

every company will qualify for the cap. During debate in this chamber in July, members were very explicit in expressing concerns that certain companies should be excluded from the liability cap. My amendment does just that.

Indeed, my amendment is limited to those companies that had contracted with the Federal Aviation Administration but which had commenced services no later than February 17, 2002. The key and determining factor is when the screening services actually commenced regardless of the date on which the contract was actually executed. In addition, companies that had been debarred from doing business with the Federal Government for any period of time—even as little as a single day—within six months after February 17, 2002 would not be eligible under any circumstances for coverage under the cap. In the event a debarred company was subsequently reinstated as a government contractor, they still would not qualify for the cap.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my amendment accomplishes the clear intent of Congress when it passed the Stabilization Act last year. Private screening companies were in no better position to foresee or prevent the events of September 11 than any private or governmental entity. Therefore, fairness and equity demand that we restore the cap under specific terms and conditions. However, my amendment also responds to the concerns of members of this chamber. Indeed, let me repeat. The language in Section 890 makes explicitly clear that only those companies that are in good standing with the government as evidenced by the fact that a company commenced aviation passenger screening services for the government no later than February 17 of this year qualify for the cap. Further, a company would not be eligible if it had been debarred for any length of time within six months from that date.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my explanation will assist my colleagues to better understand the nature and purpose of my amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I most regretfully withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORBERRY). Is there objection to the initial request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 3529, ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WORKER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3529) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and assistance to displaced workers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive speakers and recorded on pages 712 through 713 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request to consider a House bill with a Senate amendment at the Speaker's table until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leader-

ship. Therefore, the Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman for that request.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I heard what the Speaker had to say, but I think I can indicate that the minority would be very pleased to bring this up and, therefore, I think what the Speaker's ruling is indicating is that the majority does not wish to proceed. I believe I can speak clearly, and maybe I should leave it to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), to say that the minority desires that this matter be brought up at this time, and I would, therefore, yield as part of my inquiry to Mr. HOYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not yield to another Member on a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman's statement, of course, will appear in the record.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. If, in fact, under the rules I indicate on behalf of the minority that we have no objection to that unanimous consent request, what effect would that have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would read directly from page 713 of the House Rules Manual where it states that, "It is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request. Therefore, the gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry."

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. With all due respect, that was not my assertion, nor my question. My assertion was that in the event that I indicate to the Speaker that the minority side has no objection to the unanimous consent request proffered by the gentleman from Michigan to allow the unemployment extension bill to be immediately considered, would that have any effect under the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would repeat, once again, that under the clear precedents of the House, it is required that any measure such as that be cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership going back to precedent established

under Speaker O'Neill. It must be a bipartisan floor and committee leadership approval process.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Is it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to inquire whether the congressional letter gathering a number of Members addressed to the Speaker of the House has been submitted into the RECORD asking for H.R. 3529 to be passed by unanimous consent, a letter that was directed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), has that been presented to the House or to the RECORD of the House at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no specific knowledge. Of course, any Member may ask unanimous consent to have a letter or a document inserted into the RECORD.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me just ask unanimous consent for such a letter to be submitted into the RECORD, along with a letter that I have submitted as well to the Speaker on this issue of H.R. 3529 to be brought up on unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman's document may be submitted for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, November 21, 2002.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: More than 800,000 jobless Americans will lose their unemployment compensation three days before the New Year if Congress leaves town without passing extension legislation. Senate Republican Whip Don Nickles worked diligently last week to broker a compromise bill, H.R. 3529, which the House has the option of passing by unanimous consent tomorrow before it adjourns sine die. We can think of no reason why the House of Representatives, which is in session tomorrow, would be unable to pass the bipartisan compromise extension that was passed in the Senate last week. But we can think of 800,000 reasons for the House to act tomorrow.

The San Francisco Chronicle quoted White House officials as saying that "the President believes it's important to protect unemployed workers" and has been lobbying for a compromise to be reached. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3529 is that compromise. Not only would it ensure that workers receive their full thirteen weeks of extended compensation, but it would provide much needed relief to those who are about to exhaust their regular unemployment compensation and still have not found a new job.

When Members of the House left Washington last week, your spokesman responded to questions about whether the House will take up the Senate bill with: "We're done, we're closed up. Why don't they do [the House bill]?" When the House finished its business last week, House Leadership admonished Senators that it was their responsibility to ensure that a Homeland Security

bill was passed. Now, it is the responsibility of the House to ensure that an extended compensation bill gets passed and that 800,000 Americans can rest a little easier this holiday seasons.

Sincerely,

SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,  
Member of Congress.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: More than 800,000 jobless Americans will lose their unemployment compensation three days before the New Year if Congress leaves town without passing extension legislation. Senate Republican Whip Don Nickles worked diligently last week to broker a compromise bill, H.R. 3529, which the House has the option of passing by unanimous consent tomorrow before it adjourns sine die. We can think of no reason why the House of Representatives, which is in session tomorrow, would be unable to pass the bipartisan compromise extension that was passed in the Senate last week. But we can think of 800,000 reasons for the House to act tomorrow.

The San Francisco Chronicle quoted White House officials as saying that "the President believes it's important to protect unemployed workers" and has been lobbying for a compromise to be reached. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3529 is that compromise. Not only would it ensure that workers receive their full thirteen weeks of extended compensation, but it would provide much needed relief to those who are about to exhaust their regular unemployment compensation and still have not found a new job.

