United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 8, 2002 No. 90

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 8, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM KOLBE 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 of history, our celebration of Independence Day this year took on new meaning. Marked by the wounds this Nation suffered as a result of terrorism on September 11, this Nation is stronger in its resolve to seek, protect, and assure the free exercise of independent government set up by the people for the people governed.

The memory of that tragic day has made our enjoyment of freedom in this Nation an even greater treasure which must now be preserved on the face of the Earth for generations to come.

Grasped by the spirit expressed by the original signers of the Declaration of Independence, may the Members of the 107th Congress and the citizens of this Nation again appeal to You as the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of all our intentions.

With firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, may we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to foster and defend equal justice and the freedom of all now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WU 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. Lundregran, one of its clerks, 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. 4546. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4546) ''An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mrs. CARNAHAN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BUNNING, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrences of the House is requested:

S. 803. An act to enhance the management and promotion of electronic Government services and processes by establishing an Office of Electronic Government within the Office of Management and Budget, and by establishing a broad framework of measures that require using Internet-based information technology to enhance citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes.

S. 2514. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2515. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2516. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for military construction, and for other purposes.

S. 2517. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–201, as amended by Public Law 105–275, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals as members of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress—

Susan Barksdale Howorth of Mississippi, for a term of six years; and

Marlene Meyerson of Texas, for a term of six years.

Printed on recycled paper.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, June 28, 2002:

S. 2578, to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As my staff has previously communicated to you, I will undergo this morning a routine medical procedure requiring sedation. In view of present circumstances, I have determined to transfer temporarily my Constitutional powers and duties to the Vice President during the brief period of the procedure and recovery.

Accordingly, in accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, this letter shall constitute my written declaration that I am unable to discharge the Constitutional powers and duties of the office of President of the United States. Pursuant to Section 3, the Vice President shall discharge those powers and duties as Acting President until I transmit to you a written declaration that I am able to resume the discharge of those powers and duties.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, this letter shall constitute my written declaration that I am presently able to resume the discharge of the Constitutional powers and duties of the office of President of the United States. With the transmittal of this letter, I am resuming those powers and duties effective immediately.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG INDUSTRY'S NEW LOBBYING TECHNIQUE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug industry has come up with a new lobbying technique. Three weeks ago, the drug industry dumped almost $3 million into a Republican fundraising event. Two weeks ago, in a party-line vote, the drug industry and Republicans pushed through a prescription drug Medicare privatization bill.

Now the drug industry is pressuring medical schools and teaching hospitals and doctors to write Congress urging us to continue permitting drug companies to engage in anticompetitive behavior. They have convinced a few of these health care providers that unless the U.S. lets the drug industry keep competition out of the market, my colleagues guessed it, research and development will dry up. Fourteen years of patent-protection monopoly prices apparently is not enough.

The same industry that consistently earns profits five points higher than other profitable industries argues that if they do not exploit America's seniors they cannot and will not do research and development. That excuse, Mr. Speaker, is wearing thin.

Private and public resources for health care are not infinite. Drug companies continue to cheat American consumers, employer-sponsored health care plans and State governments and every other health care purchaser out of billions of dollars each year. Enough is enough.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

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 motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas or 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.

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE RATHDRUM PRAIRIE/SPOKANE VALLEY AQUIFER

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4609) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer, located in Idaho and Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4609

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

SECTION 1. COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE RATHDRUM PRAIRIE/SPOKANE VALLEY AQUIFER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the State of Idaho and the State of Washington, shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer for the purpose of preparing a model of the aquifer and establishing for those States a mutually acceptable understanding of the aquifer as a ground water resource.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the findings and conclusions of the study by not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For conducting the study under this section there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $3,500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

H.R. 4609, the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer Study Act of 2002, directs the Secretary of the Department of Interior to work with the State of Idaho and the State of Washington to conduct a comprehensive study for the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer by preparing a groundwater model to help establish a mutually acceptable understanding of the aquifer as a groundwater resource. The tools developed by this legislation will help to better coordinate and understand the various factors that influence the quantity and quality of the aquifer and encourage better cooperation between the two States charged with its maintenance operations.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), the sponsor of this legislation, for his work on this bill.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I am pleased to make a statement in support of this bill.

There is nothing in the Northwest States that is more precious than our air and our water. We in eastern Washington and northern Idaho are blessed with not only these great resources but especially our clean water. We think it is some of the best water in the entire world to drink. So we want to make sure that it is protected, and that is what this bill does.

This bill was introduced by me and by the gentleman from northern Idaho

(Mr. OTTER) because we are affected by this bill, and the aquifer which traverses both States affects our respective districts. So we are proud to introduce this bill which calls for a study, as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) mentioned, to analyze this aquifer, to understand what is there so we can make sure we protect it and wisely manage it. One of the great challenges for us in the Pacific Northwest is to make sure that our abundant resources, our natural resources, our mountains, our streams, our rivers, our lakes, our entire environment is well managed by Federal agencies and by private resources.

So in the case of the aquifer we have a situation where there are some economic interests that want to use it. They want to use it as a resource to provide industrial benefit to eastern Washington and northern Idaho.

But before they do so, we have to be sure that it is protected. What this bill does is to take a hard look at doing a model and a study to make sure we know what is there so that it can be protected.

There is also a disparity in consideration of aquifer use, of economic development, on either side of the border. Spokane, Washington, is my hometown, the major city in my district, the largest population center. It is about 32 miles from the Idaho border. Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, rests on the other side of the border in Idaho that is represented by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER), and the States of Idaho and Washington have very different consideration times for permitting, for permitting for economic benefit and use.

In Idaho, if we want to get a permit, it can take months; in Washington, it can take years. So we think that in doing this study and having the Committee on Resources in Congress adopt this position in a study, we can make sure that there is some continuity of interest in analysis and development that would rest on each side of the border, so that the legislatures of each side, each State, each respective State, would have a chance to look at this issue and understand what is there, and then make policy decisions that are coordinated rather than disparate.

So I can say to the House that there is unanimity on the part of our chambers of commerce that this is a wise approach. There are five chambers of commerce that are in Idaho and Washington State that are affected by this issue, and they are of the opinion and their memberships are of the opinion that this is a wise thing to do; that is, make sure we know what is in the aquifer, what its considerations and characteristics are, so that we can make sure we manage it wisely.

I especially want to thank the Committee on Resources. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and his subcommittee presented this bill in very fast consideration, very fair consideration. The entire Committee on Resources passed it out. I especially am grateful to that Committee on Resources that took into account this very important measure that affects a large area in eastern Washington and northern Idaho.

I will restate again that the environmental protections that we seek from this bill are sensible, they are reasonable, and they are timely. It is estimated that there are millions of gallons that go through this aquifer and would be presented by it, but we have to be sure that we know what is there, and we have to be sure that what is there is wisely managed so that we protect this wonderful resource that we have in the Pacific Northwest, a clean environment, a great place to live and work, a great place to have economic development, at the same time we protect our environmental resources.

So I will thank the gentleman from Nebraska and his counterpart, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), for his courtesy in allowing me to say a few words in support of my bill. I speak on behalf of the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) in thanking the committee and subcommittee of jurisdiction for considering this measure, and we hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

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

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4609 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of groundwater resources in certain areas of Washington and Idaho. In the Pacific Northwest, our water resources are precious resources, and we expect the results of the study to provide the States with reliable information they can use to better manage the groundwater resource which is shared between the States.

I commend my colleagues, the gentlemen from Idaho and Washington, for bringing this legislation to the floor, and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4609.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4609.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ISSUING PERMITS FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINES IN GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3380) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3380

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

SECTION 1. PERMITS FOR EXISTING NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior may issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines that exist as of September 1, 2001, within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A permit issued under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) issued consistent with laws and regulations generally applicable to utility rights-of-way within units of the National Park System; and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary deems necessary.

SEC. 2. PERMITS FOR PROPOSED NATURAL GAS PIPELINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior may issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park that are proposed to be constructed across the following:

(1) The Foothills Parkway.

(2) The Foothills Parkway Spur between Pigeon Forge and Gatlinburg.

(3) The Gatlinburg Bypass.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A permit issued under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) issued consistent with laws and regulations generally applicable to utility rights-of-way within units of the National Park System; and

(2) subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary deems necessary, including—

(A) provisions for the protection and restoration of park resources that are disturbed by pipeline construction; and

(B) assurances that construction and operation of the pipeline will not adversely affect Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3380 was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JENKINS) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for a natural gas pipeline to tie in an existing pipeline within the boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

In 2000, the Sevier County Utility District in rural east Tennessee made the request of the National Park Service to grant authority to tie in a natural gas pipeline to an already existing underground natural gas pipeline along U.S. Highway 441 in the Gatlinburg-Pigeon Forge spur. The existing pipeline

was installed prior to the Park Service's acquisition of the right-of-way along the highway.

After preparing to grant the request, it was discovered that while the Secretary possesses the authority to grant right-of-way permits through the units of the park system for various utility services, the Secretary did not possess the authority to grant a permit for natural gas and petroleum product pipelines.

The pipeline would service homes in Gatlinburg, Tennessee. At the present time, these homes are reliant upon propane and electricity to meet their energy needs. Given some air quality issues at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Park Service believes it is in the best interests of the park to permit natural gas pipelines as a clean alternative for new homes and businesses.

No permits will be granted until all environmental and safety reviews have been conducted. This authority would be consistent with the authority granted at the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkway park units.

This is a noncontroversial bill supported by both the majority and the minority, as well as the administration, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JENKINS), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the subcommittee and the committee in their favorable consideration of this bill, and in recommending it for passage.

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) has explained the provisions of this bill very well, and he pointed out that in planning this project, that it was discovered that the Secretary of the Interior had power to issue permits for other utilities, but not for natural gas, and that power has been given to the Secretary of the Interior on a case-by-case basis in the case of other national parks across this land.

All of these lines will be laid underground. The lines will be all under a road, and there will be no diminution in the natural beauty of this great national park.

As we know, this is the most visited national park in the country. There is substantial growth on all sides of this national park, in all of the border areas. The passage of this legislation will allow that growth to be clean growth. The Senate has passed this legislation, and we will appreciate the favorable consideration in the House of Representatives.

□ 1715

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

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3380 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for an existing natural gas pipeline as well as future natural gas pipelines that would cross or parallel three road segments that lead into the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

We must be very careful in approving such activities. When the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 3380 earlier this year, the National Park Service testified in support of the legislation, noting that the pipelines would cross or parallel only park roads and not involve other park resources. The National Park Service also assured the committee that all necessary steps would be taken to ensure that these pipelines have no negative impact on park resources or visitor use.

Given those assurances and relying upon them, we have no objection to consideration of H.R. 3380 by the House today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3380.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT CLATSOP NATIONAL MEMORIAL EXPANSION ACT OF 2002

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2643) to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for inclusion in the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2643

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 ''Fort Clatsop National Memorial Expansion Act of 2002''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Fort Clatsop National Memorial is the only unit of the National Park System solely dedicated to the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

(2) In 1805, the members of the Lewis and Clark Expedition built Fort Clatsop at the mouth of the Columbia River near Astoria, Oregon, and they spent 106 days at the fort waiting for the end of winter and preparing for their journey home.

(3) In 1958, Congress enacted Public Law 85–435 authorizing the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial for the purpose of commemorating the culmination, and the winter encampment, of the Lewis and Clark Expedition following its successful crossing of the North American continent.

(4) The 1995 General Management Plan for Fort Clatsop National Memorial, prepared with input from the local community, recommends the expansion of the memorial to include the trail used by expedition members to access the Pacific Ocean from the fort and the shore and forest lands surrounding the fort and trail to protect their natural settings.

(5) Expansion of Fort Clatsop National Memorial requires Federal legislation because the size of the memorial is currently limited by statute to 130 acres.

(6) Congressional action to allow for the expansion of Fort Clatsop National Memorial to include the trail to the Pacific Ocean would be timely and appropriate before the start of the bicentennial celebration of the Lewis and Clark Expedition planned to take place during the years 2004 through 2006.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF FORT CLATSOP NATIONAL MEMORIAL, OREGON.

(a) REVISED BOUNDARIES.—Section 2 of Public Law 85–435 (16 U.S.C. 450mm–1) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) INITIAL DESIGNATION OF LANDS.—'' before ''The Secretary'';

(2) by striking ''coast:'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''coast.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(b) AUTHORIZED EXPANSION.—The Fort Clatsop National Memorial shall also include the lands depicted on the map entitled 'Fort Clatsop Boundary Map', numbered '405–80026C–CCO', and dated June 1996.

