bill, I am troubled by the level at which the bill defines a ''small'' company. The bill recognizes that there are differences in large and small companies and their ability to pay user fees. The ''two-tiered'' approach to take in the application of user fees is the correct approach to take. However, the bill defines a ''small'' manufacturer as one with revenues of $10 million annually or less. This will capture only around 8 percent of medical device companies. In my opinion, this is too low and not adequate to meet the needs of small manufacturers. A more appropriate level for a ''small'' manufacturer would be around $25 to $30 million in annual revenue, companies that have 50–70 employees. The resources that must be invested in research and the testing necessary before a company even goes to FDA with an application is significant. There are individual innovators who have started companies based upon their own hard work and research. . . . modern day Thomas Edisons. While I would not say that they work out of their garages, it is true that many ideas and advances in technology have come from hard working individuals, who take the risk of starting their own medical device company. I do not want to have the federal government enact legislation that will stifle this innovation or make it impossible for the small companies to become big companies.

This past summer, I met with the representatives of many small medical device manufacturers based in Indiana. All these companies wanted is a chance to develop their products and to compete. They are very willing to play by the rules of safety and effectiveness that we impose on all manufacturers as good public policy. But because of their more limited resources, they do not want to be disadvantaged from the big companies. I agree with their concerns and, therefore, I am troubled by the level set in this bill.

Nonetheless, I intend to support the bill and I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5557.

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. WELLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5557.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2215

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this evening I would like to insert several articles into the RECORD dealing with the issue of war against Iraq and the gulf, and I wanted to remind those who are listening that, indeed, if we look at the foreign policy of the United States over the last 30 years or so, we have had more Americans killed at home and abroad as a result of rising terrorism than in the first 187 years of our country.

So we have to begin to ask the question, why are we losing so many Americans in this way? Why is Washington becoming more barricaded? Why can we not go and ride in front of the White House anymore in our cars? Why are there bomb searches all over this city? Why are American embassies being built like bunkers all around the world? I would like to submit the following.

If we think back to the time when President George Bush, Senior, prior to his election as President was director of the CIA, that was about 1977, the mid-1970s, before President Jimmy Carter became President of the United States, and at the time my colleagues might recall that the Shah of Iran was deposed in the late seventies. I think it was late 1979, and many American hostages were taken, including Terry Anderson.

At the moment that Jimmy Carter's presidency reverted to Ronald Reagan after the election of 1980, the hostages were returned home. President Carter worked very, very hard, as history will record.

Then when the Reagan-Bush administration, the new administration, took over, they essentially made a deal between our country and the Gulf states to go after Ayatollah Khomeini, the new leader in those days of Iran, who had taken our hostages. And who did they hire to do the dirty work for them? They hired none other than Saddam Hussein.

They gave him weapons through the government of the United States, and, indeed, if we look back, and I am trying to find the exact set of hearings right now. In the Committee on Banking of the House of Representatives, a hearing was held regarding the extension of Treasury tax credits, agricultural tax credits to Saddam Hussein in order to buy fertilizers, in quotes, with chemicals from our country at the same time in our country's history when we would not even make those same extensions of credit to our farmers. Companies in Salem, Ohio, and Bedford, Ohio, were being asked by our Treasury to sell those same chemicals to Iraq; and, indeed, it was done.

The Gulf states and the United States were afraid perhaps that the Ayatollah Khomeini at that time might bomb Mecca or try to spread his revolution throughout the Middle East and get control of the oil fields. So Saddam Hussein was promised access, better access from Iraq, which is landlocked, to a waterborne commerce through Kuwait, a slip of land, which