When Members of the House left Washington last week, your spokesman responded to questions about whether the House will take up the Senate bill with: "We're done, we're closed up. Why don't they do [the House bill]? When the House finished its business last week, House Leadership admonished Senators that it was their responsibility to ensure that a Homeland Security bill was passed. Now, it is the responsibility of the House to ensure that an extended compensation bill gets passed and that 800,000 Americans can rest a little easier this holiday season.

Sincerely,

Ted Strickland; Charles B. Rangel; Tim Holden; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Marcy Kaptur; Gary L. Ackerman; Edward J. Markey; Dennis J. Kucinich; Rick Larsen; Neil Abercrombie; Danny K. Davis; Sherrod Brown; Maurice D. Hinchey; James L. Oberstar; Edolphus Towns; Rick Boucher; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Stephanie Tubbs Jones; Vic Snyder; Darlene Hooley; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Barney Frank; Lane Evans; Mark Udall; Anna G. Eshoo; Shelley Berkley; Jan Schakowsky; Patrick J. Kennedy.

Joseph Crowley; James P. Moran; Bernard Sanders; Betty McCollum; John F. Tierney; Jay Inslee; Ken Bentsen; Tom Udall; Barbara Lee; Steve Israel; Carolyn B. Maloney; Sanford D. Bishop, Jr.; Robert E. Andrews; Eva M. Clayton; Howard L. Berman; Sander M. Levin; Rosa L. DeLauro; Donald M. Payne; Peter A. DeFazio; Bobby L. Rush; Norm Dicks; José E. Serrano; Martin O. Sabo; Jerrold Nadler; Nick J. Rahall II; George Miller; Carrie P. Meek; Dale E. Kildee.

Joe Baca; Silvestre Reyes; Elijah E. Cummings; Karen McCarthy; John Spratt; Zoe Lofgren; Martin T. Meehan; Baron P. Hill; Ellen O. Tauscher; Bob Etheridge; Steven R. Rothman; Lynn N. Rivers; Bob Filner; Jerry

Klecza; Bart Gordon; Diana DeGette; Earl Blumenauer; Eliot L. Engel; Jerry E. Costello; Ike Skelton; Earl Pomeroy; William D. Delahunt; Steny H. Hoyer; Virgil Goode, Jr.; Tammy Baldwin; David Wu; Jane Harman.

Rubén Hinojosa; Xavier Becerra; Julia Carson; Brian Baird; Carolyn McCarthy; Mike McIntyre; Marion Berry; Dennis Moore; David E. Price; Alcee D. Hastings; John P. Murtha; David E. Bonior; James P. McGovern; Michael M. Honda; Lynn Woolsey; Gene Green; Corrine Brown; Chales A. Gonzalez; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Robert A. Brady; Michael F. Doyle; Adam Smith; Tom Barrett; Lloyd Doggett; Jim Davis; Stephen F. Lynch; Fortney Pete Stark; James R. Langevin; Sheila Jackson-Lee.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, since the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) as a Member of this body was one of the first innovators of legislation with respect to homeland security, how very pleased I am to see the gentleman here today as Speaker pro tempore to drop the gavel on this matter. I am pleased for the gentleman, and I am proud to call the gentleman my friend.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this side of the aisle, I want to say again, as this will be I suppose the last time in the gentleman's role as majority leader that the gentleman addresses the House, we want to congratulate the gentleman on his service. We obviously have had disagreements through the years, but the gentleman has handled himself as a gentleman, and for this side of the aisle, we want to wish the gentleman Godspeed as he enters into a new phase of his career. I know the gentleman's family is pleased to welcome him back to full-time association. I know that was one of the gentleman's prime motives, as he expressed so eloquently on the floor.

On behalf of the minority, we want to wish the gentleman every success and good health and happiness in the future.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to this body that we have some new additions to our congressional family, a new addition to the Abel family. Williams James Abel arrived the night before last, yesterday, in the early hours of the morning, a beautiful baby boy, 9 pounds, 4 ounces.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) would detain for one moment. I want to share a moment with him before he leaves the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the wonderful, beautiful William James Abell,

we have another addition to our congressional family, to the Halpern family, Ari Joseph Halpern, born on November 28. I can tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, that his father is very proud.

Mr. Speaker, I notice a colleague of ours for so many years, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who has so ably served as whip on the other side of the aisle. If I could take a moment to say to the gentleman from Michigan from our side of the aisle, and I believe I dare speak in this case for the entire body, we thank him for his years of service. He has always been a gentleman. He has done his job well as a Member of Congress. I would say on behalf, I believe, of all of us in this body, I wish him Godspeed in his remaining activities.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to join the distinguished majority leader. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has been one of the most distinguished Members of this body. He has reflected, I think, what the American public expects of each of us: the courage to state our convictions. He stood for those convictions and fought for those convictions, irrespective of their popularity or whether he found himself to be in the majority on any given proposition.

I think every Member of this body admires the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for the courage of his convictions. We talk a lot about that, but I think few Members have displayed the courage of their convictions any more dramatically or faithfully than has our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

He is still a very young man, and he has much to offer his country. He fought for his country in Vietnam, and he came here and fought for its ideals. He will continue to serve, I know, as a productive and extraordinary American citizen. We wish him the very best in whatever he may do.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, one final point which I am confident will be of particular interest to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, with us today is my brother, Charlie Arme, general manager of the Rams. Mr. Speaker, he and his associates are in town this weekend to take care of business. I am sure the gentleman from Maryland would like to make him welcome.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we shall see. We shall see.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 107TH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERN) laid before the House the privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 160) providing for the sine die adjournment of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, Second Session.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows: