated rate, maybe we will get back to a period of surplus again.

Imagine telling that to our local banker when we are going out for a small business loan: Mr. Banker, if my business grows faster than can be reasonably expected, then I will be able to pay you back. That would not fly with our local bank, it would not fly with the municipality, and it ought not to fly with the Federal Government.

Another one of my colleagues from the Blue Dog Coalition is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). The Blue Dog Coalition policy co-chair, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), has led our coalition on many issues and has been recognized for his stalwart commitment to fiscal responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his leadership in this hour tonight. It has been good to see so many of the Blue Dog Democrat Coalition members come to the floor and talk about this issue.

Clearly, we are advocating fiscal responsibility because we believe it is important to the future prosperity and the future economic security of our country. In many ways, we might define the debate tonight as a debate for our national security, because main-

taining fiscal responsibility is a very important part of maintaining our national security.

We see examples all across the world of nations that get in trouble economically, Argentina being the most recent. We understand what debt, excessive debt, can mean to a country. Those of us here on the floor tonight want to try to start paying down that debt, rather than seeing it continuing to rise.

We believe it is very important not to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. What business in America could get by if its corporate executives raided the retirement funds of its employees? Those executives would be put behind bars. But in Congress and in Washington, it seems that we routinely go into the Social Security Trust Fund, take those hard-earned payroll tax dollars, and go out and spend them for something else, just at a time when Social Security is needing those funds with the retirement of the baby boom generation.

We can look at the facts. They speak for themselves. If we just turn back just a year ago and look at the projections, what we see is that just a year ago we had a projection over 10 years that our debt, our publicly held debt, that is, the debt that is held by those third parties, those folks who hold those savings bonds, those Treasury bonds, those Treasury notes, we saw a year ago that the projections were that that debt would be eliminated over the next decade. In fact, it would be actually completely paid off to the tune of \$129 billion, so we would be back in surplus.

Yet, here we are in February of 2002, and the projections have completely changed. We find that the projection is that we will have an almost 2.8 trillion debt at the end of this decade. So what we see is a completely different picture.

What has happened? Of course, we passed a major tax cut based on those projections of economic prosperity. Now it turns out that with the tax cut, with the slowdown in the economy, and with the war, that projection of surplus is gone and our projections now show an ocean of red ink.

The impact of that on paying interest is just almost incomprehensible. We projected just a year ago that we would pay \$709 billion in interest on our national debt over the next decade. We are actually paying close to \$1 billion a day right now just on interest on our national debt, but that was going to go down because the projections were that we were going to pay off that publicly held national debt.

Well, what does it look like today? Here we are with projections that we will spend almost \$1.8 trillion in interest, almost, over the next decade, \$1 trillion more in interest. What a waste. What a waste.

We believe firmly that we must end the practice of deficit spending in Washington. Congress engaged in it for 30 years, until just 4 years ago when we

passed the Balanced Budget Act, and we have seen 3 years of annual surpluses in our Federal budget. But here we are in 2002 with, once again, a projection that we will be back into deficit spending.

Some people say, "What is the big deal? Deficit spending, it sounds kind of like Washington talk." It simply means that we are spending more money than we are taking in. If Members did it at their houses, they would be running up a debt on a credit card, or going down to the bank trying to figure out how to borrow enough money to pay the bills.

In our houses, if we have a credit card, it usually has a limit on how much debt we can go into before they say, no, they cannot charge anymore.

□ 2115

It is not that way in Washington. You can just keep running the debt up or at least some people seem to think that is the way this works. They act as if it does not matter how big the national debt gets. Why is deficit spending wrong? It is wrong because the debts that we incur today will have to be paid for by our children. That is wrong. It is wrong because as the demand for credit is increased by our government, it has the effect of pushing up interest rates in the economy. So we all pay, not only in higher taxes to cover this interest on this national debt; but every time we go out and borrow money to buy cars, send our children to college, buy a new home, we are going to be paying higher interest rates than we would had the government not engaged in such reckless deficit spending.

Another thing the deficit does for us is forecloses a lot of options. If we have an emergency and we need to spend more, it is harder to go into debt when you are already deep in debt. When you are trying to solve the problem of Social Security and Medicare, which is going to get critical in about 10 years with the retirement of baby boomers, and you try to figure out how to solve that problem, if you are already deeply in debt, you are going to have trouble. If you are trying to help our senior citizens, as most of us on the floor tonight have worked hard to do with prescription drugs, where are you going to pay for it if you are already deeply in debt? It is wrong to raid Social Security in order to finance the activities of government. We need to be protecting Social Security. And deficit spending is wrong because ultimately it is going to erode the confidence in the U.S. economy.

The only reason we stand on this floor tonight and have the luxury of borrowing money in order to run our government is because of the confidence people have in the American economy. In Argentina tonight you cannot borrow any money, the government cannot. But in the good old United States people still have confidence in our economy, and we can go

out and borrow money. And you know what it is backed by? It is backed by people's faith and confidence in our economy and our willingness to pay those debts by taxing the American people someday. And if we allow that debt to keep growing and growing and growing, that interest to keep growing and growing and growing, there is going to come a point when the world is going to look at our economy and says, you all look an awful like an Argentina economy, and I do not believe we want to loan you any more money to finance that \$5 trillion national debt. And I believe if we do, we are going to have to get a little more interest rates because we look at the economy much like those investors did when they were borrowing money a few years ago on those junk bonds, and junks bonds of course require very high interest rates for anybody that wants to buy.

So if we undermine the economy of this country, in the long term it would destroy our economic security, our national security and our prosperity. That is what this debate tonight is all about.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his leadership. I commend the Blue Dogs for their willingness to come to the floor tonight and talk about this critical national issue.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman tonight for his leadership on this issue. The gentleman also very successfully lead the House just a couple weeks ago successfully to gather the signatures required to discharge campaign finance reform which successfully passed the House. We thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) very much for his contributions both then and now.

Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce a fellow Californian, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who I had the privilege of serving with in the California State Senate. The gentleman has worked hard for the people of California and our Nation and is recognized for his bipartisan approach for the important issues facing our Congress, especially the debt limit. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his leadership tonight in this effort to bring awareness to what I believe is a very, very important issue for all of the American people.

Madam Speaker, we have come to a very critical point in our congressional work. We can create a long-term physical plan that will benefit this and future generations or we can send our government down the road of excessive borrowing and send the bill to the next generation of Americans. I believe this would be the wrong approach.

As we have heard many times tonight, just a year ago the administration predicted Congress would be able to operate under the Federal debt limit

for the next 7 years. Now we are being asked for a \$750 billion increase in the Federal debt limit. The Treasury Department predicts this increase will cover government needs until 2005. So we went from being able to stay under the Federal debt limit in 9 years to being forced to raise the limit by \$750 billion just so government can continue to operate for another 3 years.

We are in danger of opening the flood gates of fiscal irresponsibility by increasing the Federal debt limit without having a plan in place to balance the budget and to pay our bills. Funding our national priorities such as homeland security and our efforts against terrorism must be done. However, to increase the Federal debt limit without having any mechanism of fiscal restraint will likely lead us down the path of deficits resulting from additional spending or additional tax cuts.