''(c) MAXIMUM DESIGNATED AREA.—The total area designated as the Fort Clatsop National Memorial shall not exceed 1,500 acres.''.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACQUISITION METHODS.—Section 3 of Public Law 85–435 (16 U.S.C. 450mm–2) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) ACQUISITION METHODS.—'' before ''Within''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) LIMITATION.—The lands (other than corporately owned timberlands) depicted on the map referred to in section 2(b) may be acquired by the Secretary of the Interior only by donation or purchase from willing sellers.''.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—Section 4 of Public Law 85–435 (16 U.S.C. 450mm–3) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Establishment'' and all that follows through ''its establishment,'' and inserting ''(a) ADMINISTRATION.—''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—If the owner of corporately owned timberlands depicted on the map referred to in section 2(b) agrees to enter into a sale of such lands as a result of actual condemnation proceedings or in lieu of condemnation proceedings, the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the owner regarding the manner in which such lands will be managed after acquisition by the United States.''.

SEC. 4. STUDY OF STATION CAMP SITE AND OTHER AREAS FOR POSSIBLE INCLUSION IN NATIONAL MEMORIAL.

The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a study of the area near McGowan, Washington, where the Lewis and Clark Expedition first camped after reaching the Pacific Ocean and known as the ''Station Camp'' site, as well as the Megler Rest Area and Fort Canby State Park, to determine the suitability, feasibility, and national significance of these sites for inclusion in the National Park System. The study shall be conducted in accordance with section 8 of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2643, as amended, would allow for the expansion of Fort Clatsop National Memorial, the only unit of the National Park System solely dedicated to the Lewis and Clark expedition. It commemorates the camp where the Corps of Discovery spent the winter of 1805 to 1806. As we approach the bicentennial of this monumental expedition, our Nation continues to draw inspiration from this great journey across the American West.

The expedition, led by Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, gave birth to new interest in the American frontier as they provided the first detailed information about the Northwest that ultimately led to a steady procession of settlers into the region. These explorers made their trek following President Thomas Jefferson's orders to explore the Missouri River to its source, establish the most direct route to the Pacific Ocean, and to make scientific and geographic observations.

They were also instructed to learn about the Indian tribes they would meet along the way and attempt to impress them with the strength of the United States and to report back regarding their observation. After their great journey across the continent, the members of the Corps of Discovery spent the winter of 1805–1806 at Fort Clatsop before beginning their return trip back east.

This legislation would also authorize the National Park Service to study the suitability and feasibility of three sites in the State of Washington, all of which have significance to the expedition, for the possible inclusion as units of the National Park System. This expansion, supported by all property owners within the boundaries, would help prepare for the influx of visitors expected during the upcoming bicentennial. We commend all parties who have worked together on this legislation to address some issues of concern that came up during committee consideration.

This is a good bill that is supported by the administration as well as both the majority and the minority, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the sponsor of H.R. 2643, the Fort Clatsop National Memorial Expansion Act. I am joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), who is an original cosponsor of the bill.

It has taken a lot of hands to bring this bill to the floor today and I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) of the Committee on Resources, and from the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Closer to home, I would also like to thank Willamette Industries for its cooperation in making this bill possible and Willamette Industries' successor in interest, Weyerhauser. Without the cooperation of these two Northwest businesses and their employees and executives, we would not be here today with a successful bill.

And even closer to home, I would very much like to recognize the hard work and diligence of Cameron Johnson on our staff who has worked on this bill since his first day as a staffer on Capitol Hill. And I would also like to recognize his predecessor Bill Minor, who unfortunately has gone to the University of Washington for law school. But Bill is from Astoria, Oregon, and Fort Clatsop is literally in his back yard.

Fort Clatsop is the western terminus of the Lewis and Clark expedition. This bill authorizes expansion of its boundaries from 130 acres to 1,500 acres. The expansion would permit the national memorial to reach the ocean and to accommodate the expected 1 million visitors for the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition. These million-plus visitors will see a nearly exact replica of the fort in which Lewis and Clark wintered over in 1805 on the Oregon coast. They will see a forest that is approximately the same as what Lewis and Clark saw. Our trees are currently about that size because of timber harvests about 75 or 100 years ago. And historians think that Lewis and Clark saw a similar forest because of a great earthquake which occurred approximately 100 years before they reached the Oregon coast. Visitors will also undoubtedly enjoy a decent dose of Oregon rain.

The Lewis and Clark expedition spent 106 days at Fort Clatsop over the winter of 1805–1806. Out of those 106 days, there were 6 sunny days, 6 cloudy but rainfree days and 94 days during which the expedition enjoyed what we would call in Oregon liquid sunshine and in the rest of the country it would be called rain.

Also this expansion will permit visitors to access the Pacific Ocean. This was, after all, the western terminus of the epochal Lewis and Clark expedition.

It serves us well to remember that like so many other scientific and exploratory adventurers, the discoveries and achievements which were made by this expedition were made through great adversity and frequently while they were looking for something else.

The expedition started planning when the territory was under French and Spanish sovereignty. By the time the expedition actually left, President Jefferson had purchased much of the territory from Napoleon. President Jefferson envisioned part of the expedition's goal to be creating a series of trade alliances with a string of Indian nations along the trail. History proved otherwise. Both the Indian nations and the United States had other pressing priorities.

And, finally, the expedition was to search for a waterway to the great West, the great hope of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a hope which floundered on ignorance of geography and geology, in this case the intervening Rocky Mountains. But Lewis and Clark was an epochal achievement and a success, despite the zigs and the zags and the partial planning successes.

Meriwether Lewis grew up near here in Ivy, Virginia, about as near to this spot in the city of Washington as Fort Clatsop is to my home in Oregon. Lewis and Clark and the expedition walked, paddled boats, rode horses and crossed more than 6,000 miles over a longer than 28-month period, and when they were through, they asserted America's claim as a transcontinental Nation and made another bold stroke in removing the words ''I can't'' from the American lexicon.

As important amongst the achievement of Lewis and Clark is in history, so are the vision and the values; the vision of America as a vibrant, growing Nation; the values of courage and perseverance. These endure with us today in our time of trial, trial from abroad by those who hate and who hate especially our diversity and our liberty; trial from within by those who abuse the freedom and trust that America has bestowed.

This is a bill to expand Fort Clatsop, and at its bicentennial it is appropriate to commemorate and celebrate, but we also do well to remember, not for history's sake alone, but to remember that we have continued to walk in the footsteps of Lewis and Clark on a journey of discovery, and to remember that beyond any horizon the future cannot be known with certainty. But with vision and values, courage and persistence, we will continue in the tradition of Lewis and Clark at Fort Clatsop, and we shall meet our destiny well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Oregon (Mr. WU) for working to ensure that Southwest Washington will play a role in the Lewis and Clark commemoration through this legislation. I also want to thank the chair and the ranking member of the committee, and particularly the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for his strong support of this bill and for his strong support of the National Park System in general.

The bicentennial commemoration of Lewis and Clark's expedition is just a year away. They began their journey back in 1803. And in 2003 communities across our Nation will begin commemorating the Corps of Discovery and

the promises they back with their journey.

It is my hope that during this commemoration Americans will visit important stops along the journey of discovery, including Station Camp and Fort Canby along with Fort Clatsop. On November 18 in 1805, William Clark stopped at Station Camp, sometimes referred to as Megler's Rest, stopped and proclaimed, ''I am in full view now of the ocean.'' It is hard to imagine what that must have felt like for the Corps, having traveled clear across the country in lands no American had seen before. But there in Washington State that is what he said and that is what they saw.

It was also at this historic site that they took a critical vote, 100 years before suffrage, 60 years before the Emancipation Proclamation. The Corps of Discovery voted where they would spend the winter. In that vote they included Sacagawea, and York, who was Clark's black slave, 100 years before suffrage and 60 years before emancipation, the entire Corps voted on the critical matter of where they would winter at my good friend's district at Fort Clatsop.

Today I welcome the opportunity to express my strong support for this legislation which seeks to expand Fort Clatsop National Monument, the only unit in the National Park system that is solely dedicated to the amazing journey of Lewis and Clark. And of great importance to my district is the legislation's inclusion of study language to authorize study for the inclusion of Station Camp and Fort Canby within the Fort Clatsop National Memorial. Although Station Camp is considered the end of the voyage, it is also true that the Northwestern part of the journey included what is now Fort Canby where Lewis and Clark led a small team to the actual coast. And you can only imagine what it must have been like to stand there on what is now called Cape Disappointment, look out over the ocean, and hoping that a ship would be there to take you home, but seeing none, you realize that you would spend the winter in that wonderful but also cold and wet environment, and then trudge by foot, boat and horseback all the way down the journey you had just traced.

This legislation calls for the Park Service to work collaboratively with the States of Oregon and Washington, the Indian tribes and the others in the local communities on the expansion of Fort Clatsop and a study including new sites before the start of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition which is planned to take place between 2003 and 2006.

Companion legislation has already passed the Senate. I want to thank our Senate colleagues in both Oregon and Washington for their leadership. I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) for his leadership, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the committee chair and the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage passage for this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend and colleague from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for his work and especially for pointing out this signal election and these early, wise westerners who, I must point out for the record, voted to go to Oregon as so many others have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

□ 1730

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2643, the Fort Clatsop National Memorial Expansion Act of 2002. I urge its adoption.

I became interested in this bill because the people I represent in Clarksville, Indiana, and the other communities surrounding the Falls of the Ohio have a unique connection to Fort Clatsop and nearby Station Camp in the State of Washington.

In October 1803, Lewis and Clark first met at the Falls of the Ohio, recruited the first members of the Corps of Discovery and departed for the West from Clarksville, Indiana, later that same month. It then took more than the 2 years for the Corps of Discovery to reach the Pacific Ocean nearby present-day McGowan, Washington.

As many know, our country will begin commemorating the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition next year. Both the Falls of the Ohio and the lower Columbia region surrounding Fort Clatsop will host national signature events to mark important moments in the journey.

Mr. Speaker, the upcoming bicentennial has caused many of us to more carefully examine the history of the Lewis and Clark expedition. In doing so, we have discovered many more important sites, like the Falls of the Ohio and Station Camp, Washington, that have not been properly recognized in the past. The Falls of the Ohio has now been certified by the National Park Service as an official site associated with the Lewis and Clark national historic trail.

I hope the National Park Service will quickly perform the feasibility study required by this bill to add the Washington State sites to the Fort Clatsop national memorial.

In closing, let me join President Bush in urging all Americans to observe the Lewis and Clark bicentennial and participate in activities to honor the achievement of this important expedition.

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

I would be remiss if I did not mention two additional individuals in closing and that is Cindy Orlando, former superintendent of Fort Clatsop National Memorial, who was superintendent of the memorial for a long time and worked on many aspects of this memorial, including this expansion. I would also like to recognize the current superintendent, Don Stryker, who is moving on to Mt. Rushmore. He will be getting a little bit more granite, but no more spectacular scenery than he has had at Fort Clatsop.

Don has been terrific in working with the park service, with the committee and with us in bringing this bill forward; and I would just like to share a moment when Don provided us with an opportunity to be at Fort Clatsop after sundown, and under the growing shadows and with a roaring campfire nearby, it was very easy to imagine what it would be like to go back 200 years to experience what the explorers experienced. It is also difficult to imagine what they had to endure to get there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add also that another individual who has worked tremendously hard on this is Dave Micandri, head of the Washington State Historical Society. It was his vision and persistence and tireless effort to make sure Station Camp was included in this legislation. He has done a marvelous job, and I also want to commend the good people of Long Beach and Ilwaco, Washington, who have worked tirelessly to ensure that their part of the story gets told, along with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

This is a tremendous opportunity. In addition to recognizing, hopefully, these expanded national park areas, we should note that Mia Lin is developing a series of sculptures, part of a confluence project at a series of installations that will take place at four different locations along the confluence of rivers reflecting the cultural integration, symbolized by the rivers merging. It should be a profound and exciting piece of work and something that will be a treasure for many years to come.

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

I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for working diligently with me, and I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) for his courtesies.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2643, 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. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4609, H.R. 3380, and H.R. 2643.

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

There was no objection.

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. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

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, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4609, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2643, by the yeas and nays.

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

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE RATHDRUM PRAIRIE/SPOKANE VALLEY AQUIFER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4609.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4609, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 9, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—340

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—9

Coble
Duncan
Flake
Jones (NC)
Kerns
Paul
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Toomey

NOT VOTING—85

Aderholt
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blunt
Bonior
Borski
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Callahan
Camp
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clement
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Dingell
Filner
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hilleary
Hoeffel
Hoyer
Hulshof
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kingston
LaHood
Lantos
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Luther
Matsui
Meek (FL)
Miller, Dan
Miller, George
Nadler
Obey
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pitts
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rangel
Riley
Rivers
Roukema
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stump
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Traficant
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Whitfield
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1856

Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. STUPAK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 283, I was traveling on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FORT CLATSOP NATIONAL MEMORIAL EXPANSION ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2643, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2643, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 331, nays 18, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—331

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Combest
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, Jeff
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Cantor
Coble
Collins
Condit
Duncan
Everett
Flake
Hall (TX)
Hostettler
Jones (NC)
Kerns
Ose
Paul
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Toomey

NOT VOTING—85

Aderholt
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blunt
Bonior
Borski
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Callahan
Camp
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clement
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Dingell
Filner
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hilleary
Hoeffel
Hoyer
Hulshof
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kingston
LaHood
Lantos
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Luther
Matsui
Meek (FL)
Miller, Dan
Miller, George
Nadler
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Payne
Pitts
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rangel
Riley
Rivers
Roukema
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stump
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Traficant
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Whitfield
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1908

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 284, I was traveling on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 283 and 284. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each on them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, district business prevents me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, July 8, 2002. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following rollcall votes: H.R. 4609, the Rathdrum Prarie/Spokane Valley Aquifer Study Act (rollcall No. 283); and H.R. 2643, the Fort Clatsop National Memorial Expansion Act (rollcall No. 284).

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to inform you of my resignation from the Budget Committee as I undertake my new role to serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus. I look forward to serving on the Transportation Committee to advance the issues important to my constituents.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. CAPUANO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H.R. 470) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 470

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby, elected to the following committees of the United States House of Representatives:

Committee on Resources: Mr. Holden of Pennsylvania;

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Capuano of Massachusetts:

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4635, ARMING PILOTS AGAINST TERRORISM ACT

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, a "Dear Colleague" letter has been sent to Members informing them that the Committee on Rules plans to meet on Tuesday, July 9, 2002, to grant a rule for the consideration of H.R. 4635, the Arming Pilots Against Terrorism Act.

The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which would require that amendments be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD prior to the consideration on the floor.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has filed its report on the bill today. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The text of the reported bill is available on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's web site.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted, and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER ON TOMORROW MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2001

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3295 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H.R. 3295 be instructed to recede from disagreement with the provisions contained in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 101(a)(3) of the Senate amendment to the House bill (relating to the accessibility of voting systems for individuals with disabilities).

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). 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.

REFORMING THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President will go to New York, to Wall Street, to give a much-anticipated speech on reforming the mess in corporate America.

Now this will be an interesting day because this is the same President and Vice President and cabinet who have long touted their extraordinarily tight ties with corporate America; the same President who appointed Harvey Pitt, a former securities lawyer, as head of the Securities Exchange Commission; Mr. Pitt, who, when he was sworn in, promised a kinder, gentler Securities and Exchange Commission, even while all these abuses were going on. And, in fact, recently Mr. Pitt was berated for meeting with people from a firm under investigation; and he said, well, how could I not meet with people from firms under investigation who I represented? I represented them all.

□ 1915

He is saying as the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, basically if he recused himself for conflict of interest from his former clients, and obviously future clients when he leaves his measly government salary and goes back to earning millions of dollars a year, representing these crooks and swindlers, he would not be able to do his job. In fact, he is not able to do his job.

Just the other day, an administrative law judge dismissed a finding by the SEC because Harvey Pitt could not vote, because he can meet with these people, he can consult with them and talk with them and tell them what the SEC is looking at and doing about them, he can do that; but the line is drawn by Federal law at voting. If he has recently represented these people, which he has, he could not vote.

So in the case of Ernst and Young, Chairman Pitt had to recuse himself. Commissioner Cynthia Glassman had to recuse herself. So there was only one person left to vote who was a Clinton appointee, who did not have a conflict of interest, who had not represented these miscreants previously; and an administrative law judge said that is not adequate, you cannot have just one person vote to prosecute these folks.

Now we are confronted with the fact that we have a Securities and Exchange Commission, which has been dramatically underfunded by the Bush administration, 40 percent less than the House budget which was not adequate. In fact, the President, as recently as March, and his staff were representing a zero funding increase for the Securities and Exchange Commission, the one that is so outgunned, and now the one they are bragging on for doing all of this investigating and putting these people in jail and all this stuff they are going to be doing. Of course, they cannot do any of that if the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission is so extraordinarily conflicted that he cannot vote in any of the prosecutions and other members of the board are also conflicted. In fact, the President has nominated yet another person from another accounting firm to be on the board of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Hopefully, what we will hear tomorrow from the President will be something that is a radical change from the first year and a half of his administration, where they have been coddling these crooks and criminals, the Ken Lays of the world, that basically wrote the energy policy of the United States of America. The Bush administration has yet to release the documents regarding the meetings that Mr. Lay and Enron had with the administration in formulating that policy. We do know that Enron met more than once a day, more than once a day, this giant corporation met with the energy commission, more than once a day. That is a real good distance. Those are the kind of watchdogs we want.

Mr. Pitt and the SEC are kind of reminding me of my old chessie bear. He is a wonderful old dog, a great watchdog, but he is now 13½ years old, much past his expected longevity for a chessie. His teeth are kind of worn down and he is still a big dog, and even when he barks, we know it is not very serious. That is kind of what we got at the SEC today, and I am afraid that is what we are going to get from the President tomorrow.

There will be some barking, but there are not going to be any real teeth; and we are going to know it is not very serious because the people that they would have to go after are the same people who contributed to the record fundraiser the Republicans had 3 weeks ago, the record amount of money that President Bush raised in his Presidential campaign. Their largess might be constrained. I mean, sure, they have hidden some of it in places where we cannot go after it, like mansions in Florida and that; but we want to make sure, I am certain, that they have some left to contribute to political causes after all.

So I expect we are going to get the toothless, barkless watchdog tomorrow. We are going to have to watch very carefully what the President proposes.

Will he support the Senate bill, the Sarbanes bill? Thus far they have opposed it and supported the phony bill that passed the House to reform some of these practices.

Will they go after the corporate tax havens? Will they go after these thieves and crooks and criminals and put them in jail? Will they try and get Americans back their 401(k)s and pensions or not? The proof will be in the speech tomorrow. We will all listen carefully.

IN HONOR OF BILL RUGER, SR.

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak for a few moments about the passing of one of America's talented inventors, industrialists, and sportsmen.

Bill Ruger, Sr., was a long-time friend and constituent of mine. As chairman of Sturm, Ruger and Company, the manufacturer of the world-renowned Ruger gun, Bill gained recognition as an inventor, pioneer, faithful employer, and patriotic American industrialist. The ''old man,'' as many employees and admirers lovingly called him, was the undisputed king of the American sporting industry.

Building on the first sale of the Sturm Ruger standard pistol in 1949,

Bill ultimately created the largest and most widely respected firearms manufacturing concern in the world. For almost 50 years, he built a business, patented numerous innovative ideas and designs, and produced products with legendary appeal and durability. His rare genius was in transforming his innovations into products that won intense customer satisfaction and, in turn, customer loyalty. Bill believed that a well-designed, well-made and reasonably priced product would always attract buyers; and the legions of sportsmen that would never hike a field with anything but a Ruger certainly proved him right.

In some ways, he was the Henry Ford or Thomas Edison of the second half of the 20th century, taking manufacturing processes such as investment casting to new levels, and beating the competition fair and square through timeless quality and efficiency. He had a love for all things mechanical and taught himself most of what he would later use as the basis of his designs. In the process, he became one of the foremost authorities on automotive design and was one of the few people in the world that actually designed and built his own automobile.

Bill Ruger did not build his company in order to sell out and retire, but rather to profit steadily from the success of its products. He believed in taking the long view and built lasting relationships with employees and customers. At a time when manufacturers are heading overseas and across our borders, Sturm Ruger proudly engineers and builds all of its products in the United States.

His success has created great opportunity for many others, including many of my constituents; and his company continues to be a vital part of New Hampshire's economy and community. The ''old man,'' as he was called, leaves a proud legacy to many, not only in New Hampshire but in Arizona and Connecticut as well.

For people who call themselves sportsmen, Bill Ruger was a name that was as celebrated and admired as Ernest Hemingway or Jack O'Connor. Although Bill will be missed by many who take regularly to the field, somehow we will know that he will be along for many more hunts.

Bill viewed a well-crafted gun as a bond that connected families as it was passed from generation to generation. What he may have missed is how one of his creations bonds us to him as his genius and commitment to quality, durability, and affordability live on in perfectly cast steel and finely carved walnut.

That was the gift left to us by the old man. He will be missed by many friends, admirers and employees but especially by his family. I would like to extend my condolences to the Ruger and Vogel families, especially Molly and Bill Ruger, on the passing of their father, a truly great man.

NO VOUCHERS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor because a bill has just been introduced to impose vouchers on the District of Columbia. The Congress had the opportunity to impose vouchers on itself when H.R. 1 was here, the President's Leave No Child Behind bill. Instead, it defeated a voucher proposal 273 to 155; 68 Republicans joined 204 Democrats. It was not even close.

Further, there have been 20 referenda on vouchers, all of them defeated, most recently in California and Michigan. Not only were they defeated overwhelmingly by almost three-quarters of the population in each State but the people of color, minorities, voted even more overwhelmingly against vouchers. In D.C. we had our own voucher vote in the 1980s: 89 percent against, 11 percent for.

What we are asking for in the Nation's capital is the same choices in educating our children that each and every Member of this body has insisted upon already for her own district and in her own State; and do not get me wrong, I do not believe a child can be in the first grade but once. So I strongly believe in choices and alternatives to public schools. The District deserves applause for its efforts on choice because our own efforts far outdo the efforts of any Member of this body. Applause, not punishment, for the choices we have made.

What are our alternatives? First, we have more charter schools in the District of Columbia per capita than any other district. Fourteen percent of our children go to public charter schools. No other Member's district even approaches this percentage of its children in charter schools.

Second, a D.C. child can go out of her own ward to any public school in the District of Columbia. We had children every day going from the poorest wards in 7th and 8th across to more wealthy wards, Ward 3, for example.

Third, I have strongly supported the work of the Washington scholarship fund, a private organization that provides scholarships, mostly to Catholic schools, using private money. I mean that that effort using private money is precisely the way to support our children.

Fourth, D.C. closes schools where it is not up to standard and then reopens them under new leadership. We have done that with nine schools this year with remarkable results.

It is ironic that this bill would come up at this time. Today's Washington Times has an editorial: ''D.C. Schools Make Headway.'' It is an editorial from a newspaper that has been fiercely critical of the D.C. public schools. It opens by saying: ''Preliminary test data show that D.C. teachers appear to be teaching and students appear to be learning,'' and it cites statistics. Fifty percent of the children improved in math and reading. Did they do as well in my colleagues' districts? Children in the most economically deprived neighborhoods improved 20 percent. Did my colleagues' economically deprived children do as well?

All of our charter schools are accountable. We can close charter schools, and have closed three this year, when they are not doing as well with our children. We can close public schools, and we closed nine this year, reopened them and they have done much better under new leadership. We can impose the same requirements on charter public schools as we do on other schools, and those requirements are very stiff. We cannot do that particularly to religious schools because they must not be accountable to the government in the practice of their religion.

I want to be clear about where I stand on the D.C. public schools. I am a proud graduate of the D.C. public schools, but I am not an apologist for them. I am proud of how they are improving. They are not nearly good enough; but by voting against the bill that has been introduced, my colleagues will be voting against choices others have made for their districts, not voting against choice.

We already have multiple choices in the District of Columbia, sufficient choices, so that I invite other Members to look at how to provide choices when their own people have voted against vouchers. There are other ways to acquire and to get choices. We would very much appreciate being allowed to make our own choices the way my colleagues' districts have insisted upon making their own choices.

Read today's Washington Times: ''D.C. Schools Make Headway.'' Add to what my colleagues read. Respect the democratic choices of the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens, entitled to their free choices, in the same way that my colleagues' own constituents are.

DEMOCRATIC PROPOSAL FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention this evening to use the full 60 minutes. I am more likely to use about 20 minutes, but I did want to take the opportunity this evening to talk about an issue which I think was sort of left dangling when we left here a week ago before the July 4th recess.

My colleagues know that in the middle of the night, I guess it was about 2 a.m., we finally voted on the Republican prescription drug plan; and I was extremely disappointed, to say the

least, over the fact that there was no opportunity to debate and bring up the Democratic substitute, the Democratic proposal.

Mr. Speaker, for at least 2 years, if not longer, I have been talking about the need for this House to debate the prescription drug issue, and I was glad to see that the Republicans finally did bring their bill to the floor. Although I do not agree with their bill and I do not think it will accomplish the goal of providing a prescription drug benefit, I was at least pleased to see that they were willing to bring it up.

□ 1930

But bringing the bill up also means debating the bill and allowing an alternative by the minority, the Democrats in the House, to debate and argue their alternative as well.

It is the first time in my memory, and I have been here 14 years, that on an important issue like this, that the minority, in this case the Democrats, were not allowed to have their alternative, their substitute, be considered by the full House. I think it was a grave mistake, a major error. I think it portends, clearly, that the Republican leadership in this House is not serious about passing a prescription drug bill. If they really felt they had the votes and they were able to strongly pass their bill and send it over to the other body and then eventually send it to the President, they would not have had any problem in letting the Democratic alternative come up. And the reason they did not allow it to come up, I am firmly convinced, is because they felt it would probably pass.

As it was, I think we had eight Republicans who voted against the Republican proposal, we had eight Democrats that I think voted for the Republican proposal, so it was clearly the case that the votes were very narrow there. And it is very likely if a Democratic substitute had been allowed and considered, it would have carried the day and it would have been the bill that passed this House.

I do not want to spend an hour tonight talking about why I think the Republican bill is a failure and why the Democratic alternative would have been a success. The issue now, of course, goes over to the other body, and the other body will be taking up a prescription drug bill fairly soon, within the next few weeks before the August break. But I will say that the major differences between the Republicans here and the Democrats in the House and the way in which the Democratic bill in the other body reflects the Democratic bill here, is that the Democrats are in favor of expanding Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit.

We have been saying fairly simply that Medicare is a good program; that it works. Whether we like it ideologically or not is not the issue. It works. It provides hospital care, it provides doctor care, and it should provide prescription drug benefits as well. And every senior or disabled person who is covered under Medicare should have the option as well of having a prescription drug benefit.

The Democratic proposal is very similar to what we provide now for doctor bills. In other words, under part B of Medicare now every senior can opt into a Medicare program that covers their doctor bills. They pay, I think, about $45 a month for the benefit. Eighty percent of their costs are paid for by the Federal Government. The deductible is $100, and after they have paid $2,000 out of pocket for the 20 percent copay, all their bills are paid for by the Federal Government.

More than 99 percent of the seniors and those who are eligible for Medicare take advantage of the part B benefit and pay the premium and get the benefit. As Democrats, we are simply saying do the same thing, establish a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Everyone who is in Medicare is eligible for it. They would pay $25 a month for a premium, have a $100 deductible, and 80 percent of the cost of their drug bills would be paid by the Federal Government. After they paid $2,000 out of pocket for the 20 percent copay, all their bills, 100 percent, would be paid for by the Federal Government. Very simple. Very easy to understand.

The Democrats also are determined to deal with the issue of price, because we know that the biggest problem facing seniors is that the price of prescription drugs is going up. It is not just for seniors, it is for all Americans. So we say, well, bring this prescription drug program under the umbrella of Medicare and we will have 30 to 40 million Americans who now are under the auspices of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who runs the Medicare program, and he or she would have the bargaining power of those 30 or 40 million seniors, Americans, and would be able to go to the drug companies and say, look, I have 30 or 40 million people; if you want me to buy your drugs, you have to give me a big discount. That discount might be as much as 30 percent across the board. That is a huge savings not only for the Federal Government, which is paying 80 percent of the cost, but also for the seniors who are paying the 20 percent copay.

The problem is, from what I see, that the Republicans in the House do not want any part of this because they do not believe in Medicare. They do not like it. It is a government program. But more than anything else, they do not want to expand Medicare to provide a prescription drug benefit. So what the bill does that passed the House of Representatives a week ago, the Republican bill, is really to further their goal, I think, the Republican goal, of privatizing the Medicare program.

What the Republican bill does is to create a program of subsidies to HMOs and private insurance companies to offer drug-only insurance policies to seniors. Some money in the form of a subsidy, a payment, goes to private insurance companies in the hope they will provide prescription drug coverage, or drug insurance policies, to whatever seniors want to buy them. It does not guarantee any benefit plan. There are going to be areas of the country, just like with HMOs, where these private insurance companies are not going to be offering the prescription drug plan. We do not know what the premiums will be. We do not know what kind of benefits they will offer. That is all up in the air.

And, of course, the insurers have already said they do not want any part of the drug-only policies. In fact, if there was an ability right now for insurance companies to offer drug-only policies they would be offering them. So it makes no sense, in my opinion, to instead of doing what the Democrats do, which is to say we are going to have a Medicare program to cover prescription drugs and guarantee a benefit for everyone, simply hope that the private insurance companies will somehow provide these kinds of policies.

Now, I do not want to just talk myself, because I think some might say, well, okay, here is another Democrat that is saying this will not work, the Republican plan will not work, but every one of the major newspapers, every major media outlet in the country has come out and said this Republican proposal, these drug insurance policies, will not work. I just want to go over a few of them tonight and highlight some of the things that have been said in the last few weeks, just to point out again that there are third-party validators, major newspapers, major insurance companies, executives, or insurance company trade officials who are saying these drug-only policies will never be offered.

This was in The New York Times. It was an editorial on Saturday, June 22, and I will read part of it. It says: ''House Republicans, who regard traditional Medicare as antiquated, would provide money to private insurance companies, a big source of GOP campaign donations, to offer prescription drug policies. The idea of relying on private companies seems more ideological than practical. The pool of elderly Americans who will want the insurance is likely to consist of those who have the most need for expensive medicine. Even with Federal subsidies, it's unclear that enough insurance companies would be willing to participate and provide the economies that come from competition.''

So The New York Times is saying this will not work; nobody is going to offer these policies, essentially. But we have another article in The New York Times a week earlier, this was from Sunday, June 16, which was giving comments from other insurance people, or people familiar with the insurance business, and the title of this article from June 16 says ''Experts Wary of

G.O.P. Drug Plan: Some Say 'Drug Only' Coverage Isn't Affordable for Insurers.''

Keep in mind that the Republican proposal is a voluntary proposal. Nobody has to offer it. No insurance company has to offer these drug-only policies. Again, I will just read some of the highlights of this article in this Sunday New York Times, June 16.

''Under the proposal, Medicare would pay subsidies to private entities to offer insurance covering the cost of prescription drugs. Such 'drug only' insurance does not exist, and many private insurers doubt whether they could offer it at an affordable price. 'I am very skeptical that 'drug only' private plans would develop,' said Bill Gradison, a former Congressman,'' and I will add Republican Congressman, ''who was President of the Health Insurance Association of America from 1993 to 1998. Representative BILL THOMAS, the California Republican who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, insisted: 'We should rely on private sector innovation in delivering the drug benefit. The private sector approach offers the most savings per prescription.' However, John C. Rother, Public Policy Director of AARP, which represents millions of the elderly, said, 'There is a risk of repeating the H.M.O. experience' with any proposal that relies heavily on private entities to provide Medicare drug benefits.''

I do not want to go on, Mr. Speaker. I just want to point out that in the same way that we relied on HMOs to provide medicine coverage for seniors and found so many of them basically dropping out of the market, offering it maybe for 6 months and then telling seniors that they could not provide the coverage any more, and so many areas of the country that do not have HMOs offering any kind of HMO, the same problem is going to exist with these drug policies that the Republicans are proposing. There are going to be huge areas of the country where no policies are offered. And if they are offered, they are likely to be so expensive in terms of the premium that seniors just will decide it is not worth paying for them; not worth buying them.

So I think the promise or the commitment that the Republicans say they are making by passing this bill last week saying they are going to provide some prescription drug coverage is really a hollow one. None of this is going to be offered. None of this is going to happen.

There was an article, an op-ed on June 18 in The New York Times, by Paul Krugman, and he basically explained why insurance companies would not offer these kinds of policies. I think he did it very well, and I just wanted to read a little bit from that, if I could.

He says, ''The House Republican plan has a bigger flaw. Instead of providing insurance directly, it will subsidize insurance companies to provide the coverage. The theory, apparently, is that competition among private insurance providers would somehow lead to lower costs.''

Some of my Republican colleagues said this during the debate, that because of competition between insurance companies, drug prices would come down. But the problem is, there will not be any competition because nobody is going to offer them.

What Mr. Krugman says in The New York Times on June 18 is, ''In fact, the almost certain result would be an embarrassing fiasco because the subsidy would have few, if any, takers. The trouble with drug insurance from a private insurance point of view is that some people have much higher drug expenses than the average, while others have expenses that are much lower, and both sets of people know who they are. This means that any company that tries to offer a plan whose premiums reflect average drug costs will find the only takers will be those who have above-average drug costs.''

What Krugman is basically saying is that drug insurance is not like traditional insurance. If we think of auto insurance, where maybe there is 100 people insured and one person has an accident, all the others are paying into a pot of money and that one accident is paid for with the pot. But the insurance company is making money because they are only paying out maybe for one accident out of the hundred people. But in the case of a drug insurance or medicine, every senior needs medicine. Every senior has an opportunity to have the need for some kind of prescription during the course of the year.

So it is really a benefit. It is not something you are insuring for a risk of because everybody is going to take advantage of it. So seniors that have very high drug costs, $2,000 or $3,000, they may be willing to buy a drug policy that they have to pay $75 or $85 a month premium, but someone who does not have a huge drug cost is not going to do that and pay that huge cost. So we will have a situation where the insurance companies will say why would I want to provide this kind of coverage; I cannot make any money.

Again, I do not want to just rely on what I am saying. There are a whole bunch of quotes here, and I can just give some about where insurance industry executives are commenting on the Republican plan and saying it will not work. We have Mr. Don Young, President of Health Insurance Association of America, April 24 this year in Congress Daily. He says, ''We caution Congress against relying on drug-only insurance as the mechanism to deliver a benefit.'' We have Charles Kahn, President of the Health Insurance Association of America in The New York Times in February of last year. He says, ''I don't know of an insurance company that would offer a drug-only policy like that or even consider it.'' We have him again saying, ''We will withhold judgment on the House Republican proposal until we see it in details. Nevertheless, we continue to believe that the concept of so-called drug-only private insurance simply would not work in practice. Private drug-only coverage would have to clear insurmountable financial, regulatory, and administrative hurdles simply to get to market.''

□ 1945

Mary Lehnhard, senior vice president, Blue Cross and Blue Shield says, ''It is exceedingly unlikely that any of our plans would offer a stand-alone prescription drug policy in their service areas. The reason is affordability. The absolute cost of an annual rate of increase in the cost of prescription drugs would make a drug-only benefit package so expensive that only those who expect to have very high use of the benefit would initially buy a policy. The package would not appeal to the majority of seniors that have relatively low drug costs. Plans would experience tremendous adverse selection, which would escalate premiums.''

I could go on, but I am not going to. It is clear that every major insurance executive and trade association is saying the same thing, that these drug policies will never be offered.

Mr. Speaker, we might ask, the Republican leadership is not badly motivated. They are not bad people. Why are they going in this direction? What is the reason why they would try to pass something in the House on a strictly partisan vote, pretty much, that has no chance of passing the other body; or even if it did become law, have any real impact on seniors in terms of something that they would actually be able to buy or would want to buy.

I think one of the answers is that the real goal behind the Republican bill is not to offer a prescription drug coverage, but rather to take one more step towards privatizing Medicare. I do not know what other conclusion I can come to.

The other conclusion is, somehow they feel it is necessary to come up with something before Election Day so they can say that they passed something, and they will simply go out on the hustings and say we tried to pass something, and hope that Americans do not pay attention to what it is.

Of course, some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, including myself, have cited the fact that the Republican Party in the House is getting huge campaign contributions from the prescription drug industry, and so maybe they want to do something like this bill in order to pretend that they are providing a prescription drug benefit, but do not want to alienate the insurance company by actually doing something that might make a difference. I will go back to that when I talk about the price issue.

I want to talk a little bit about why I think the Republican bill is a bad bill even if it was available. In other words, I do not think anybody is going to sell

these policies. I do not think that they are going to be offered anywhere where the premium is going to be affordable; but let us assume for 1 minute that I am Mr. SMITH, a senior in New Jersey, and somehow this bill passes and there is an insurance company in my area that offers a drug-only insurance policy.

Think about the reasons why I would not want to buy it, even if it was available, and there are many. First of all, if we look at the Republican proposal, it is basically going to cover less than 20 percent of prescription drug costs. The Democratic proposal guarantees that 80 percent of your costs are paid for by the Federal Government. The Republican proposal, even if it was available, and I do not think it will be, will probably cover less than 20 percent of the costs. Why would I say that?

Well, first of all, there is a huge hole or gap in coverage. Let us say you pay the premium, whatever it is. For the first $1,000, they estimate that the insurance company would probably offer to pay 80 percent of the cost, and for the second $1,000, they estimate the insurance company would pay 50 percent. They estimate that, they do not guarantee it.

From the $2,000 out of pocket to $3,700 out of pocket, they estimate that the Republican plan will pay no part of the cost. The average senior citizen, 47 percent of the seniors end up with prescription drug bills that fall into that gap, between $2,000 and $3,700 out of pocket.

Again, I would ask, even if this coverage was available, and it will not be, but even if it was, why would seniors want to pay a premium that for a good percentage of their cost is going to pay absolutely nothing by the Republicans' own calculations? We can look at the bill in many ways, but the most ridiculous thing about it at all, frankly, is that there is this gaping hole where there is no coverage at all for 47 percent of the seniors who incur costs over $2,000 a year.

I have already talked about the Democratic proposal and what it would do, so I am not going to go into that anymore this evening. But I did want to spend a little time on the issue of price because I think it is so important. We know, and we do not need statistics, because constituents have come up to Members over the past year and said the price of prescription drugs just keeps soaring, I cannot afford it.

The week before last when we were meeting and we finally voted on the bill, Families U.S.A., which is a health care consumer group, came out with a report on prices for prescription drugs. They basically pointed out very dramatically that for the most popular prescription drug medicines, prices rose three times the rate of inflation last year. I am going to go over some of the highlights from their press release of June 24.

It says, ''The prices of the 50 most prescribed drugs for senior citizens rose on average by nearly three times the rate of inflation last year according to a new report released today by Families U.S.A. The study analyzed price increases for the 50 most commonly prescribed drugs for seniors for the last year, January 2001 through January 2002, and then for the past 5 years and the past 10 years.''

The report found that last year nearly 36 out of 50 of these drugs rose at least one-and-a-half times the rate of inflation while over one-third, 18 out of 50, rose three or more times the rate of inflation.

Then they go into the specific drugs. It shows dramatically in the report how bad the price situation is and why these prescription drugs are increasingly not affordable.

Well, what is the Republican House leadership's answer to that?

I have discussed the problem of the basic bill, and the gaping hole where almost 50 percent of the seniors would not get any benefit above a certain amount of money that they would have to put out of pocket. But just to ensure in the Republican bill that the price issue could not be addressed in any way by the Federal Government, by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, by the administrator of the program which the Republicans put forward, the Republicans put in the bill a clause that they call the noninterference clause, based on published reports in Congress Daily; and this was put in by the CATS, the Conservative Action Team, a group of conservative Republican Members in the House.

And this noninterference clause, and this is in the bill that passed a week ago, it says that the administrator of the Republican program may not require or institute a price structure for the reimbursement of covered outpatient drugs, and the administrator may not interfere in any way with negotiations between PDP sponsors and Medicare+Choice organizations and drug manufacturers, wholesalers or other suppliers of covered outpatient drugs. What this noninterference clause essentially says is that we do not want the administrator of this prescription drug program, the Federal program, to in any way try to negotiate or interfere with any pricing. Now, how outrageous can this be?

I mentioned before the whole goal of the Democratic alternative was not only to put prescription drugs under Medicare and guarantee that every senior and every disabled person under Medicare had a prescription drug benefit, and the same benefit throughout the country, but that because of the fact that now 30 or 40 million Americans were now under the auspices of Medicare for their prescription drugs, that the Secretary of Health and Human Services would have the power to negotiate price reductions because he represented all those seniors and disabled people.

The Democrats actually put in the bill, in their alternative, a clause that mandates that the Secretary negotiate price reductions on behalf of those 30–40 million Americans. And we know it can be done. It is done by the Veterans Administration, by the military. It is done by other branches of the Federal Government in order to achieve major price reductions, 30–40 percent.

Not only do the Republicans not put their program under Medicare and do all of the other things that I have mentioned, but they specifically put in the bill that there cannot be any negotiations on price by the administrator of their program. Again, people say why would they do this? Why would well-meaning people insist that there be no negotiations over price in whatever program they are trying to set up?

I have no other answer than to say it is because they are essentially in the pockets of the pharmaceutical industry. The pharmaceutical industry insists that the Republican leadership not address the issue of price because they do not want to see any loss of profits.

I do not think that they would lose any profits because the bottom line is, all of a sudden now the prescription drug industry, the brand name pharmaceutical industry, is going to have all these seniors who they would be selling prescription medicine to that are not getting it now. The volume of their sales would skyrocket, but they are so afraid that there is going to be some negotiation over price that would reduce prices and somehow they would be negatively impacted, that they insist that there be a noninterference clause on price.

Mr. Speaker, Members do not have to believe me. I have backup information. The Washington Post, the day that the Republican bill was being considered in the Committee on Energy and the Commerce, of which I am a member, we had to break early at 5 p.m. and not finish the bill until the next day because the Republican National Committee was having a major fund-raiser; and a big part of it was being financed by the pharmaceutical industry. This was an article that appeared the next day in the Washington Post. It says, ''Drug Firms Among Big Donors at GOP Event. Pharmaceutical companies are among 21 donors paying $250,000 each for red-carpet treatment at tonight's GOP fund-raising gala starring President Bush, 2 days after Republicans unveiled a prescription drug plan the industry is backing, according to GOP officials.''

Skipping down in the article, ''Drug companies, in particular, have made a rich investment into tonight's gala. Robert Ingram, GlaxoSmithKline PLC's chief operating officer, is the chief corporate fund-raiser for the gala. His company gave at least $250,000. Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, a trade group funded by the drug companies, kicked in $250,000, too. PhRMA, as it is best

known inside the Beltway, is also helping underwrite a television ad campaign touting the GOP's prescription drug plan.

Pfizer, Inc., contributed at least $100,000 to the event, enough to earn the company the status of a vice chairman for the dinner. Eli Lilly, Bayer AG and Merck & Company each paid up to $50,000 to sponsor a table. Republican officials said other drug companies donated money as part of the fund-raising extravaganza.

''Every company giving money to the event has business before Congress. But the juxtaposition of the prescription drug debate on Capitol Hill and drug companies helping underwrite a major fund-raiser highlights the tight relationship lawmakers have with groups seeking to influence the work before them.

''A senior House GOP leadership aide said yesterday that Republicans are working hard behind the scenes on behalf of PhRMA to make sure that the party's prescription drug plan for the elderly suits drug companies.''

I am not going to continue to read. But in conjunction with all of this, what is the Republican leadership hoping for? They passed the bill. They are going to go over now to the other body and the other body is going to start the debate, and I hope that the other body comes up with a Medicare plan. But what we are going to see over the next few months, and it has already started, is a huge ad campaign financed primarily by the pharmaceutical industry, to try to convince the American public through TV and other media outlets that the Republican plan is the best bill.

It has already started. The United Seniors Association which is basically a senior group that is put together by PhRMA, the pharmaceutical trade group, they launched a $3 million ad campaign before the debate touting the House GOP prescription drug plan which is based on, as I said, private insurers offering prescription drug coverage.

□ 2000

PhRMA spokeswoman Jackie Cottrell admitted they had recently given United Seniors Association an unrestricted grant. According to the Associated Press, several Republican officials speaking under condition of anonymity said they understood that the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America have provided the funds for the commercials.

Again, this is all in black and white. This is all easily documented. And I just think it is very sad. I think it is very sad that we ended up passing a Republican bill that is nothing more than a sham, something put out by the prescription drug industry so that the Republican leadership can say they have done something. We are talking about a Republican bill that will not work. Even if it did, the benefit is clearly inadequate, and I just think it is very sad that we are here now; and after 2 years of myself and other Democrats talking about the need for a prescription drug plan that all we ended up with was something that is basically a bone for the prescription drug industry and which is probably going nowhere because it will not be taken seriously by the other House and never become law.

But I think we have to continue to speak out; we have to continue to point out that this is a major issue, that the price of prescription drugs will continue to rise, that more and more seniors will not be able to buy their prescription drug medicine and that something needs to be done that is real that is going to make a difference for them. And I would hate to see this just become a campaign issue. I would much rather that this were an issue that was resolved and that actually ended up with a benefit that passed both Houses and that went to the President and was signed into law. But I do not see that happening.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude tonight, but I do intend to continue to bring this up over the next few weeks or the next few months because I think it is important that my colleagues understand that those of us on the Democratic side have not given up in trying to provide a real prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare and that as much as there may be ads and paid advertisements telling the American public that the Republican plan will accomplish something, that there needs to be voices here in the House of Representatives that say it will not and that it is just paid-for ads for a meaningless proposal and that at some point we will get together on a bipartisan basis and pass a meaningful prescription drug benefit that will actually provide a difference for America's seniors.

ENCOURAGING TOURISM IN COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). 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. Mr. Speaker, I hold deep respect for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and I find his comments on some occasions to have substantial merit. But let me tell you, having just heard his comments this evening, that was probably one of the most partisan speeches I have heard on this House floor. The gentleman from New Jersey stands up here and acts as if the Democratic Party takes no contributions and as if taking contributions is some kind of evil. I would be happy to yield time to the gentleman if he would like to come up and explain the trial lawyers in this country, where their proceeds go.

It is very easy when you are not charged with getting the mule train up the mountain, it is very easy to sit on sidelines, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has done, and criticize the people who have to get that wagon up the mountain. It is always easy when you are not the one having to push or pull the wagon. It is always easy to sit on the wagon and demand more from the mules that are pulling that wagon.

I found those remarks almost outrageous, almost outrageous. Outside of the person who spoke them, who has, in my opinion, a great amount of integrity, that is the only thing that saved these remarks that we have just heard from being outrageous. Where was the gentleman from New Jersey when it was time for a bipartisan, not a partisan, effort, but a bipartisan effort to put a prescription care bill together? All we see is after we finally get something done, after finally this House begins to move on prescription care services, we always have the Monday morning quarterbacks that show up, and today happens to be Monday evening, so the Monday evening quarterbacks that show up and say, oh, my gosh, this was not right, you should have done this, you should have done that. But you never saw a shovel in their hands. You never saw them helping to dig the ditch. All they do is sit back there under the shade tree criticizing the people that have to dig the ditch. So I hope that we hold those comments in their proper context, and frankly in the future I would expect more from a gentleman of that capability and that integrity.

I want to move on to a couple different subjects this evening that I think are very important. First of all, as many of my colleagues know, I come from the State of Colorado. My district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado, and all the substantial fires in Colorado are in the Third Congressional District and some of the damage by the fire of course has gone beyond the borders of the third district. It certainly has impacted the people of the State of Colorado, and I do not mean to underestimate the damage that these fires caused in their particular areas.

But what I want to stress to my colleagues is a very, very small fraction of Colorado actually went into flames and burned down. What is happening, what we are seeing out in Colorado is we are seeing a lot of negative publicity about the damage that these fires did. And again if you owned a home out there that was destroyed by a fire, you could not get much more negative press coverage. Of course it is devastating to you and of course the loss is terrible, but as a State I think we need to put it in its proper proportion because the impact of the negative stories we are seeing about those fires in Colorado, and by the way, all of those fires are pretty well controlled right now. I think all of them but one are contained, but the publicity in the press that we are seeing as a result of those

fires is really impacting severely Colorado's tourism economy. So I want to tonight in front of my colleagues bring up this poster here and show the Colorado fire damage.

Now, according to what my colleagues have read in the media and so on and the pictures shown across the country, the belief would be that a huge amount of the State of Colorado is in flames. Take a very close look at this. It is the blackened areas of the State of Colorado which have been burned and this is a current poster. We have got some down in Durango. This is the big fire outside of Denver right there, and these other little spots, these little black spots including this spot here in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. Look at that in proportion to the rest of the State.

What I am saying is that Colorado is open for business. One can go to Colorado and have a terrific vacation. The mountains of Colorado are still as pristine as they were with the small exceptions of some of these black areas where we have suffered consequences of terrible fire. A couple forests, the Pike National Forest, have shut down temporarily pending more moisture; and we are worried about the fire hazard out there. You will be limited in that you cannot open a can of beans and cook them over an open fire out there in those Colorado mountains. You can use a Coleman stove or something else, but you cannot have open fires. But aside from that, Colorado is open for business.

Colorado has four national parks. They are open for business. The Air Force Academy is open for business. My good friend Bob Zimmerman and his crew down there in the valley with the sand dunes, soon to be a national park, the Sand Dunes National Park, soon to be funded this week we hope in an appropriations bill, which will be good news to Bob Zimmerman, they are open for business down there. Go see the sand dunes.

There is the Black Canyon National Park, open for business. The Colorado National Monument in Grand Junction, open for business. The Aspen Music Festival, open for business. The Steamboat community, and they have a great summer up there, open for business. Denver, the Denver Rockies, open for business.

By far, less than a fraction, less than a fraction of the land in the State of Colorado, was burned, well less than 1 percent. But if you want to help the people of Colorado who have suffered as a result of these fires, go ahead with your planned vacation.

Nothing is worse than having a negative impact upon you as a result of fire, and then turning around and losing your job because tourists have quit coming to Colorado. Colorado is open for business. It is a great place to visit. I would urge my colleagues to head for Colorado, if you get an opportunity, or talk to some of your constituents. Encourage them to go ahead and visit our great State.

Colorado is the highest place on the continent; the highest place on the continent. The low point in Colorado is higher than almost all of the high points in most of the other States. I think we probably have, I am not sure, but it is close, 65 mountains over 14,000 feet. Colorado has 56 of them. Colorado is the only State in the Union that has no water coming in. It is the Mother of Rivers. It is called the Mother State of Rivers. It is a natural beauty.

So if you have an opportunity, go visit the sand dunes, go visit the Air Force Academy, go to a Rockies game, go over in Glenwood Springs. Glenwood Springs, the mountains around it have some scars as a result of this fire, but that famous Hot Springs pool, still open for business. So I would hope that some of my colleagues give that their consideration and head for Colorado. It is a great State.

CORPORATE GREED

Now I want to change subjects entirely. The next subject I want to talk about is on the minds of a lot of people in America. It is on the minds of many of my colleagues here. Pretty simple. It is called corporate greed.

What has happened out there in the world of business in this fine country of ours? What has happened to the Adam Smith philosophy in ''A Wealth of Great Nations,'' the book that he wrote, that really has been a guiding foundation for capitalism in America?

Well, one of the things that has happened is we have had a few, not a huge amount, but a few greedy individuals who have not only taken advantage, in my opinion, have taken criminal advantage of the public's trust, and I wanted to go through a few of those examples this evening. Because in order for capitalism to work as well as it has worked, in order for it to continue to operate, you have to have as an element of it, as a basic element of capitalism, as a basic element of our business system in this country, a business system that is admired throughout the world, you have to have as an element of it public integrity, integrity when you are dealing with the public's money; and that comes not only from the chief financial officer, not only from the chief executive officer, but it also is a fiduciary requirement of your board of directors.

Let me start by looking at the corporate structure as corporations are envisioned in America. A corporation is a legal entity. It is not a person; it is a legal entity. Remember, not all corporations are big. In fact, by far, by far the majority of corporations in this country are very, very small.

I will give you an example. My in-laws have a ranch. They are not big ranchers. They have a ranch. But because of corporate liability, they have incorporated their ranch. I know people who run an ice cream truck who incorporate their ice cream truck. So just because someone is incorporated does not mean they are large, and to throw the same blanket overall corporations because of the misbehavior of a few individuals in a few corporations would be a big mistake to our free enterprise system.

You would be surprised if you just look out amongst your neighbors in the business world. Whether it is a Subway shop, whether it is some other kind of a trucking operation, a farming operation, you would be surprised how many of them are incorporated. So you must be careful before you criticize all of these corporate entities.

Now, in America we have what we call in the corporate structure as it is envisioned, as it has been practiced since corporations first came around, you have the president or the chief executive officer. Let us call it the chief executive officer of the corporation.

Now, a lot of people think that the chief executive officer is the top dog, that is the person, he or she is in charge of that company. Well, the reality of it is the CEO, your chief executive officer, answers to the board of directors.

The board of directors is the top element of management, so to speak. They kind of oversee. They set the policy for management. They set the long-term vision for the company. So, really, the most important entity in a corporation as far as management and as far as overall philosophy are not the executive officers like the president of the company or the chief executive officer of the company or the chief financial officer of the company. The most important aspect, in my opinion, is your board of directors.

Now, board of directors usually consist, in a typical corporation, of anywhere from, say, three, but your average board probably runs more between 20 and 30, members on that board of directors.

□ 2015

They meet on a regular basis, and within the average or the typical board of directors out there, they have subcommittees. They have an audit subcommittee, and that audit subcommittee's job is to oversee the management of the company, to be sure that the management of the company is following the general philosophy of the company as far as the audits, is following the law as far as the audits, and that the audits are making sense, that they are being performed. You have the executive committee of the board of directors which deals with executive compensation, and there are a lot of cases that we are going to question further in my remarks.

For example, how could the executive committee of Worldcom, which all of my colleagues know is right now on the verge of bankruptcy, how could the executive committee grant the CEO, the chief executive officer, a gentleman named Bernie Ebbers, a $400 million loan. Worldcom is not a bank.

I saw an interesting article the other day, and the name of the author slipped my mind, but I want to give

credit to whoever that individual is. But they made a comparison to Donald Trump years ago and the troubles he got into as compared to the troubles people like Worldcom or Tyco or Xerox Corporation or K-Mart Corporation, the troubles they are into today, and it said, back then, Don Trump borrowed his money from the banks, and he was able to recover. Donald Trump actually made a pretty respectable recovery from the downfall that he took, but he dealt with banks.

What has happened in the meantime is these corporations have acted as banks. These board of directors have acted as banks. Frankly, they have put a bad name on all board of directors. They have put a bad name on all chief executive officers, and that is undeserved. We have a lot of companies in this country which operate in a very ethical fashion. We have a lot of them that operate a very efficient operation, and they have good products. But the only way for that to continue into the future is we have to have peer enforcement. We have to make it much more significant in this country to steal or take or borrow $400 million from a company that you do not pay back, that you have more consequences as a result of that than you do when you go into Wal-Mart and you steal a candy bar and you get arrested for shoplifting. My concern right now is that some of these individuals will walk away with less of a punishment than would any one of us if we were to walk into a convenience store and steal a candy bar and get arrested for shoplifting.

This is an opportunity for our system to show that the system has self enforcement, to show that the system knows how to stay on the tracks; that when we have individuals that try and derail the train, individuals that try and derail the train, that the system has a way of pulling those people back into place, that the system has a method of punishment towards these people. There are a lot of people, there are a lot of employees that have suffered as a result of K-Mart's bankruptcy. Now, unfortunately, those employees that have suffered as a result of K-Mart's bankruptcy finally are not the chief executive officers, one who gave himself a loan the day before they filed bankruptcy. I am going to go through some of these different examples.

Now, a lot of people say, and politicians love to jump to this, they love to say, well, it is a Republican or Democrat. Let me tell my colleagues something. This has happened while the Democrats were under control, when Bill Clinton was in his office over there. Take a look at Sunbeam Corporation, Waste Management Corporation, and most of the numbers that have been, where the books have been cooked on these corporations that we are talking about today happened during the democratic administration. I heard the President today, under a Republican, our Republican President today talking about the need that we have to crack down and crack down immediately on this, and he gave a bunch of different remedies.

My point here is not to get into a discussion whether the Republicans caused it or the Democrats caused it. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats caused it. What caused it were some people with greed. I think many of these people acted in a criminal fashion. They are nothing but a bunch of thugs. That is exactly what they are. They are not thugs that were put out there by the Democratic Party. They are not thugs that were put out there by the Republican Party. They are just common, every day criminals who got put into the wrong position and they stole and stole and stole until they finally got caught.

Now, how interesting that some of these people, including Worldcom, today testifies up here on Capitol Hill about look, it was just an accounting problem. It was the accountants. This is during the same time, while they were here today testifying, a gentleman named Scott Sullivan, I think it is Scott Sullivan who was the treasurer for Worldcom, or their chief financial officer for Worldcom, and let me get the name exactly correct here. Yes, Scott Sullivan. He was the chief financial officer. While he was on Capitol Hill today, while he was on Capitol Hill today, refusing to talk to the United States Congress about what went wrong at Worldcom, why thousands, tens of thousands of people will lose their jobs, while he was refusing to talk today, here is what he was having built in Florida. Take a look at this. This home here is about a $15 million to $20 million home, 24,000 square feet. You could park many, many semis in these different structures. That is this 40-year-old's home in Florida on a lake, on a private lake that is being built out there. This is an individual who paid himself out of Worldcom, out of public, out of the public's investment money, paid himself the kind of salaries and bonuses to allow him to build a $15 million to $20 million home. And he anticipated, continuing to go ahead and, in my opinion, rob the people of this corporation on a continuing basis. Just think of the heating bill on this place every month. Think of the taxes on this place. The taxes are probably $10,000 or $20,000 every month. Where does he get the money? Go to the shareholders. Fudging the books, cooking the books. That is what we have going here.

When we have a criminal in our midst, we have to point him out. But because we have a group of several thousands and thousands of people, and in our country, thousands and thousands of people do business in our country. When we find a crook, people will become convinced that all of you are crooks if you do not do something about the crook you can get your hands on. We have an opportunity right now, the United States Congress, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Justice Department, and the President, who has obviously showed his intent; we have this opportunity to get our hands around the crooks. And the society, society today is looking to us to be responsive and to do something to get these people out of our midst, to make sure that we do not have future frauds like this one that just is taking place.

Now, I could care less about the $15 million home; what I care about is the 15,000 jobs. Do we think anybody else besides Scott Sullivan and his fellow executives get to walk away from a job to a home like that? How many Worldcom employees today are without a job and without any future potential for a job because of the greed practiced within the corporate board room, and within the executive offices of Worldcom, Incorporated? Look, I do not just want to pick on Worldcom. Let me talk about a couple of others here.

ImClone Systems. These are the people that find out on Wednesday that their magical cure for cancer will not be certified because it does not cure cancer, and so immediately they start selling stock before they are forced to make the announcement on Friday. There is the case where we heard about Martha Stewart. Whether or not Martha Stewart had inside information, who knows? But it is highly suspicious, that just out of the blue sky, Martha Stewart gets the message, or decides the day before the announcement is made that the stock is going to collapse, the day before, hours before, she sells that stock to some unsuspecting buyer out there. It was not just Martha Stewart that sold her stock on that day. Interestingly, the President of the company made sure his daughter sold her $2.5 million or $3 million worth of stock that day, and made sure the father sold his stock that day, and the stock broker himself, what a coincidence that all of his friends who had heavy investments in this company sold their stock on December 27 and the announcement was made on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, if the SEC finds out, and I suspect that they probably will, that these individuals dealt on inside knowledge, the hammer ought to come down. The hammer ought to come down. Because if it does not, the credibility of the entire system, of the free enterprise system of our country comes into question.

We are presented with an opportunity here. We are presented with an opportunity in the business world of this Nation, in the political world of this Nation that when somebody misbehaves like this, when somebody takes advantage of the public's trust and, in essence, steals from the public, we have the wherewithal and we have the courage to go get them. That is exactly what was expressed by our President today. This President is very focused and very intent on getting these people in a ringer, and that is exactly what we have to do.

Let me talk about a couple of other corporations. Xerox Corporation. When I grew up, everybody trusted Xerox Corporation. And they have restated twice in the last 2 weeks. We notice that they never state positive news. Everything these people are coming out with is negative. And it costs who? Not the chief executive officer; it costs the shareholders and employees of these companies.

Enron; of course, we know about Enron. But it is kind of amusing to hear Andrew Fastow, he set up these quiet, secret corporations, secret partnerships, although he actually got the approval of the board of directors, and it was very interesting that the U.S. Senate report was very critical of these board of directors, and justifiably so. It is the board's responsibility to make sure that you do not have an Enron Corporation, somebody like an Andrew Fastow, who is a crook. That is exactly what he did. A crook. Paid himself $30 million for 4 months of work. Of course, he runs this little partnership. Just to make it a little sarcastic to the shareholders, they name it after different characters or different scenes in the Star Wars movie. They think it is all one big joke. Show up at work every day, Andrew at Enron, and packed the money in his bag. Of course, we can imagine, Andrew also lives in a multimillion dollar home. So we gave Scott Sullivan's home, poor guy, has not finished his $20 million home yet, so he is probably only living in a $5 million home. But he has to live up to his standards, he has to move up in society. The same thing with Andrew down there in Texas.

These people need to have their assets that were improperly and unethically gained by them, taken away from them, under an appropriate judicial process. I am not saying that we become some kind of a dictatorship and that we throw our justice system out the window. Everybody is entitled a fair day in court, but everybody is also entitled to a square deal. And when you do not get a square deal, and you are not on fair negotiating grounds, when you do not get a square deal, we ought to have the process to make sure that those who cheated you, those who stole from you, those who acted in a criminal manner, pay the consequences of their actions.

Now, it does not just stop at Enron, as all of us know; it does not just stop with Worldcom. Look at Tyco International. What does Tyco do? The President of Tyco International, who makes hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars in pay, decides to cheat the government, cheat the people, that is who it is, the government is the people; cheat the people of the State he lives in on paying sales tax for the paintings that he bought.

Let me tell my colleagues something: I used to be a police officer. The first clue, when the door is cracked open, it ought to be a hint; if it is not locked, that is a hint. If the door of the House or the building one goes up to to investigate on, if the door is actually cracked open, you better guess something bigger is inside, something is inside. When you have a chief executive officer of a corporation, Tyco International, cheating on really what are small numbers as compared to his net worth, you better open the door, you better go investigate inside the building and see what else this individual has done. My guess is you have just scratched the surface. In my opinion, the Internal Revenue Service ought to be down there doing audits of this individual. Tyco International ought to be filing lawsuits against this individual. The prosecutors in that State ought to be looking into this individual for criminal fraud.

□ 2030

It does not just stop with the chief executive officer. A lot of times when one starts padding the books, cooking the books, one has to bring in partners. In this particular case, he brought in his lawyer.

Let us talk about his lawyer for a minute, or, first of all, his chief financial officer. His chief financial officer and the CEO cashed over $500 million in stocks since July of 1999. Now, that is on top of their salaries. Their salaries are not enough, and they are huge salaries, so they cash in $500 million more, to kind of pad their wallets.

Then they got their attorney, Mark Belnick. He decides that as an attorney he ought to be receiving bonuses, but he does not want these to be disclosed to the public at large, so he devises a way to have the corporation pay him tens of millions of dollars as the lawyer for the company in such a manner that he does not have to release it on the public disclosure statements.

Why does he not want it released on the public disclosure statements? Because he knows the shareholders would have nothing to do with it; that the shareholders would demand, would demand accountability, and would demand that he not receive that kind of pay.

Of course, he is aware of this. He knows that he might get caught in the action. He knows he might get caught with his hand in the cookie jar. So what does he do? He goes to the chief executive officer of Tyco, International, Dennis Kowalski, and says, Dennis, I might get caught at this. This is what I think happened. I might get caught, so why do you not give me a contract as your attorney, and if I get convicted with a felony, you still have to pay me millions of dollars. If I am convicted of a felony, if you decide to fire me because I am, in essence, stealing from the company, you have to pay me tens of millions of dollars.

That is the kind of corruption that goes on in the corporate world that we need to immediately isolate, and we need to cut it out. We need to stop it in such a way that any future chief executive officer and every board of directors is going to understand there are consequences to pay.

That is what we do with shoplifting in this country in every store we go into. I went into Toys ''R'' Us this weekend. As I walked in, they had a big poster at the front: Shoplifting. Help us keep prices low. Help us stop shoplifting. Shoplifting is a crime.

Yet, nowhere do we go where we find a board of directors where, at the entry into their boardroom, it says, you have a responsibility, board of directors, to the shareholders of this corporation, to the employees of this corporation, and to the public as a whole to make sure that this kind of thievery is not going on, or that these kinds of misleading statements are not going on, and that your management team is, in fact, the best possible management team that could be out there.

What I am saying here is that our country needs to focus, and the businesses and the chief executive officers and the good executives, and we have a lot of good people that run a lot of good companies in this country, they are the ones who need to stand up and speak the loudest about this misbehavior that has gone on in the corporate boardroom and in the corporate executive offices.

I do not want to stop just short of Tyco. I should mention also the board of directors. Tyco had a member of the board of directors named Frank Welsh. Tyco bought another company, and guess what, Frank Welsh decided he ought to have a cut of it, so he got a $20 million little payment on the side for helping merge the company. Where is Frank Welsh tonight? He is probably sitting in a limousine getting ready to go to a play on Broadway or something.

These people need to understand that we will go after them. I will tell the Members, for my part, I have some solutions that I think will work. But I want Members to know that, for my part, I am very committed, as I think most of my colleagues are, Republican or Democrat. And this is not an affront to one political party, this is an affront to the people of this Nation, and we must all remain committed to see that these people pay the consequences for the fraud that they have worked upon the public.

I want to show Members something. I have mentioned a couple of these corporations. Let me go through some others. We talked about Tyco. Remember what Tyco did? That is what I have just been talking about. WorldCom, that is where the chief executive officer, a guy named Bernie Evers, had the board of directors loan him almost $400 million, on top of all the other millions and tens of millions of dollars he has been paid. This is where Scott Sullivan worked, that big mansion. That is WorldCom.

K-Mart, K-Mart has its chief executive officers and some of its other executive officers, they go and first of all they go into bankruptcy. They lay off

22,000 people. K-Mart lays off 22,000 jobs as a result of their bankruptcy. But right before they filed bankruptcy, K-Mart acts and gives their chief executive officer a $5 million loan, and they forgive the repayment of it. Have Members ever heard of a bank saying, here is $5 million, but you don't have to worry about paying it back?

That is exactly what these companies have done, and K-Mart leads the charge. That is exactly what WorldCom did, and they helped lead the charge: Here you are, Mr. Chief Executive Officer, here is $400 million. Do not worry about paying it back. What is going on here?

And then Enron. We talked about Enron. We talked about Xerox. We talked about ImClone: Hey, we have bad news on the cancer drug. Sell, sell, sell. Find some sucker out there that does not have the information we have.

In America we love to compete, but in America we like to compete on a level playing field. Every executive that I mentioned this evening with these corporations did not want to compete on a level playing field. They did not want to come face-to-face where the odds were all the same, they wanted to compete where the odds were overwhelmingly in favor of them and not you, where the odds almost assured that you lost and they won.

The only way to even that playing field out is to clear out the dirt and put grass in there. Frankly, we have got a lot of dirt in some of these companies in these executive officers.

Let me tell the Members what my solution is. This is a little game. When we play the game of Monopoly, if you mess up, you go to jail, move directly to jail, do not collect. Do not collect. These chief executive officers of WorldCom or ImClone or Tyco or Xerox or Enron should not be able to collect on their way to jail. That is where they ought to be. They ought to be on their way to jail.

The justice system, I hope, will prevail here. I hope the Internal Revenue Service takes note of these individuals.

Have Members seen lately that the Internal Revenue Service announced they are going to begin random audits? So, watch out, some out there who are making $15,000 or $20,000 or $30,000 a year, they might be audited by the IRS. My question to the Internal Revenue Service, and I have not put it to them, but I intend to put it to the commissioner of Internal Revenue Service, okay, okay, how many of these people are you auditing? How many of these executive officers, these boards of directors are you auditing? If you are not auditing them, you ought to be, right now.

Now, unfortunately, it does not just stop here. We can continue. We can go with others. This is a cable TV company. They built their own golf course off shareholders' money. They loaned to their family. They started family companies with all their daughters and sons and their families off shareholders' money. Now that company, they are in bankruptcy or on the verge of bankruptcy. How many health care people lost their jobs as a result of this?

Where were the auditing companies? We know about Arthur Andersen. The trouble I have with the prosecution of Arthur Andersen, I know they went after them for obstruction of justice. They went after the company, they did not go after individuals. My suggestion, my humble suggestion to the Department of Justice, is to go after the individuals.

What happened in Andersen is we have now, successfully, Arthur Andersen for all realistic purposes is no longer in existence. Two years from now they will have closed all their books and they will be out of business. Lots of innocent people at Arthur Andersen lost their jobs, but the chief executive officers, and these accountants that dealt with this that were supposed to do the auditing probably have already found jobs with somebody else by now.

We need to go after people. We need to go after the individuals. We need to go after the crooks, because we have got to separate the crooks from the honest people. It has to happen.

Look at this. I mentioned earlier, Sunbeam Corporation. That seems to be about where it started. Global Crossing. Gary Winnick, that guy was paid $700 million or $800 million. They have also destroyed their documents, or admitted to destruction of documents, since they have been under Federal investigation.

My point here is that we have to come up with some solutions. We have to go after some of these companies. We have to go after the Arthur Andersens, the individuals that have fallen on their jobs and are not completing the responsibilities that they have.

I have some recommendations. I think there are some things that we can do.

Let me start out with the board of directors. I think it is imperative, I think it is imperative that we hold boards of directors responsible for the actions of a corporation. I think it is very important that boards of directors, that every corporation in America have, especially if it is a widely traded one, for example, the family farm, like my in-laws' family farm, it would be unreasonable to expect them, they do not have public shareholders, it is held by shares in the family, for them to go outside the farm and bring somebody that is not related to the farm to come in and help with the management.

But where we have a corporation that is widely traded, for example, where we have a Tyco Corporation, or where we have a Xerox or a K-Mart Corporation, that board of directors should consist not only of outside directors. And let me explain what I mean by outside directors. In a corporation, if one is employed, for example, let us take a look at WorldCom, if one is employed by WorldCom and is put on the WorldCom board of directors, then one is what is called an inside director. You are employed by the company and serve on the board.

In many cases, a board is healthy if we have some inside people. They are the people involved in day-to-day operations. So in rare circumstances, it is appropriate to have inside people on that board of directors, because they run the operations. So some of the executive officers probably should be on the board of directors.

But every corporate board that is widely traded with the public should also have outside directors who are not beholden to the president or the chief executive officer or the chief financial officer for their job; that they have a level of independence; that they can come into the boardroom and say, hey, Mr. Chief Executive Officer, hey, Mrs. Chief Executive Officer, tell me exactly what these books mean. Tell me what you are doing. I do not owe my job to you. You respond to the board of directors.

I think there has been a dramatic wake-up call across the country to boards of directors. I am sure that the board members of Enron Corporation, for example, WorldCom, and many of these other companies, K-Mart and so on, will find themselves in litigation for a long, long time as a result of their negligence. And frankly, it is justified. They need to be held accountable. If they accept that position, they must deliver the responsibilities that that position demands.

So that is one of my solutions, revamping boards of directors across this country.

We have to regulate auditors. We cannot allow auditors on one hand, or first of all, we should not allow them into offices. Auditors, not outside auditors, or not the inside auditors, and again, inside auditors are the people that the company employs, their accounting department. They make sure that they audit inside. But we have outside at-arm's-length auditors.

The first thing we should not allow to happen is allow them to office in the same offices. At Enron Corporation, Arthur Andersen shared offices with the people they are auditing. I mean, if one sits next to somebody, offices with somebody, they cannot over time help becoming buddies with them. It happens. So, one, they should not office together.

Two, they have to separate consulting services and auditing services. The auditors should not be able to accept any gifts, should not office, should not offer any other services other than the fact they are in there to audit, just like in a bank.

I had an opportunity some time ago to visit with the president of some banks in Colorado, a very capable individual, a very capable individual. He explained to me exactly how the government, the FEC, or not the FEC, the

banking regulators, exactly how they audit and when they come in. They cannot even offer a pencil to them. You cannot give them a pencil or buy them meals. You cannot buy meals or take the auditor out for lunch.

We cannot let them come in and share offices on a permanent basis. When they are in there auditing our banking system, they are not giving them consulting advice as well. They are an independent arm. Those auditors have a very isolated role. They are to go in there and make sure the books are not being cooked. That is what happens in our banks.

Many, many years ago we had a similar problem with our banks, so the government and the people of this country took an affirmative step. They said, look, we want independence in these auditors. That is what has happened. As a result of that, we have a very accurate picture of a bank's financial condition based on these audits.

That is what has to happen in corporate America. We need to regulate this auditing system. We need to get auditors that are good for the punch; that when the auditor comes out and says, this is what the corporation looks like, it is in fact what the corporation does look like.

Now, we have to have a stronger Securities and Exchange Commission, we have the FDIC, the Federal auditing and banking systems. I think we have a pretty good Justice Department, but I encourage the Justice Department to be very aggressive in its prosecution of these corporate thugs. But, on top of that, we have to have a strong Securities and Exchange Commission.

I find it interesting that in the last few days, a couple of Republicans and many Democrats have demanded the resignation of the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who has not been in his job very long and certainly was not in his job at the time that most of this happened. Give him an opportunity.

I think, frankly, some of the fault rests with our appropriations. We have to get some cops down there in the SEC. The SEC has to be as aggressive with these corporate misbehaviors as retailers are with shoplifters. That is what is happening here, except these shoplifters are taking from the public in the amounts of tens and hundreds of millions of dollars.

□ 2045

So the SEC has to be stronger. My guess would be especially with the revelations that have occurred in the last week or so that we as a Congress will, in fact, grant more resources so that we can get our SEC cops in place and they can do the job they need to do. So we have to have a strong SEC. And we have got to have a coordinated effort between the Securities and Exchange Commission, which brings the civil litigation, and the Justice Department, which bring the criminal litigation.

If I were the Attorney General of this country, I would contact every U.S. Attorney in every district out there and I would say, go get them. If you have got corporate fraud in your district, in the jurisdiction that you have, go get them. We need to have a public display just like we do with shoplifting. We do not want shoplifting and we do not want corporate thugs taking money from the public, and we have got to go after them, but that requires coordination.

I am a little more encouraged than some of my friends about the ability of the Justice Department and the SEC on their coordinated efforts, but I do think they need more resources, and I think it is incumbent upon us to get those resources for them.

I also want to talk about the compensation package. The compensation package, how can you justify compensation to the president of the corporation, not to the person that invented the better mouse trap, but to the treasurer, in fact, the chief financial officer. How can you justify compensation that allows a 40-year-old person who is the treasurer of the company to build a 15, $20 million home just like this and to walk away with bonuses in the hundreds of millions of dollars? You cannot do it. We have got to adjust the compensation system.

Now, look, we have got to be careful about that. I will tell you, if you told me somebody invented the cure for cancer or the cure for the common cold or a better way to educate our kids in a manner such that we really get the top quality product, who cares if they live like this? You show me the person who can figure out the cure for cancer, for breast cancer, I think that is great. Where it is deserving, where you are getting a square deal, that is okay. But these were not gained through arm's length transactions, through innovation, other than innovation in a criminal fashion, as I have mentioned earlier. These are ill-gotten gains. That is what has happened here. That house was built, in my opinion, by ill-gotten gains, by a 40-year-old person who cared more about his own greed than he did the company which employed him and expected him to carry out his fiduciary duties for the owners of that company which, of course, are the shareholders of that company.