In the span of 1 year, the Office of Management and Budget has reduced its 10-year budget surplus projections by \$5 trillion. When investors around the world look to Washington to see the creation of huge budget deficits, they will inevitably push interest rates higher. When interest rates go up, the American consumer suffers. A homeowner in our country who holds \$100,000 mortgage debt would save a total of \$50,000 over the life of a 30-year mortgage if the mortgage rate was just 2 percentage points lower. American consumers hold about \$6.5 trillion in mortgage debt, so each percentage point of increase in their mortgage rate means an extra \$250 billion in mortgage costs to Americans.

In addition, local schools and local hospitals will be forced to pay higher interest costs as they issue bonds to raise the necessary funds they need to continue to educate our kids and care for sick Americans and injured Americans.

Throughout the 1990's, the Federal Government maintained fiscal discipline; and the pay off to the American consumer was remarkable. Let us not throw these gains away. Instead, let us do what may be tough but obviously what is right. Let us put in place a mechanism for fiscal responsibility and fiscal constraint. Let us not allow this budget or this credit limit to increase and put future American generations in fiscal jeopardy.

Madam Speaker, we should fund our war on terrorism and our efforts on homeland security, and we must save Social Security and Medicare from insolvency by adopting a more fiscally-responsible approach to budget priorities. Now is the time to make the tough choices to ensure future generations are not saddled with trillions of dollars of debt and stuck with a bankrupt retirement program. I thank the Blue Dogs for their effort in this regard.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, in closing I want to thank the Blue Dog Democrats who

have joined me here tonight in this discussion of raising the national debt limit and its implications for our Federal fiscal policy. I look forward to the opportunity to debate this issue in the days ahead as we continue to work to balance the budget and pay down our debt and protect the Social Security Trust Fund for the future.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1542, INTERNET FREEDOM AND BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. LINDER (during Special Order of Mr. SCHIFF), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-361) on the resolution (H. Res. 350) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1542) to deregulate the Internet and high speed data services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

IMMIGRATION INTO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I come before the body tonight to talk about an issue that has often times been in the forefront in my thinking and a concern about the direction of the Nation; and that, of course, is immigration and the effect of massive immigration on our country.

Madam Speaker, I and my wife and several other members of the Congress of the House of Representatives just returned from a trip to Turkey, and it was a very interesting, very fascinating trip. And as we got back into the United States and were coming through customs, the young lady who was the customs official that was stamping our passport and checking to see what we have and that sort of thing at JFK looked up at me and said, I think I have seen you some place before, maybe on C-SPAN. And I said, Well, perhaps because I often am doing exactly what I am doing here tonight. I have spoken often on the issue of immigration. And she just had immediately got this sort of dejected look on her face and said, What a mess. What a mess. And she said it in a way that says it all.

Here is an official charged with the responsibility of implementing part of our immigration laws; and she, as well as so many other of her colleagues working in that area, recognize that it is in fact a mess.

Now, I have often come before this body and stood at this particular microphone and talked about the implications, well, more importantly the incredible situation we face with an organization, the INS, that is dysfunctional, to say the least. We have a situation where we have literally millions

of people coming across our borders every single year that cannot be accounted for, millions of people who actually end up staying here beyond the time that they were allowed to come in under visas. And many people, of course, coming across the border every single year without any sort of visa or permission from this government to do.

There are many implications as a result of having this kind of situation, a country that is completely unable to defend its own borders. That is the situation that we face tonight. And I have talked on many occasions about the implications of that situation, the economic implications in this country, the incredible costs that we incur.

In a recent article in the *Denver Post*, a columnist by the name of Al Knight identified the costs to just the city and county of Denver for the purpose of providing services for immigrants, both legal and illegal, who come into the city in order to have their children, have a baby. And then Medicaid picks up the cost of it for the most part, in fact, 100 percent of it. And how much then it ends up costing every citizen just for that one little chunk of the action. And it goes on, of course, schools, roads, housing, welfare, enormous economic costs, infrastructural costs for a Nation that cannot defend its own borders.

There are political ramifications. There are cultural ramifications. And there are, of course, even security, national security issues that are all too evident for us here tonight as a result of the September 11 events. And we have talked about these things, and I try to bring them to the attention of my colleagues because, of course, I believe that they are worthy of that attention, those issues.

Tonight I am going to focus just on a little bit of a different side of this because as I said I just came back from a country that is a fascinating place, and it is in a part of the world that is experiencing enormous difficulties. Of course, that has probably been the case for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. And I have been, therefore, thinking about this issue that Huntington calls the "clash of civilizations" because we were there where we saw civilizations clashing. And Mr. Huntington in his book, "Clash of Civilizations," points out that there are today no real ideologies clashing. There are really not nations fighting nations so much as there are civilizations clashing with each other. And this does have relevance to the issue of immigration and certain other aspects of our national policy.

□ 2130

So I am going to focus on that for just some time tonight because I do think again that is a side of this immigration issue that has not really been discussed to the extent that it is warranted.

Madam Speaker, I wonder whether or not we have given enough thought to

some of the philosophical questions that develop as a result of massive immigration into this country and combining massive immigration with another phenomenon in America that I will call radical multiculturalism.

Another great book, while I am speaking of that, is a book called the *Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*, by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. He speaks to this problem, and he says what happens when people of different ethnic origins, speaking different languages and professing different religions, settle on the same geographical locality, live under the same political sovereignty, unless a common purpose binds them together, tribal antagonisms will drive them apart.

In the century darkly ahead, civilization faces a critical question, he says. What is it that holds a nation together? And that is what I am going to address here for just a little bit this evening.

He goes on to say, no one in the 19th century thought more carefully about representative government than John Stewart Mill. The two elements that defined a nation, as Mill saw it, were the desire on the part of the inhabitants to be governed together and the common sympathy instilled by shared history, values and language.

Free institutions, he wrote, are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities. Among the people without fellow feeling, especially if they read and speak different languages, united public opinion, necessary for the working of representative government, cannot exist.

It is in general a necessary condition of free institutions that the boundaries of government should coincide in the main with those of nationalities.

Of course, that is happening less and less in this world. It is happening less and less in the United States.

One can say and be accurate I think to suggest that America has for a long time shown itself to be something in opposition to this definition that Mr. Mill has given us of a cohesive country. After all, we are a Nation that was born out of many ethnic origins, people from a variety of different countries, of course, coming here to create what we now call the United States of America; and many of them spoke different languages and had different values and different religions and that sort of thing, but they came together in this country and created a new experiment, new experiment in the way we govern ourselves. We call it a republic.

So how could it be then that the possibility or the problem of massive immigration could possibly in the United States, which as I say has a history of immigration, of course, people coming from all over the world and having formed a very prosperous and workable country, how could it be that we then look at the possibility that that might not be the future for the United States?

Let me suggest, Madam Speaker, that there are some major and significant differences between massive immigration today in the United States and the immigration that brought this country into an existence, its existence.

For the most part, it is my belief, it is my understanding of history, of our history especially, that it indeed is a country to which many people came from different places but came with a common purpose for the most part. They came here with the idea that they were in fact joining something new, participating in a new experiment in government, seeking a new life and seeking, most importantly, to break the ties to the old, and this is a very important distinction that I think we have to address. And when they came, the way that the culture existed and, up until just recently anyway, all the forces internally in the United States, the cultural and political forces, were driving people into an amalgamation, if you will, a homogeneity, the melting pot. That is where it comes from, where people came from a lot of places but became one. *E pluribus unum*.

That amazing sort of phenomenon created this incredibly wonderful country, and it held us together through a revolution and civil war, World War I, World War II, Depression, all of the other things that provided a threat to the national existence. It held us together.

Something is happening that I think we have to pay attention to. Today and for the last actually I think probably almost 40 years, we have seen a difference in the kind of immigration and the kind of people who are coming to the United States, the kind of connections they have to the countries from which they came and their desire to maintain them, their desire to maintain another language, different customs, different habits and even, even a desire to maintain some sort of political affinity to the country from which they came.

This I suggest, Madam Speaker, is a new thing with which we must deal, a new phenomenon, and we could deal with it still in this country, this massive country if we were talking about immigration at the numbers that were even high at the turn of the century, couple hundred thousand people a year at the turn of the late 1800s, early 1900s. That was it. That was the highest we ever got 220 some thousand people coming to the United States. We could handle that. But we are, of course, far above that today.

When we combine the massive numbers of people coming into the United States with this different philosophical background and difference in terms of what they are looking for, what they want to be when they get here and add to the mix this multiculturalism, this concept, this idea taught in the schools, the idea promulgated by the media, the idea promulgated certainly by what some people have termed the

elite in our society, this idea being that all cultures are the same, that no nation state is really any different than any other nation state, that there is nothing unique about the United States, that we should not look to our past because they are nothing really, just a bunch of dead white males who made up our history, we should eschew that, we should move away from that, we should condemn that, we should disconnect ourselves from that history and embrace this multicultural concept.

I would suggest that these two phenomena, these two things, this massive immigration with people coming with a different purpose in mind and combined with this multiculturalism, I would say radical multiculturalism, this is concocting a deadly mixture for the United States.

This manifests itself in a variety of ways, and there are some very interesting statistics which point this out, what is happening to us. We have allowed for many, many years, we have allowed people to live in the United States while claiming citizenship in another country. Relatively few people have ever done that in our Nation's history frankly, but recently we have noticed a significant increase.

There are now estimates of six, seven or eight million people in the United States who are claiming dual citizenship, and that is really probably a very conservative estimate. Because between 1961 and 1997, 22 million legal immigrants, that is just legal, came to this country. Seventy-five percent of them came from countries that allowed dual citizenship; and many millions, as I say, now claim that.

Interestingly, a couple of years ago Mexico changed its laws and allowed its citizens immigrating from Mexico to retain their citizenship. They have even gone farther than that, and they are now encouraging Mexicans in the United States to vote in both the United States and in elections in Mexico.

We were recently in Mexico. I will never forget sitting at a luncheon and sitting next to a gentleman by the name of Eddie Levy. Eddie Levy, his name tag in front of us there. When we went around, introduced ourselves, Mr. Levy introduced himself as a member of the Mexican Congress. And indeed he was. He was a citizen of Los Angeles, but he is also a member of the Mexican Congress.

There are cities in southern Texas where the mayor of the city is a Mexican national. There is a city that has actually said that none of its documents will be written in English anymore, will all be in Spanish. It has actually said that nobody employed by the city can enforce any immigration laws, any American immigration laws. This is a city inside the United States.

The President of Mexico recently, he has something he calls the Vision 20/20 plan for homogenous Americas. He is unabashedly staking Mexico's future

and fortunes on greener pastures in the north. This is from a Gwinnett News Service article, February 21. He delights in describing a borderless region, symbiotic in its relations, similar in principle to the European Economic Union where jobs and people and the Euro cross most borders as easily as the wind.

This is the President of Mexico. When we think of 2025, year 2025, there is not going to be a border, Mr. Fox has said. Soon there will be free movement of people, just like the free movement of goods.

We were in Mexico, as I say, not too long ago. We met with a representative of the Mexican government who is a newly appointed cabinet minister there for a newly created cabinet in the Mexican government. His name is Juan Hernandez, and Mr. Hernandez's title translates something like minister in charge of Mexicans living outside of Mexico.

It is a very interesting title, of course, and he was also unabashed in what he described as the future he saw. It is one in which essentially millions of Mexican citizens will be coming to the United States, legally and illegally. He sees really no difference. Because, as he told me, really there are not two countries here, he said. We are just talking a region. This is a member of the Mexican government.

So there is a blending, that is for sure, there is a blending of culture. There is a blending, and the border is in many respects almost eliminated. It is gone, for all intents and purposes.

There can be a legitimate debate, as I have said often, as to whether or not we should abolish the border between the United States and Mexico, between the United States and Canada and form this sort of European Union model that Mr. Fox wants and that many Members of this Congress want, maybe even members of our administration want. We can debate this point. A bill could arise for that purpose. We could have a national debate as to whether or not we want to eliminate the borders.

□ 2145

I would vote "no." I believe that there is a purpose served by them, borders, that is; and they go beyond just the need for our own immediate security. They go into this bigger issue that I am talking about in terms of what makes a nation; what, in fact, holds a nation together. But, nonetheless, it is a legitimate topic. We can debate it, if that is where we are going.

The problem I have, Madam Speaker, is that that is where we are going; but it is without the debate. We will not hear on the floor of this House, we will not hear in any committee of this Congress a discussion as to the efficacy of doing something like eliminating our borders. We will talk about the need to revamp the INS and all that, and I am all for it; but I really do think that the whole battle over immigration is really a battle as to whether or not we should have borders.

And the people who are the ultimate sort of multiculturalists, the people who do not see a reason to attach any significance to what we describe as the United States of America, its uniqueness and the validity of our civilization, of Western Civilization, essentially, in this clash of civilizations that we now face in the world, the people who push that concept will push for the elimination of our borders. And they are aided in that if they cannot get it via a bill through this Congress, signed by the President, then they will get it as a result of changing who we are and what we are in the United States.

As I say, it is not just massive immigration that is the problem. It is massive immigration connected with this multiculturalism that infects our system, our culture. It is the kind of thing that says that schoolchildren cannot say the Pledge any more; it is the kind of thing that will not allow flags to be flown in our schools and in public institutions. Even after the outpouring of patriotic fervor after September 11, there were places throughout the United States that disallowed the flying of the flag because they said it may in fact anger people; it may be an affront to somebody; that it may make them uncomfortable. The flying of the flag may make them uncomfortable.

No, Madam Speaker, the elimination of any sort of recognition of uniqueness of America from our public schools under this cloak of multiculturalism, I guess I will call it, has resulted in a situation where we have at least a generation, maybe two, who are incredibly illiterate when it comes to American history and the American ideal.

I am a teacher by background. I taught for 8 years in Jefferson County, Colorado. I taught civics, as a matter of fact. And I can attest to something that I think is pretty much common sense, but it is a fact that children are not born with an appreciation, an innate appreciation of the Declaration of Independence or the Bill of Rights, who we are as a Nation. They do not understand that innately. They have to be taught. It has to be something that is appreciated in their homes and reinforced in the school, the same way that most children do not come to school with an appreciation of great art or great literature or great music. We have to teach them that. They do not come to it naturally.

The same thing happens with teaching them about America and about the uniqueness of this country and about what it means to be an American, how it separates us from the rest of the world. But even saying that today in a public school could get someone in trouble. Today, if a teacher in a public school in this land actually said that there is something unique about America, it separates us from the rest of the world and it is better, they would be in trouble. There are politicians that may be in trouble for saying it. There are certainly people in the media who would rail against such a concept. I see aspects of this all the time.

I think there are major implications to issues like drawing lines, congressional lines, just for certain ethnic groups, and even caucuses here in the Congress of the United States, where Black, Hispanic and others are based on ethnicity. I always wonder about how that helps us come together as a Nation; how does this help us actually define ourselves as a Nation, the common set of ideals, of values, of languages?

Now, I am Italian. I am 100 percent Italian. I am a recent arrival, as a matter of fact, by heritage. My grandparents came to the United States in the late 1800s and early 1900s, along with the wave of immigration all over the world. As I say, both sides came from Italy, so I am relatively new, if you want to think of it that way. I cannot trace my heritage back to the Mayflower. So I am a relatively new American, if you want to think of it that way. Yet I must say, Madam Speaker, that in growing up, all the textbooks I was given in school, all the things that I was told in my home, all of the influences of my life, and all of the references to my history, our history, if you want to say it that way, was all American history.

I grew up thinking of Jefferson and Madison and Adams, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin. These were the heroes of my history. That is what I was taught, both at home and in school. There was never any idea that we were somehow still tied politically or linguistically to Italy. As a matter of fact, and perhaps even unfortunately, Italian was not allowed to be spoken in my grandparents' home. It was an indication of their desire to separate themselves from the nation of their birth and to come here and start anew.

That, as I say, is what I think has changed. I believe our schools do not teach that. I believe that we are witnessing this significant shift in culture, and I think it is something worthy of us to discuss. Massive immigration, combined with radical multiculturalism spells disaster, as far as I am concerned, Madam Speaker. As I say, I have often come to the floor to talk about the other implications of immigration, but tonight I just wanted to address this topic for a short period of time because I do think it is worthy of note.

Perhaps it is because I just came back from overseas where I could see the effects of this clash of civilizations; that everywhere we look around the world, as a matter of fact, we can see tribalism breaking up nation states, and that is the new world in which we live. It is happening all over. Countries are facing this kind of problem, and I worry about our own future. And I think that in order for us to sustain ourselves, in order for the United States to sustain itself and be the leader of Western Civilization, that we have to have a cohesion, we have to have a homogenous society.

Now, I am not suggesting for a moment that anybody has to ignore their

background. Certainly I do not. Certainly I appreciate my own, and I appreciate anybody else's desire to revel in their own cultural background and heritage. That is not the issue at all. It is the issue of whether or not we disconnect, though, politically, from what we were to who we are today. And I worry that that is not happening.

There are certainly indications that something very, very different is occurring in America today as a result of massive immigration into the United States. Uncontrolled immigration. We can, in fact, still have immigration. We do not have to slam any doors shut. We simply have to reduce the number; and we have to, on the other side of the coin, begin to once again focus on what it means to be an American in our public schools, in our institutions, in our leaders.

I think the President of the United States and all people entrusted with the responsibility of leadership in America should focus on that and talk about it. It is imperative now, I think, as we enter into this new world, this clash of civilizations that I mentioned. It is imperative that we identify for the world at large and for our own citizens exactly who we are and why there is the struggle against the evil that we have identified as the terrorists in the world. It is in a way a clash of civilizations, certainly; and it is important for Americans to understand who we are, where we came from, and where we are going.

We need a cohesive society. We need a language in which we can all communicate. Even that, of course, as you know, is being challenged continually. Bilingual education, as an example, is where children are placed in classes and taught in a language other than English for the purpose, they say, of increasing their educational attainment levels. But even when it is shown over and over again that there is no actual increase in educational attainment levels, people still push bilingual education. So you have to ask yourself why. What is the purpose? If it is not to actually help a child accomplish something, accomplish a better education, obtain a better education, then why are we doing it? It is, I suggest, Madam Speaker, as a result of this radical multiculturalism; the idea that we do not want people to disconnect from that other culture, wherever they came from and what they were, and connect to a new one. We want to foster this Balkanizing sort of phenomenon that we are experiencing in the United States. All very dangerous stuff.

#### POVERTY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have listened to much of the discussion this evening, and I have de-

cidated that I am going to talk about something that I do not think we talk about nearly enough, and I am sure that we do not do nearly enough about it, and that is the whole issue of poverty and what it does to millions of people in our Nation and what it does to millions of people throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, the stubborn persistence of poverty in America is one of the most inexplicable features of our national life. America, that is our country, in the 21st century is the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world. We have the resources to provide for all of our citizens, and certainly we have the resources to end hunger, homelessness, and to offer quality health care and education to all of our people. Yet, in our great national paradox, we have not chosen to do so.

The gap between the few ultra-wealthy and the overwhelming majority of working people, that gap, which was once quite small, has grown and is now wider than at any time since the Great Depression.

□ 2200

It has, in the judgment of many, become so large that it undermines our sense of a Nation of equals. Poverty and income inequality present a real challenge to our notion of America as a Nation that promotes equality and that is seriously moving in that direction.

In 1997, the top 1 percent of the U.S. population, that is, 2.6 million people, had as much after-tax income as the 100 million Americans with the lowest income.

At the same time, household debt reached historic highs. The total value of all forms of outstanding household debt was greater than the total disposable income of all households.

The wealthiest 1 percent reduced their share of the debt by 27 percent, while the middle 20 percent of households increased their share of the debt by 38.8 percent.

There was no progress in reducing poverty between 1995 and 1999 despite an increasing economy. More than 1.4 million Americans are classified as food insecure, including the cruelest feature of poverty, the concentration of children among the poor.

Madam Speaker, 45 percent of children in poor families are considered food insecure.

Reductions in poverty as a result of economic growth were entirely offset by increased poverty due to cuts in government safety net programs. The poor in the United States are less likely than the poor in other countries to leave poverty. On average, 28.6 percent of the United States poor are able to escape their economic situation, while in Sweden the rate is 36 percent. In Germany, the rate is 37 percent; in Canada, the rate is 42 percent; and in the Netherlands the rate is 44 percent.

Counting the poor has become a cynical art. Measures of poverty have

come and gone, many of them arbitrary from their inception. The current poverty level has never been permitted to adjust to cost of living increases and other impacts. The debate over defining poverty and who is poor has been used to limit the ability of public policy to address poverty in a meaningful way.

As William Greider has pointed out, "The effect of the poverty line is to obscure the existence of a vast pool of struggling families who are above the poverty line, who are not officially poor, and to exclude them from the political equation."

Further quoting, "Helping the poor is considered virtuous even among conservatives. Helping the nonpoor is considered wasteful or even fraudulent. The problem of poverty is presumed to reside in the poor people themselves, not in the structure of wages available in the private economy."

According to a recent study by the Economic Policy Institute, 29 percent of working families in the United States with one to three children under age 12 do not earn enough to afford basic necessities such as food, housing, health care, and child care, even during a period of national prosperity. Nearly one-third of families with incomes below twice the poverty threshold faced at least one critical hardship, like going without food, getting evicted, having to double up in housing with another family or not having access to medical care during an acute illness.

The report calculated a basic budget level for each State, the budget a family would need to afford food, housing, child care, health insurance, transportation, and utilities. Even for families that include a full-time worker, nearly one-quarter of the families below twice the poverty line face these problems.

Of families with incomes below the basic income line, half include a parent who worked full time, and nearly 60 percent are two-parent families. More than 75 percent are headed by a worker with a high school degree or more. About one-third live in the suburbs, one-third in the cities, and one-third in rural areas.

Just over half of all families living below the basic budget level are white families. However, about half of all black and Hispanic families fall below the basic budget levels.

No one argues for income equality in the sense we demand equality in polling places. Nevertheless, there is, somewhere, a line where economic inequality becomes incompatible with democracy. The marketplace makes no allowance for democracy, and there is no greater challenge to our democracy than economic injustice and poverty in the first place.

So out of concern for basic economic justice, out of the fundamental need for capitalism to balance production and consumption and a profound need to preserve our sense of Nation, we face no more critical task than shaping a national economic policy which addresses the issue of poverty.

The question of poverty and economic income inequality has moved center stage as, for the first time in a decade, America is mired in recession. And of course we know that when we talk recession overall we are talking serious depression for those at the lowest levels of our economic stratum.

More than 8 million Americans are now out of work. More than 1 million workers have lost their jobs since September 11. Our economy has been shedding 100,000 jobs a week. Two million workers will likely lose their unemployment insurance benefits in the first 6 months of this year. Ninety-four percent of those who lose benefits will not receive additional assistance.

It is extremely unfortunate that the President's budget slashes job training in 336 cities from \$225 million to \$45 million.

We have now experienced more than 13 consecutive months of industrial decline, the longest such period since the Great Depression. American consumers, which have accounted for two-thirds of our economic engine in recent years, have been staggered by the current crisis, and both the November and December retail sales have been characterized as dismal.

As usual, the most vulnerable are the hardest hit. Unemployment of African Americans and Hispanics have increased at least 50 percent faster than the national average. For African American teens, the increase is 400 percent faster. While the number of African Americans in poverty began to decrease in the last years of the period of economic expansion in the 1990s and the wage gap decreased during those recent years, the income gap has remained substantial.

The persistent racial inequalities and inequities are underlined by a recent study by Edward N. Wolff. Wolff points to the persistence of these inequalities and notes that even if we could immediately eliminate the racial income gap, it could take another two generations for the wealth gap to close.

Unemployment rates for women who are heads of household have soared. 200,000 single moms are scheduled to be dropped from Federal assistance in 2003.

Also soaring is the homeless rates. According to the Coalition for the Homeless, a record number of people, more than 29,000, were spending nights in shelters in New York during November, up from 8,000 in October.

Meanwhile, the so-called safety net, gutted by welfare reform, has begun to reveal fearsome gaps. Even before the downturn began, more than 100,000 families lost their income support because of time limits. In the first 3 years of TANF, 540,000 families had benefits terminated for not complying with program rules.

State reserves for income support programs are drying up rapidly. Illinois and Michigan are among states most at risk.

Food stamps have traditionally been one of the basic protections of the safe-

ty net. However, over the past few years participation rates have fallen sharply because of barriers to access.

One of the other basic fixtures of the safety net has been unemployment insurance. Benefit levels now replace only 33 percent of the coverage that average workers lost, down from 36 percent in 1990. The percentage of unemployed workers who actually get unemployment benefits has also declined over the past 40 years, peaking at 49 percent in 1975 and declining to a mere 37 percent in 2001.

We know that recessions are particularly cruel to State budgets. Those who have been following events in Illinois know that Medicaid is high on the endangered list. We need an economic stimulus to jump-start our economy, and we need it immediately.

While some talk about tax cuts which will primarily benefit the wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers, and do nothing for the bottom 75 percent, let me suggest that any serious economic stimulus package must consider and be focused on the needs of the poor and the most vulnerable among us.

The President's fiscal year 2003 budget calls for cutting job training and employment funding by almost \$700 million while unemployment is increasing.

The President's budget calls for reducing community development support by 28 percent while poor communities and programs for child care and social services are in crisis.

The President's budget proposes to cut home energy assistance by \$300 million compared to fiscal year 2002.

The President's budget cuts funding for JAIBG, which helps States improve facilities and services to incarcerated youth by 13.8 percent.

The President's budget makes the first of 10 annual \$780 million cuts to our teaching hospitals; and, to add insult to injury, then adds a 30 percent cut to a program which funds medical training at hospitals that specialize in the care of children.

The President's budget request reduces his own plan for prescription drug benefits from the \$48 billion he proposed last year to \$13.2 billion this year.

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health would take a \$29 million hit, while the Occupational Safety and Health Administration will take a \$9 million hit.

Public housing will face a \$382 million cut along with the \$417 million cut for public housing repairs and \$268 million from the Community Development Block Grants.

□ 2215

Now is the time for some hard thinking about priorities and about cutting waste in government.

Here is what Vice Admiral Jack Shanahan, United States Navy, retired, former commander of the United States Second Fleet and head of the Military Advisory Committee of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities

wrote about the President's budget on February 13. He said: "The decision to ask Congress to increase the Pentagon budget by \$48 billion or more may sound reasonable in light of America's ongoing war on terrorism, but the reality is that the Pentagon budget should actually be trimmed by 15 percent."

Further quoting: "To be sure, our military will require new tools to fight modern adversaries. The Pentagon needs more unmanned aircraft, better communications and reconnaissance technology, as well as more mobile weaponry.

"We need to spend more money on military personnel and ideas, as we create a force that is capable of a seamless transition from humanitarian activities to peacekeeping to actual combat and back again. This places a premium on the individual soldier who gets the job done with minimum loss of life on both sides, with minimum property damage and in the shortest possible time.

"But these new military expenditures can easily be paid for with money saved from eliminating outdated weapons from the Pentagon budget, wasteful expenditures that President Bush himself pledged to cut.

"None of the weapons that the administration reportedly wanted to eliminate prior to September 11, like the F-22 fighter jet, the Crusader artillery system, and the Comanche helicopter, would have been of any significant benefit to our troops in Afghanistan. Likewise, they will not be needed by our military personnel in any foreseeable conflict with our most likely adversaries.

"But the money that could be saved by cutting these Cold War weapons could definitely be put to good use. The administration is correct that America needs to spend more on shoring up national security. But rather than add to the Pentagon budget, President Bush should trim it of Cold War fat and apply the savings to our more expansive and pressing security needs."

Madam Speaker, we must provide protection for those at greatest risk of economic hardship: low wage, entry level and part-time workers, women, minorities, the underprivileged, small businesses, marginal communities and those who have lost their jobs.

Specifically, what does this mean? I believe it means raising the minimum wage to a livable wage. Obviously, there is never enough time to really talk totally about the minimum wage or the living wage movement. But suffice it to say that the living-wage movement has become one of the most potent and effective tools for attacking poverty.

Chicago and Cook County are just two of the more than 70 local units of government which have passed living-wage ordinances. We now have extensive research which shows that when the lowest-paid workers receive additional income, they spend those dollars

to meet their family's needs. This provides a boost to the local economy which more than offsets the increased salary costs.

Further research demonstrates that businesses do not flee these communities because of modest increases in wage costs, but are actually attracted to communities with healthy economies. Extending unemployment and medical benefits both with regards to time and eligibility has become a central feature of the current legislative initiative in the Congress and offers one of the fastest and most efficient means of stimulating the economy.

Providing direct loans and grants to small businesses affected by the September 11 terrorist attacks has become a hot topic of discussion, especially since the Congress passed the airline bailout.

I believe that it makes a lot of sense to look towards assisting small businesses which today generate the majority of jobs in our Nation. Reauthorizing a TANF program, which not only takes people off welfare, but takes people out of poverty, is one of the largest issues facing us this year.

The unfortunate fact is that welfare reform has been successful. Unfortunately, the problem is that it was never intended to meet the needs of the poor, but to shed public responsibility for addressing poverty.

Welfare rolls have declined, but many of those who have left TANF are in worse economic condition than they were before they left. The U.S. Conference of Mayors reports that emergency shelter requests in 27 cities have increased 13 percent over the last year, but the President's budget cuts public housing repairs \$417 million. That is 14.7 percent.

Real welfare reform must address, at a minimum, improving the safety net for children while helping parents meet work-related goals; empowering families to find resources and tools and make decisions needed to meet their needs and goals as a family; ensuring families with multiple barriers to employment and economic independence receive necessary services, including mental health and substance abuse treatment; revising the time limits on eligibility, as was emphasized by the just-completed National Governors Conference; redefining the goal of reform to reduce poverty, especially child poverty, not just caseloads.

We will never eliminate poverty until we recognize the need for a federally funded daycare program for children of all ages. Forty-nine States have child care costs greater than tuition to public colleges; yet quality day care is not only a critical prerequisite for parental employment, it is critical for healthy child development.

Finally, and critical for our growth as a Nation, is a system of national health care, including prescription drug coverage and the treatment of mental illness on par with all other illness. America is abuzz these days with

response to the new Denzel Washington movie "John Q" and how it relates to people's own experiences with paying for health care in America.

No nation in the world has the health care resources, the technology, the trained health care professionals of America. But our health care delivery system is broken and our priorities, especially our lack of focus on prevention, are sadly misplaced.

I hope that the result of the November election in Portland, Maine, will be a bellwether of things to come in health care. Portland voters passed a referendum on universal health care, despite the fact that opponents spent hundreds of thousands of dollars more than congressional candidates usually spend in Maine trying to defeat the measure. A single-payer, universal health care system would be more efficient, would cost less as a result of eliminating mountains of paperwork, would offer more choice and would provide coverage to every one of our people.

Integral to my dream, my vision for America, is an America where poverty and all of the social, moral, mental and physical ills associated with poverty are eradicated forever.

Of course, a part of that poverty syndrome is the fact that our prisons are filled to the hilt with individuals, 2 million of them. While we are only 5 percent of the world's population, we have 25 percent of the world's prison population.

The Justice Department has predicted that 630,000 of these individuals are going to be released from prison this year. About 30,000 of them will be in my State, the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, we have not prepared for them as they come back to neighborhoods and communities. So a good part of our attack on poverty has to be a serious look at our correctional system and a serious look at what it takes to reform, to rehabilitate and to prepare people for reentry into normal society once they are released from correctional facilities and institutions.

I introduced the week before last a bill, the Public Safety Ex-Offender Self-Sufficiency Act, that is designed to provide structured living arrangements for ex-offenders as they return home, an arrangement that is not designed to cost taxpayers a great deal of money. We use a creative approach to financing by creating a model like the low-income-housing tax credit program, where instead of credits on the basis of population, that we provide credits on the basis of the number of ex-offenders in a State.

Private developers are encouraged to develop housing. This bill calls for the development of 100,000 units over the next 5 years, the idea being that corporations who do this will get the benefit of their resource back within a 10-year period. They must hold the facilities at least for 15 years. Individuals will then have a place to live, a place to go, where they can also receive education, job training, skill development,

counseling for whatever their social or physical-medical problems may be, as well as health care and assistance with job placement.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that if America is to become the Nation that it has the potential of being, then we must seriously address the problems, needs, hopes, and aspirations of all our citizens, and even those who are mired down at the bottom.

I believe in the theory and the concept that a rising tide should lift all boats; and I am confident that as we lift and improve the lives of those at the bottom, as we help the American dream become more of a reality for all of our citizens, then America becomes that Nation that Langston Hughes talked about when he suggested that we ought to let America be America again, the land that it has never been, but yet must be.

In all of our greatness, we have not realized the fulfillment of our potential. It is my hope that as we deal with the issues of poverty and the issues of those who are the most needy among us, we will lift America to heights that it has never seen.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BALDACCI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

#### 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. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McINNIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GANSKE, for 5 minutes, February 27 and March 1.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 27.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 980. An act to provide for the improvement of the safety of child restraints in passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure 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.

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 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:

5547. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rules Relating to Intermediaries of Commodity Interest Transactions (RIN: 3038-AB56) received February 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5548. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Listing Standards and Conditions for Trading Security Futures Products (RIN: 3038-AB87) received February 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5549. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sulfuryl Fluoride; Temporary Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-301166A; FRL-6823-4] (RIN: 2070-AC18) received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5550. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301215; FRL-6820-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 05, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5551. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5552. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the transport of a chemical warfare agent, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5553. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that certain major defense acquisition programs have breached the unit cost by more than 15 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5554. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the decision to convert to contractor performance by the private sector the Transportation function at NADEP Cherry Point, NC, which was found to be the most cost-effective, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5555. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense (DoD) to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5556. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's report of activities for calendar year 2001; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5557. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Home Mortgage Disclosure [Regulation C; Docket No. R-1001] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5558. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Yucca Mountain site has met recommended approval for the development of a repository for the geological disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high level nuclear waste from the Nation's defense activities, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10134 nt.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5559. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress Regarding Number of Chimpanzees and Funding for Care of Chimpanzees, as required by Public Law 106-551; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5560. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [CA 242-0316; FRL-7134-1] received January 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5561. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; State of New York [NY002; FRL-7137-7] received January 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5562. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Wyoming; Revisions to Air Pollution Regulations [WY001-0007a, WY-001-0008a, WY-001-0009a; FRL-7130-3] received January 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5563. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential-use Allowances for Calendar Year 2002; and Extension of the De Minimis Exemption for Essential Laboratory and Analytical Uses through Calendar Year 2005 [FRL-7140-5] (RIN: 2060-AJ81) received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5564. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Revisions to the 1-Hour Ozone Maintenance State Implementation Plan for the Paducah Area, Kentucky; Correction [KY-200214; FRL-7138-5] received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5565. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Kingdom for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-12), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5566. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to India [Transmittal No. DTC 167-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5567. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to India [Transmittal No. DTC 162-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5568. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to India [Transmittal No. DTC 164-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5569. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to India [Transmittal No. DTC 161-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 123-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 128-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5572. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5573. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5574. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5575. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5576. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior,

transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5577. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5578. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Policy, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5579. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5580. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5581. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5582. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5583. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the report on General Accounting Office employees detailed to congressional committees as of January 25, 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5584. A letter from the Acting General Counsel and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5585. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revised Jurisdiction Thresholds for Section 8 of the Clayton Act—received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5586. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; San Diego Bay [CGD11-01-010] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5587. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Naval Supply Center Pier, San Diego Bay, CA [CGD11-01-008] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5588. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Naval Amphibious Base, San Diego Bay, CA [CGD11-01-011] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5589. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; Ports of Charleston and Georgetown, SC [COTP Charleston-01-128] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5590. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands [CGD07-01-136] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5591. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands [CGD07-02-002] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5592. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI [COTP Honolulu 01-008] (RIN 2115-AA97 and 2115-AA98) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5593. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-200, 747-300, and 747SR Series Airplanes Powered by General Electric CF6-45/50 or Pratt & Whitney JT9D-70 Series Engines [Docket No. 2001-NM-124-AD; Amendment 39-12578; AD 2001-26-12] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5594. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes; and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-290-AD; Amendment 39-12590; AD 2001-26-24] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5595. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-100, -200, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-12589; AD 2001-26-23] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5596. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model Avro 146-RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-90-AD; Amendment 39-12588; AD 2001-26-22] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5597. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-255-AD; Amendment 39-12587; AD 2001-26-21] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5598. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-12586; AD 2001-26-20] (RIN 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5599. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Galaxy Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-388-AD; Amendment 39-12599; AD 2002-01-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5600. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alternate Compliance Program; Incorporation of Offshore Supply Vessels [USCG-2001-10164] (RIN: 2115-AG17) received February 5, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5601. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Grob-Werke GmbH & Co KG Models G102 Club Astir III, G102 Club Astir IIIB, and G102 Standard Astir III Sailplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-48-AD; Amendment 39-12591; AD 2001-26-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5602. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-174-AD; Amendment 39-12584; AD 2001-26-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5603. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-28-AD; Amendment 39-12583; AD 2001-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5604. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-11-AD; Amendment 39-12597; AD 2002-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5605. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328 Series Airplanes Equipped with Honeywell GP-300 Guidance and Display Controller [Docket No. 97-NM-187-AD; Amendment 39-12580; AD 2001-26-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5606. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, B1, B2, B3, BA, D, and AS355E Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-70-AD; Amendment 39-12605; AD 2001-26-53] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5607. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Model EC135 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-64-AD; Amendment 39-12604; AD 2001-26-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received Feb-

ruary 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5608. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace, Springhill, LA [Airspace Docket No. 2001-ASW-14] received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5609. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-405-AD; Amendment 39-12513; AD 2001-23-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5610. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes, and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-12581; AD 2001-26-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5611. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes, and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-162-AD; Amendment 39-12582; AD 2001-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5612. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation (formerly Allison Engine Company) AE 3007 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-12558; AD 2001-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5613. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76B and S-76C Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-51-AD; Amendment 39-12559; AD 2001-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5614. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8-70 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-12551; AD 2001-24-34] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5615. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100, -200, and -200C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-12550; AD 2001-24-33] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5616. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747SP, and 747SR

Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-220-AD; Amendment 39-12549; AD 2001-24-32] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5617. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-12548; AD 2001-24-31] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5618. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-200C and -200F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-12547; AD 2001-24-30] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5619. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-217-AD; Amendment 39-12546; AD 2001-24-29] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5620. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -10F, -15, -30, -30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), -40, and -40F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-98-AD; Amendment 39-12540; AD 2001-24-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5621. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; GE Aircraft Engines CT7 Series Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-61-AD; Amendment 39-12594; AD 2002-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5622. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Model PC-7 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-30-AD; Amendment 39-12579; AD 2001-26-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5623. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30291; Amdt. No. 2089] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5624. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30289; Amdt. No. 433] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5625. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model HP.137 Jetstream Mk.1, Jetstream Series 200, Jetstream Series 3101, and Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No.

2001-CE-34-AD; Amendment 39-12596; AD 2002-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5626. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (formerly AlliedSignal Inc. and Garrett Turbine Engine Company) TPE331-8, -10N, and -12B Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 2000-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-12472; AD 2001-21-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5627. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Model S-70A and S-70C Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-18-AD; Amendment 39-12561; AD 2001-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5628. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH Models 228-100, 228-101, 228-200, 228-201, 228-202, and 228-212 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-19-AD; Amendment 39-12471; AD 2001-21-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5629. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Reims Aviation S.A. Model F406 Airplanes; Correction [Docket No. 99-CE-28-AD; Amendment 39-12504; AD 2001-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5630. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Models LTS101-600A-2 and LTS-600A-3 Turboshaft Engines; and LTP101-600A-1A and LTP101-700A-1A Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-12557; AD 2001-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5631. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes; C-9 Airplanes; and Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-291-AD; Amendment 39-12531; AD 2001-24-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5632. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-294-AD; Amendment 39-12533; AD 2001-24-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5633. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series

Airplanes; Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes; Model MD-88 Airplanes; and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-12544; AD 2001-24-27] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5634. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes; C-9 Airplanes; Model DC-9-81, -82, -83, and -87 Series Airplanes; and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-297-AD; Amendment 39-12536; AD 2001-24-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5635. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, and -40 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-288-AD; Amendment 39-12530; AD 2001-24-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5636. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -30, and -40 Series Airplanes and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-292-AD; Amendment 39-12532; AD 2001-24-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5637. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -30, and -40, Series Airplanes and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-296-AD; Amendment 39-12535; AD 2001-24-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5638. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, and -40 Series Airplanes and C-9 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-12542; AD 2001-24-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5639. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -15, -30, -30F (KC-10A and KDC-10 Military), and -40 Series Airplanes; and Model MD-10-10F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-95-AD; Amendment 39-12537; AD 2001-24-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5640. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 Series Airplanes, and Model MD-10-10F and -30F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-96-AD; Amendment 39-12538; AD 2001-24-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5641. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, trans-

mitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, -10F, -30, -30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), -40, and -40F Series Airplanes; and Model MD-10-10F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-97-AD; Amendment 39-12539; AD 2001-24-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5642. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10 and -30 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-12541; AD 2001-24-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5643. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-210-AD; Amendment 39-12545; AD 2001-24-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5644. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B2 and B4, A300 B4-600 and B4-600R, and A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-204-AD; Amendment 39-12543; AD 2001-24-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5645. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Expansion of Telehealth Services for Homebound Beneficiaries," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395 note. Public Law 105-33 section 4206 (d)(1) (111 Stat. 378); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5646. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Herger-Feinstein Quincy Library Group Forest Recovery Act Pilot Project FY 2000"; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Agriculture.

#### 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. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 350. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1542) to deregulate the Internet and high speed data services, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-361). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on February 15, 2002]

H.R. 2481. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than March 29, 2002.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. SUNUNU):

H.R. 3784. A bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 3785. A bill to establish expanded teacher loan forgiveness programs under the guaranteed and direct student loan programs for teachers of mathematics and science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 3786. A bill to revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3787. A bill to extend the duty suspension on 1N-N5297; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 3788. A bill to limit liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for service station dealers with respect to the release or threatened release of recycled oil; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 3789. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, as the "Teno Roncalio Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the automatic treatment of amounts paid for services performed in Federal employment by residents of American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. GRUCCI):

H.R. 3791. A bill to establish a pilot program under which the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in consultation with regional technology consultants, may make direct loans to technology-related small business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 3792. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr.

PASCARELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GRUCCI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3794. A bill to amend the Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 to adjust the percentage differentials payable to Federal law enforcement officers in certain high-cost areas; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 3795. A bill to establish a Federal Bureau of Audits within the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct audits of all publicly registered companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 3796. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in the management of health care services for veterans, shall place certain low-income veterans in a higher health-care priority category; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 3797. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Main Street, Lake Placid, New York, as the "John A. 'Jack' Shea Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. MCINNIS):

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require clear and convincing scientific data with respect to the designation of critical habitat of a species under that Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REYES, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KING, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FILNER:

H. Con. Res. 333. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Attorney General should appoint a special counsel on matters relating to Enron Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the Republic of Turkey's cooperation in the war against terrorism, economic reforms in Turkey, and the economic partnership meetings to be held between the United States and Turkey; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H. Res. 349. A resolution designating certain majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SHOWS:

H. Res. 351. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3022) to provide for a program of temporary enhanced unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

207. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to House Joint Resolution 30 memorializing the United States Congress to honor its commitment to fully fund the federal share of the special education costs required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, P.L. 105-17, as amended; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 68: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 175: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 183: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FORD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 184: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 200: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 210: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 250: Mr. BURR of North Carolina and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 389: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 476: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 536: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 556: Mr. WOLF and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 630: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 632: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 658: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 704: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 709: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 747: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 760: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 786: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 808: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1073: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1081: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1097: Mr. QUINN and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1116: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 1184: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KIND, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1187: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1296: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1331: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1354: Mr. REYES and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1361: Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1371: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1391: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1431: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1434: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1520: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1527: Mr. HOSTETTLE.

H.R. 1581: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1582: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1632: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1673: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1841: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SPRATT.

- H.R. 1873: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 1927: Mr. SHUSTER.  
H.R. 1933: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
H.R. 1961: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2014: Mr. MCINNIS.  
H.R. 2074: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 2088: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.  
H.R. 2148: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. DICKS.  
H.R. 2156: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 2219: Mr. KING, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mrs. CLAYTON.  
H.R. 2220: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. PASTOR.  
H.R. 2235: Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 2332: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 2335: Mr. WAXMAN.  
H.R. 2364: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.  
H.R. 2374: Mr. MCCRERY.  
H.R. 2405: Mr. KIRK and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 2484: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SHAW, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. WALSH.  
H.R. 2521: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 2573: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 2610: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 2612: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
H.R. 2623: Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 2629: Mr. DICKS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
H.R. 2695: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 2720: Mr. LANTOS.  
H.R. 2725: Mr. BOSWELL.  
H.R. 2805: Mr. NORWOOD.  
H.R. 2808: Mr. REGULA.  
H.R. 2820: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 2830: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 2835: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 2836: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 2863: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 2950: Mr. WELLER.  
H.R. 3006: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. NORWOOD.  
H.R. 3013: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3026: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 3041: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 3058: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 3065: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3113: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 3131: Ms. WATSON and Mr. LATHAM.  
H.R. 3186: Mr. MCNULTY.  
H.R. 3188: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H.R. 3230: Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
H.R. 3236: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
H.R. 3238: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GORDON.  
H.R. 3271: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 3305: Mr. POMEROY.  
H.R. 3336: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BACA, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 3337: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COYNE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 3347: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.  
H.R. 3363: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
H.R. 3382: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.R. 3414: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HAYES, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 3424: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 3430: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 3431: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HORN, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. CLEMENT.  
H.R. 3450: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SIMMONS.  
H.R. 3462: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 3498: Mr. FILNER and Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 3509: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
H.R. 3524: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. LANTOS.  
H.R. 3566: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. FARR of California.  
H.R. 3569: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
H.R. 3581: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD, and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 3609: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. SHOWS.  
H.R. 3612: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 3615: Mr. GRUCCI.  
H.R. 3617: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 3624: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. ADERHOLT.  
H.R. 3645: Mr. FOLEY.  
H.R. 3657: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FORD.  
H.R. 3661: Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
H.R. 3669: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. HART, and Mr. OXLEY.  
H.R. 3670: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 3671: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 3694: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FORD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 3713: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FRANK, Ms. HART, and Mr. SNYDER.  
H.R. 3715: Mr. GILMAN.  
H.R. 3717: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. PICKERING.  
H.R. 3733: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 3741: Mr. PUTNAM.  
H.R. 3763: Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
H.J. Res. 6: Mr. HINCHEY.  
H.J. Res. 81: Mr. BISHOP.  
H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. BERMAN.  
H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. BARCIA.  
H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. WATSON.  
H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. KIND, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. COMBEST.  
H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. OLVER.  
H. Con. Res. 238: Mr. FOLEY.  
H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. WYNN and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.  
H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. FORD.  
H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. FOLEY.  
H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
H. Con. Res. 311: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. MCINNIS.  
H. Con. Res. 316: Mr. SOUDER.  
H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. BERRY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HORN, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. OSBORNE.  
H. Con. Res. 328: Mr. FILNER and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H. Con. Res. 329: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. MORELLA.  
H. Res. 154: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NEY, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.  
H. Res. 225: Mr. BOYD and Mr. CROWLEY.  
H. Res. 300: Mr. FRANK.  
H. Res. 339: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BONIOR.  
H. Res. 346: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.