Executive compensation has got to be revamped. I do not care how good of an executive you are, I do not care how fine a company you run, it troubles me that any company in the world would pay you 700-some-million dollars, which I think the head of Oracle or one of the corporations out there just paid their chief executive officer, I think it was 700 million in the last year or two. That includes stock options, I understand that, but, I mean, that kind of compensation is just out of line. We pay the President of the United States a fraction of that.

And not only that, take a look at the retirement package. I have an article here out of Business Week, July 15. This is the newest Business Week. Not only do some of these corporate executives, they rake in the cash while they are running the company at the expense of public shareholders, take a look at their retirement packages. How many people do you think at WorldCom, that got fired at WorldCom got compensation packages? It is the same thing. We can talk about Global Crossing. We can talk about Kmart. We can talk about Conseco, Sunbeam, any number of these. Take a look at what their employees got when they got laid off as a result of this corporate mismanagement.

But let me tell you what happens at some of these corporations and why compensation needs to be readjusted. This is Philip Morris. At Philip Morris, the retired chief executive officer gets for life, gets for life, this guy's name is Jeffrey Bible, this is what his retirement package is from Philip Morris Corporation for as long as he lives, and occasionally for this he needs to be available to consult, which means nothing, but for as long as he lives, he gets an office near his home and that would include a secretary. Remember, he is no longer working for the company. He has retired from the company. By the way, he was not underpaid. His last year with the company, they paid him $50 million. He is now a retired corporate executive. This is what he gets: An office near his home, including a secretary; an unlimited phone calling card; two cellular telephones; two fax machines, plus the cost of the maintenance; security at his home and security for his vacation home.

So the shareholders of this company will pay the former president of the company security money to make sure his home is secure and his vacation home is secure. Access to the corporate jet. Any time he wants, he can call up on the phone, Mr. Bible can, and say, I want the corporate jet and they take him anywhere he wants around the world. Access to the dining room. Access to the gym. A company car and driver for the rest of his life. And if he does not want the car and driver, they will pay him $100,000 a year. So he can go out and spend $100,000 a year on the car he needs. And $15,000 a year for somebody to give him financial advice. So if he needs financial advice from his tax accountant, the company will pay him 15,000.

That retirement package comes right out of the pockets of the consumer and right out of the pockets of the shareholders. Just like this house built on ill-gotten gains down in Florida as a result of Scott Sullivan and WorldCom Corporation, it is the same thing. That is where that money is coming from.

I applaud the President today. The President came out and I think in very strong terms has set the direction for the House and the Senate to follow, that if we do not have the laws in place, and, by the way, we have a lot of laws in place today, there is a lot we can do today by simply enforcing the

laws that are already in existence. I am not convinced we need a whole lot more new laws as far as the criminal behavior is concerned. What we need are more resources out there to these agencies to enforce the laws that exist.

So the President today made it very clear, and I think it would be to our benefit in both the House and the other side, in the Senate, to follow this lead. And this week I hope we can accomplish with some strong firm legislation an enforcement of a policy in this country that makes your punishment from stealing from the shareholders, from stealing from the public, for misappropriating, from lying on your accounting, from cooking the books, makes those offenses much more serious consequences than you would face if you went out and shoplifted a candy bar from the local retail store.

Our business system in this country depends on integrity. Now we know that not everybody is going to be honest. It cannot happen. Any time you get a group of people together, you will have a bad apple. It is the same thing in Congress. It happened in the Catholic priesthood. It has happened in the corporate world. So we have to build in, we have to anticipate that you will have a crooked corporate executive here and there. But the key to it is not to pretend that it is not going to happen or to depend totally on honesty. Our society has never totally depended on honesty. We have always had law. It is to put the laws in place. It is not just to put the laws in place. It is to enforce the laws that you have in place.

Let me conclude by saying this, I hope that we give the support to the President that he has asked; that we give the resources to the Securities and Exchange Commission that they need to police this problem; that we crack down hard on corporate governance; that we crack down hard on the auditing and audit oversight for companies like Arthur Andersen. And, by the way, the five major auditing firms in this country, all of them have been named in some of these transactions. It is clearly a mess out there that can be cleaned up. It has to be cleaned up.

Do not let us forget that what is being highlighted here, and appropriately. I think we need to focus a lot of attention on it, but sometimes when we focus all our attention on the misdeeds by a few, it tars everybody else. I mean, look at the Catholic priesthood. You get a few bad priests and all priests out there are being tarnished unfairly. Let me say we have people out there who do run ethical business. We have people that deliver good products. We have people that care about their shareholders. We have people that are responsible to their board of directors and we have boards of directors that are responsible to the people that they represent and we have a lot of good workers out there. That is what has made the American system great and the American system will stay great as long as we jump on top of people who have committed misdeeds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a speaking engagement.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. LUTHER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. BASS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BASS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 803. An act to enhance the management and promotion of electronic Government services and processes by establishing an Office of Electronic Government within the Office of Management and Budget. and by establishing a broad framework of measures that require using Internet-based information technology to enhance citizen access to Government information and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2578. To amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 9, 2002, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7731. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's draft bill entitled, ''To amend sections 3, 7D, 16(i)(2), and 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to recover through user fees the costs of standardization activities''; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7732. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nicotine; Tolerance Revocations [OPP-2002-0035; FRL-6836-7] received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7733. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 107—237); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7734. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for an FY 2003 budget amendment for the Department of Defense; (H. Doc. No. 107—241); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7735. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Daniel G. Brown, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7736. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Study on Impact of Foreign Sourcing of Systems'' required by Section 831 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7737. A letter from the Senior Paralegal, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Standards: Claims on Securities Firms [No. 2002-5] (RIN: 1550-AB11) received June 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7738. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) 2000-01 Overview of Student Progress, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 924; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7739. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule — Amendment of Parts 2 and 25of the Commission's Rules to Permit Operation of NGSO FSS Systems Co-Frequency with GSO and Terrestrial Systems in the Ku-Band Frequency Range; Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Authorize Subsidiary Terrestrial Use of the 12.2-12.7 GHz Band by Direct Broadcast Satellite Licensees and Their Affiliates; and Applications of Broadwave USA, PDC Broadband Corporation, and Satellite Receivers, Ltd. to Provide A Fixed Service in the 12.2-12.7 GHz Band [ET Docket No. 98-206, RM-9147, RM-9245] Received June 27, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7740. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for FY 2002 (RIN: 3150-AG95) received June 27, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7741. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Taliban that was declared in Executive Order 13129 of July 4, 1999, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 107—238); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7742. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his termination of the national emergency with respect to Taliban and amendment of Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(a); (H. Doc. No. 107—239); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

7743. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-39), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7744. 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 Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 182-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7745. 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 Russia, Ukraine, Norway and Cayman Islands [Transmittal No. DTC 183-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7746. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7747. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7748. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7749. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7750. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting a proposed bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 2003 through 2007; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7751. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the 2001 Annual Report describing the activities performed by the Commission, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(9); to the Committee on House Administration.

7752. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Carolina Heelsplitter (RIN: 1018-AH31) received July 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7753. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Southern California Distinct Vertebrate Population Segment of the Mountain Yellowlegged Frog (Rana muscosa) (RIN: 1018-AF83) received July 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7754. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Ambrosia pumila (San Diego Ambrosia) from Southern California (RIN: 1018-AF86) received July 10, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7755. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-fourth in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1999 through September 30, 2000, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7756. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revised and Clarified Hazardous Materials Safety Rulemaking and Program Procedures [Docket No. RSPA-98-3974] (RIN: 2137-AD20) received July 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7757. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Dry dock shift from Bath Iron Works, Portland to Portland State Pier, Portland, Maine and back to Bath Iron Works Portland and onto the heavy lift ship Blue Marlin [CGD1-01-033] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received July 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7758. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones, Security Zones, and Special Local Regulations [USCG-2001-10936] received July 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7759. A letter from the Attorney, RSPA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Requirements for Maintenance, Requalification, Repair and Use of DOT Specification Cylinders [Docket No. RSPA-01-10373 (HM-220D)] (RIN: 2137-AD58) received July 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7760. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an updated report concerning the emigration laws and policies of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b); (H. Doc. No. 107—240); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

7761. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Closing Agreements (Rev. Proc. 2002-47) received June 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7762. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the 2002 Report to Congress on Combating Terrorism, pursuant to the Fiscal Year (FY) 1998 National Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 105-85); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary.

7763. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft bill to provide voluntary separation payment authority to the Secretary of Commerce in connection with reorganization of the Economic Development Administration; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services.

7764. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a proposed bill entitled, ''To authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4129. A bill to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act to clarify the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Central Utah Project, to redirect unexpended budget authority for the Central Utah Project for wastewater treatment and reuse and other purposes, to provide for prepayment of repayment contracts for municipal and industrial water delivery facilities, and to eliminate a deadline for such prepayment; with an amendment (Rept. 107–554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4635. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a program for Federal flight deck officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107–555 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following actions occurred on June 28, 2002]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4984 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4985 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4986 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4635. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a program for Federal flight deck officers, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Judiciary for a period ending not later than July 9, 2002, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k) of rule X (Rept. 107–555 Pt. 1).

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 July 1, 2002]

H.R. 3929. Referral to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than September 6, 2002.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 5062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require a sports franchise to provide for all of the games played by the franchise to be available for local television broadcasting in order to be subject to the presumption that 50 percent of the consideration in the sale or exchange of a sports franchise is allocable to player contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 5063. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence and to restore the tax exempt status of death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AKIN:

H.R. 5064. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 5065. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit Indian tribal courts, pursuant to tribal domestic relations laws, to alienate or assign benefits under retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 5066. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to limit the authority of the United States to recover, after a member of the uniformed services is retired or separated from the uniformed services, amounts of basic pay, allowances, bonuses, special pays, and other compensation erroneously paid to the member before the member's retirement or separation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 5067. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to permit States the option of coverage of aliens who are citizens covered under the Compact of Free Association legally residing in the United States under the Medicaid Program and the State children's health insurance program (SCHIP); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 5068. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to expand the current provision of medical assistance to certain uninsured women who have been screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer to also cover ovarian and uterine cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion from gross income for survivor benefits of a deceased public safety officer shall apply to such benefits regardless of whether the recipient is the spouse or a child of the officer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H. Con. Res. 435. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the therapeutic technique known as rebirthing is a dangerous and harmful practice and should be prohibited; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 470. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. OSE):

H. Res. 471. A resolution to recognize the significant contributions of Paul Ecke, Jr. to the poinsettia industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to the public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 168: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 285: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 303: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.
H.R. 360: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 389: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 488: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 599: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 632: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 664: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 744: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 822: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 951: Mr. OSE, Mr. JOHN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 952: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 978: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1089: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1127: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1184: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FORD, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1187: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1296: Mr. FORD, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1433: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1452: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1460: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 1774: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1811: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1919: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1990: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2035: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2117: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
H.R. 2232: Mr. HONDA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2290: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2459: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 2484: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 2570: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2702: Mr. LEVIN and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2874: Mr. BARRETT and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 3131: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3218: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 3315: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 3324: Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 3337: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3413: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 3414: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3430: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3443: Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 3450: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3475: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 3595: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3741: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3831: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 3838: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3884: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3912: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3916: Mr. OWENS and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3930: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3974: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4011: Mr. GILMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 4034: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4037: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 4058: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4060: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4066: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4084: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4141: Mr. CANNON and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 4152: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4210: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4582: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DICKS, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 4614: Ms. WATERS, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4630: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4635: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 4643: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4646: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 4655: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4704: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4720: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 4728: Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4738: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 4743: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 4768: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4777: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 4839: Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 4864: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4877: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 4878: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4914: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 4926: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4939: Ms. LEE and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4964: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4965: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 4967: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 4973: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 5037: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 5044: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 5047: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 5055: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. REYES and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5059: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. BONO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 365: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 367: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 406: Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 413: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. GRUCCI.

H. Res. 87: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. LYNCH.

H. Res. 253: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Res. 393: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LEE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H. Res. 437: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. FERGUSON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2733

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 5, line 6, insert '', including awareness by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both,'' after ''in the United States''.

H.R. 2733

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 5, after line 25, insert the following new subsection:

(f) WOMEN AND MINORITY AWARENESS STUDIES.—

(1) BASELINE STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the extent of awareness of, and participation in, enterprise integration development activities by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both.

(2) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report evaluating the extent to which activities under this section, especially under subsection (d)(1), have increased the awareness of, and participation in, enterprise integration development activities by businesses that are majority owned by women, minorities, or both.

H.R. 4635

OFFERED BY: MR. PAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 2, line 10, strike ''pilot''.

Page 8, strike lines 18 through 24.

Page 9, line 1, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(4)''.

Page 11, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 19 on page 13.

Page 13, line 20, strike ''(j)'' and insert ''(i)''.